

VICE-REGAL COMMITTEE OF INQUIRY INTO PRIMARY EDUCATION  
(IRELAND), 1913.

APPENDIX  
TO THE  
SECOND REPORT  
OF THE  
COMMITTEE.

MINUTES OF EVIDENCE,

13th March—25th June, 1913,

WITH APPENDICES.

First Report of the Committee is printed separately as [Cd. 6828].

Appendix to the First Report of the Committee, 1 vol., is printed separately as [Cd. 6829].

Second Report of the Committee is printed separately as [Cd. 7228].

Presented to both Houses of Parliament by Command of His Majesty.



LONDON :

PRINTED UNDER THE AUTHORITY OF HIS MAJESTY'S STATIONERY OFFICE.

By ALEX. THOM & Co., Limited, Abbey Street, DUBLIN.

To be purchased, either directly or through any Bookseller, from

E. PONSONBY, Limited, 110, Grafton Street, DUBLIN; or

WILKIN AND SONS, Limited, 29, BERNERS BUILDINGS, FETTER LANE, E.C.4, and 32, AINSWORTH STREET, S.W., and  
54, ST. MARK STREET, CARDIFF; or

H.M. STATIONERY OFFICE (SCOTTISH BRANCH), 23, FOWLE STREET, EDINBURGH,

or from the Agencies in the British Colonies and Dependencies,  
the United States of America, the Continent of Europe and Abroad of

T. FISHER UNWIN, London, W.C.

1914.

[Cd. 7229]

4s. 8d.

# Vice-Regal Committee of Inquiry into Primary Education (Ireland), 1913.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS.

|                              | Page |
|------------------------------|------|
| LIST OF WITNESSES .. .. .    | ii   |
| MENTIONS OF EVIDENCE .. .. . | 1    |
| APPENDICES .. .. .           | 463  |
| INDEX .. .. .                | 529  |

## LIST OF WITNESSES.

| —               | Date on which Evidence was taken. | Name.                                 | Designation.   | Questions. | Page. |
|-----------------|-----------------------------------|---------------------------------------|--|------------|-------|
| Eighth Day ..   | 13th March, 1913                  | Mr. Alfred Parsor ..                  | Late Chief Inspector, Board of National Education in Ireland.  | 3714-3765  | 1     |
| Ninth Day :     | 14th March, 1913                  | Do. ..                                | do. ..   | 4264-4722  | 21    |
| Tenth Day ..    | 1st April, 1913 ..                | Mr. Edmund Downing ..                 | do. ..   | 4723-5272  | 39    |
| Eleventh Day    | 2nd April, 1913 ..                | Do ..                                 | do. ..   | 5273-5321  | 58    |
| Twelfth Day     | 3rd April, 1913 ..                | *The Ven. Lewis Foster, D.D.          | Archdeacon of Down.  | 5322-5860  | 68    |
| Do. ..          | do. ..                            | *The Very Rev. Charles Gleeson, B.D.  | Dean of Bellinist.   | 5861-5985  | 79    |
| Do. ..          | do. ..                            | *The Rev. S. M. Benson, M.A.          | Chancellor of Connor ..  | 5986-6187  | 82    |
| Thirteenth Day. | 4th April, 1913 ..                | *The Rev. Maurice H. P. Collins.      | Vicar of Antrim ..   | 6188-6410  | 88    |
| Do. ..          | do. ..                            | *The Rev. Alfred S. Woodward, M.A.    | Rector of St. Mark's, Ballysillan, Bellinist.  | 6411-6526  | 93    |
| Fourteenth Day  | 16th April, 1913 ..               | Mr. J. J. Hynes, M.A. ..              | Late Chief Inspector, Board of National Education in Ireland.  | 6527-7303  | 99    |
| Fifteenth Day   | 17th April, 1913 ..               | †The Rev. J. Bingham, M.A., D.D.      | Minister of Dundonald, and Convener of the Committee on Elementary Education of the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church. | 7304-7478  | 122   |
| Do. ..          | do. ..                            | *The Rev. D. Carrigan, M.A.           | Minister of Glenties, co. Antrim.  | 7479-7662  | 133   |
| Sixteenth Day   | 18th April, 1913 ..               | The Rev. D. MacLaughlin, B.D., F.R.D. | Minister of Drumminis, co. Antrim.   | 7663-7936  | 140   |
| Do. ..          | do. ..                            | Mr. T. P. Gill ..                     | Secretary of the Department of Agriculture and Technical Instruction for Ireland.  | 7937-8030  | 144   |
| Do. ..          | do. ..                            | Mr. Francis Meehan ..                 | Principal of Tehermore National School, co. Kerry.   | 8031-8316  | 149   |
| Seventeenth Day | 29th April, 1913 ..               | ‡The Rev. G. Mahaffy, M.A.            | Canon of Christ Church Cathedral, Dublin, and Member of the Board of Education of the General Synod of the Church of Ireland.    | 8317-8669  | 156   |

\*Representatives of the Church of Ireland, Managers of National Schools in the Counties of Antrim and Down, and in the County of the City of Belfast.

†Representatives of the Committee on Elementary Education of the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church in Ireland.

‡Representative of the Board of Education of the General Synod of the Church of Ireland.



| —                     | Date<br>on which Evidence<br>was taken | Name   | Dedignation   | Question.   | Page |
|-----------------------|--|--|---|-------------|------|
| Eighteenth<br>Day     | 28th April, 1913 ..                    | The Rev. J. Courtney<br>Clarke, D.D.           | Commissioner of National<br>Education, Ireland.   | 9979-9982   | 170  |
| Nineteenth<br>Day     | 1st May, 1913 ..                       | Mr. Philip Ward ..                             | Commissioner of National<br>Education, Ireland.   | 9983-9985   | 189  |
| Twentieth Day         | 29th May, 1913 ..                      | Mr. F. C. Forth, A.R.C.S.I.                    | Principal of Municipal<br>Technical Institute, and<br>Director of Technical<br>Instruction, Belfast.  | 9923-10101  | 239  |
| Twenty-first<br>Day   | 2nd May, 1913 ..                       | †The Rev. J. W. Tristram,<br>D.D.              | Canon of St. Patrick's Cath-<br>edral, and Inspector of<br>Schools of the Church of<br>Ireland (Diocese of<br>Dublin), and for the Board<br>of Roman Catholics. | 10102-10408 | 227  |
| Twenty-second<br>Day  | 22nd May, 1913 ..                      | Mr. F. H. Dale ..                              | H.M. Chief Inspector of<br>Elementary Schools, Board<br>of Education, England.  | 10409-10991 | 240  |
| Twenty-third<br>Day   | 23rd May, 1913 ..                      | Mr. P. E. Lomas, L.S.O.,<br>L.R.C.S.I.         | Secretary, Board of National<br>Education in Ireland.   | 10992-11190 | 259  |
| Twenty-fourth<br>Day  | 28th May, 1913 ..                      | Mr. W. J. M. Starkie, M.A.,<br>Litt.D., L.L.D. | Resident Commissioner of<br>National Education in<br>Ireland.   | 11200-11308 | 280  |
| Twenty-fifth<br>Day   | 29th May, 1913 ..                      | do ..  | do ..   | 11309-11803 | 306  |
| Twenty-sixth<br>Day   | 30th May, 1913 ..                      | do ..  | do ..   | 11804-12225 | 329  |
| Twenty-seventh<br>Day | 17th June, 1913 ..                     | do ..  | do ..   | 12226-12585 | 361  |
| Twenty-eighth<br>Day  | 18th June, 1913 ..                     | do ..  | do ..   | 12586-12961 | 379  |
| Twenty-ninth<br>Day   | 19th June, 1913 ..                     | do ..  | do ..   | 12962-13272 | 390  |
| Thirtieth Day         | 20th June, 1913 ..                     | do ..  | do ..   | 13273-13945 | 409  |
| Thirty-first<br>Day   | 24th June, 1913 ..                     | Mr. David Prineas ..                           | Assistant to the Board of<br>National Education in<br>Ireland.  | 13946-14122 | 427  |
| Do ..                 | do ..                                  | Rev. E. W. Mahon, Pres-<br>entist.             | Rector of Portadown ..  | 14123-14324 | 438  |
| Thirty-second<br>Day  | 25th June, 1913 ..                     | Mr. P. E. Lomas, L.S.O.,<br>L.R.C.S.I.         | Secretary, Board of National<br>Education in Ireland.   | 14325-14623 | 447  |

†Representative of the Board of Education of the General Synod of the Church of Ireland.

# VICE-REGAL COMMITTEE OF INQUIRY INTO PRIMARY EDUCATION (IRELAND), 1913.

## MINUTES OF EVIDENCE.

EIGHTH DAY.—THURSDAY, MARCH 13TH, 1913.

At 23, Kildare-street.

Present: UEL DILL, M.A., LL.D., LL.D. (Chairman); The Most Rev. DENIS KELLY, D.D., of Ross; Sir HIRAM SHAW WILKINSON, LL.D.; Mr. JOHN COFFEY; Mr. HENRAGE; Mr. J. J. IARLSON; Mr. JEREMIAH HENLY; Mr. WALTER MCMURROUGH KAVANAGH, D.L.; and Mr. THOMAS MICHAEL KITTLE; and

Mr. ARTHUR J. DONNELLY, M.A., B.Sc., Secretary.

Mr. ALFRED PUSHER examined.

3714. The CHAIRMAN.—With regard to your standing and services under the National Board, Mr. Pusher, you were district inspector from the year 1874, were you not?—Yes.

3715. And you were appointed head inspector in 1891?—Yes.

3716. And chief of inspection in 1895?—Yes.

3717. And when was the title of chief of inspection changed to chief inspector?—1900.

3718. And then you became chief inspector?—Yes.

3719. Were the chiefs of inspection abolished as separate officers, or was it merely a change of name?—No, the duties were changed.

3720. It follows from that that you have been three systems?—Yes, a short time under the system that preceded the results system.

3721. And you have full experience as to the results system?—Yes.

3722. Now, in the first paragraph of your report, you say that in 1871, before payment on individual schools was introduced, the staff consisted of six head inspectors and sixty district inspectors?—Yes.

3723. But you do not mention the chiefs of inspection there?—No, because they were not considered as inspectors at all. They were regarded as office people. I may mention that the title of chief of inspection is short for Chief of the Inspection and Statistical Department.

3724. Now each of these 60 district inspectors was located by himself in a definite district. The head inspectors led no districts in those days?—No, they exercised supervision at that time over ten districts each.

3725. For inspection purposes there were various forms of report in those days?—The primary report was mainly concerned with the buildings. It entered into minute detail about everything in the school and premises.

3726. That inspection was not held every year?—No, only every four or five years, I think. Of course, as I was inspector only one year before the system was abolished, I had very few occasions for using it.

3727. That inspection for buildings and equipment appears to have been abandoned under the results system?—Yes.

3728. It did not follow that no attention was paid by any inspector afterwards to the state of the buildings and equipment in his report?—Oh, no; there were several paragraphs referring to it.

3729. Was as much attention paid to the buildings and equipment, and so on, under this former scheme

of inspection, or anything like it, as there is now?—I think there was just as much attention paid to it, but it had not the same effect perhaps on the teacher's income.

3730. Now, with regard to this secondary report, notice of the visit had to be given to the teacher?—Yes.

3731. The visit was supposed to be held during the months of best attendance, and the inspector had to examine every pupil he found. Now how did he get over the schools if the inspection was carried on in a limited portion of the year?—He was able to get over all the schools in one-third of the year.

3732. Yes he?—Yes.

3733. Examining every pupil?—Examining every examination was not as minute as under the results system. We did not go down that Patrick St.

passed in grammar and geography, and all that, but we noted the number that passed in reading, in writing, and in arithmetic, and so on.

3734. Had you the pass marks of the pupils?—No, we merely noted that he was qualified.

3735. The secondary report (No. 2) was one of inspection rather than of examination. What did that inspection include?—Well, one spent some time seeing the teacher doing a little work, and interjected a question now and then. One did not examine them minutely, and one took no notes as to the number who were able to do one thing or another. A few questions were asked on, say, the second class programme to see that the pupils were going on with the work.

3736. One important part of it consisted in hearing the teacher give lessons himself?—Oh, yes.

3737. And watching his method?—Watching his method.

3738. And the manner of the boys in answering?—Yes.

3739. I pass over No. 4, the incidental report; I need not trouble about that?—No, it is the same as at present.

3740. Now we go to the results system. Kindly give a rapid sketch of what you have mentioned in your report?—When the examinations for results scheme were introduced in 1872 it was deemed unnecessary; indeed, it became impossible after the first year—to continue this minute system of inspection. The results report was made seasonal, the examinations being spread over the entire year. In addition, the inspector had to visit each school twice without notice, and on one of these occasions to hold a secondary inspection. With the large increase of schools and children, especially in the higher classes, it was found

impossible to fulfil these requirements completely, but most inspectors held many secondary inspections; I think my proportion was seldom below three-fourths of my schools, and often reached nine-tenths. This form of report was abolished about 1888, the essential points being incorporated into the "incidental" form. I have a paper that shows the number of these visits that were made in one year by the different inspectors.

8741-2. Is it tabulated?—It is tabulated. I may just mention that it was towards the end of the results period, and, of course, the work had got very much heavier as the children got up into higher classes, and as extras began to be more plentiful, but the number of results examinations in this year, 1888, were 129 for each inspector; secondary inspections, 34; other visits, primary and secondary applications, amounted to about 10, and the incidental visits to 150.

8743. Now you say that up to 1800 the old districts system maintained its ground, and the number of districts was raised to 25. Was that done in that year?—No, it was raised early in the results period. It was found that some of the districts had got too heavy (Belmont district was one), so there were two new districts. That was early in the results period.

8744-5. Now will you explain how the head inspector tried to maintain uniformity of standard. This paper says that the head inspector maintains, as far as practicable, a uniform standard of marking the answering of pupils, and so on, and I see you say that the way taken to secure uniformity of results examinations was that they held conferences under the chief of inspection in the Education Office?—Yes.

8746. And these head inspectors were summoned to a conference in Dublin?—Yes, they were generally in Dublin for other purposes as well as that, and then occasion was taken of their being in Dublin to have conferences with the chiefs of inspection.

8747. That is, they did not meet at regular intervals?—Oh, yes, they did. They met once a year. They really met in connection with the preparation of papers for the teachers' examinations.

8748. Then I see a very effective measure taken to secure uniformity was, that of one of these annual conferences one district inspector was called on to examine a school in the presence of the others?—Yes.

8749. How many would there be?—He would have ten or eleven inspectors at least, and possibly one or two young inspectors who had just been appointed.

8750. Now, what was the mode of testing inspectors in those days for their work when you first entered?—Well, when I entered first, which was before the results system, of course, I was sent out with one of the district inspectors here in town. He took me in charge for a week or a fortnight, and then I was sent down to another inspector. It happened that I was sent down to Newry, and the inspector there was not very well, and I was called upon to give him some help as the model school examinations; and the head inspector came there and took me about. Then I was sent to Mullingar, and I was taken about by another head inspector, and the training I got amounted to perhaps about four or five weeks outdoor work, with about a fortnight in the office going over forms and looking at reports, and such things, before I went out as a district inspector.

8751. That was before the results system?—That was before the results system.

8752. Was there any change made in the mode of training when the results system was introduced?—Yes, the men were kept much longer on probation, and this preliminary sort of service. In fact they seldom got a district till they were twelve months or even two years going about with other inspectors.

8753. And watching their methods?—Yes.

8754. And were they allowed to inspect under the eye of the other inspectors?—Yes, they had to do it.

8755. How does that compare with the present system of training inspectors?—Well I think the two are very much alike.

8756. We had it in evidence that for six months the junior inspector is put under the charge of a senior?—Yes.

8757. That is very much what you have described—Yes.

8758. And then I think the probation goes on for a year?—Oh, fully, as a rule.

8759. Two years?—It may be two years.

8760. And is in the time spent going about with the senior?—Not all. At the end of six months, and even during the first six months, he will not necessarily be with the senior every day. The senior has a perfect right to pass him over to one of his juniors, but he must be employed in that circuit.

8761. At any rate, he will be with some experienced inspector?—Yes, and after the first few months he will be sent to give a little help, and after six months, when he has passed the probationary period, and has been recognised as qualified for permanent appointment, he will be allowed to examine a school, but the inspectors have orders not to give him any difficult cases or any critical case.

8762. And he won't be allowed to assign a merit mark without complete control of some other inspector?—Well, he should not be, but I do not know what has been done since I went out, for I am out now a year and a half practically.

8763. Then the whole present system of training rather resembles the system under the results examinations?—I think it is very much alike. There is a slight difference in some respect, of course, about the examinations that they have to undergo, and such things.

8764. Was that system of deputed one of the district inspectors to examine a school in the presence of ten or twelve other inspectors calculated to produce very good results?—I do not think it was of very much use.

8765. How would the children acquit themselves in the presence of ten or twelve inspectors watching them?—The children never minded these things. That was my experience. The children looked upon it as rather an amusing day. The examination was not very strict on a day of that sort.

8766. May I call your attention to a line or two at the end of page 8 of your prints, in which you say the head inspector also held check examinations in every district each year if possible, and in case of a teacher's appeal through the manager against an inspector's examination, the head inspector might re-examine the school if a prima facie case were shown. Now will you give me an idea of what happened if the head inspector re-examined a school in the case of an appeal?—He would send up exactly the same form of report as the district inspector had sent up, with full marks for all the pupils in all the subjects, and then if there was a serious discrepancy, blame would probably fall on the district inspector.

8767. Who was then charged with comparing the head inspector's report and the district inspector's report?—The chief of inspection.

8768. Would it go any further?—Oh, yes, he would probably take it to the Resident Commissioner.

8769. And after that?—After that an order would be issued as to what was to be done.

8770. It did not go before the Board necessarily?—Not in the first instance.

8771. You say various modifications were made from time to time in the regulation regarding the past mark, and that the general effect was to make the examinations rather mechanical and to open the door to exam?—It was laid down distinctly what we might ask, and what we might not ask, and how many questions were to be asked. The teachers, of course, knew this, and if there was an inspector whose style they did not like they would sometimes stand near him with their paper open, and see that he did not transgress those regulations in any one point, and, of course, he should not do so, and complaints were sometimes made.

8772. And did the teacher often appeal to the office if the inspector went beyond the regulations?—No, unless it was a very serious case.

18th March, 1913.]

Mr. ALFRED FURMAN, examined.

[Continued.]

8775. Appeals were very rare under the circumstances, but the right of appeal was always there. Now we go on to a very important paragraph. The district system was abolished, and 22 circuits containing about 400 schools were established, each in charge of one senior and two sub or district inspectors. You allege, as a great objection to that system, that it is difficult or almost impossible to get 22 men of sufficient experience to fill that position of senior inspector?—Yes, if they are to be given any real supervising powers of control.

8776. I think you say the senior inspector has no authority?—He has very little authority.

8777. I am asking for information because I understood from various sources that he has a certain amount of authority over the junior inspectors, a directive power?—Oh, he has some authority, certainly.

8778. You put it very broadly. You say the senior inspector has no authority, and the sub-inspectors have no responsibility. You say that "this has proved a more workable scheme, but it is open to the same objection given above"?—What I really meant by that was that he had no power to order his district inspectors to give certain marks or to adopt a certain course.

8779. But the junior, I understand, according to some recent order, cannot alter the merit mark without the sanction of the senior?—Yes, but remember that I was referring to a time before that. I was referring to the time when I was chief inspector myself. What has been done since I only know by hearsay. That change, I think, was only made within the last year or so.

8780. But, as a matter of strict accuracy, would you adhere to that expression that the senior has no authority and the sub-inspectors no responsibility?—I am referring there to the power to order a sub-inspector to do certain things, to adopt his standard. That is what I had in my mind when I was writing that, and I do not think he has authority to order a sub-inspector to adopt his standard.

8781. But surely a senior man from the very fact of his being a senior, and holding a higher office, might influence the younger man considerably?—Yes, he might influence him by quiet converse. In that way he has influence, but I do not think he has authority, that is, power to order the man to do so-and-so.

8782. The *Inspector or Boss*.—You confine the word "authority" simply to the merit mark?—No, to the standard.

8783. Mr. REYNOLDS.—Has he power to establish a uniform standard?—I don't think he has the power or authority to order his sub-inspector to adopt his own standard of marking.

8784. The *Burner or Boss*.—Has he no power to say to one, "I regard your standard as too high," and to another, "I regard your standard as too low," or that "You are too strict in such-and-such a direction," or "too lenient in other directions"?—Yes.

8785. And can he say to him, "You should mend your manners in this matter"?—He can say it, but I do not think he has any way of enforcing it.

The CHAIRMAN.—I think we have evidence that if the senior and junior disagree about the merit mark, it must be referred to the office?

Mr. REYNOLDS.—That shows that the senior has not power or authority.

8786. The CHAIRMAN.—Then you say that 22 men of sufficient experience and judgment are not likely to be found among a staff of 60, if their position is to be one of guiding and controlling subordinate officers, that is, if they are to possess that kind of authority that you desiderate, is not that what you mean?—Yes.

8787. That power of command?—Yes.

8788. But, of course, the 22 men, although according to what you say they do not possess that, and although they may not be all first-rate men, are still equal to their present duty?—I do not look upon their duties as anything higher than what the district inspectors had before.

8789. It is a fact that their duties are so limited as you speak of?—Their range of duty is very limited, I think.

8790. Their position is nearly one of being co-ordinate with the other two, the senior is almost on the same level with the other?—That is my experience. In the way of authority I think it is so, but, of course, he has different duties.

8791. I want you to explain two points. You say that each circuit was divided into three equal sections, radiating out from the common centre of residence, and the schools of each of these sections were in charge of each of the three district inspectors in rotation, so that if one inspector were not quite reasonable the other two might correct the balance; but that the effect was really the opposite, the one unreasonable man's award militated against the just treatment of all the schools?—Yes. The circuits were divided into three sections. The inspector taking Section A the first year, would take Section B next year, and then Section C, and if he was a hard man all the schools would suffer within the three years, even if the other two men were not only reasonable, but actually lenient. His one mark would be sufficient to interfere with the increments of the teachers.

8792. The one mark of the unreasonable man would militate against the teacher's promotion and increment?—Yes.

8793. According to the triennial system. You say this arrangement which had many other faults was introduced without any reference to the chiefs of inspection. Were those great changes introduced without consultation?—Yes, absolutely. I might perhaps mention that the first intimation we chiefs got of it was when a clerk coming into the office said, "Is it true that you are to be turned out of the office?"

8794. Mr. HANCOCK.—In what year was that?—That was in the year 1900.

8795. The CHAIRMAN.—Now you say, "With six head inspectors conferring together a fair equality of standard of examination might be reached, but even with them the attainment of a uniform standard of inspection would probably be hopeless. Uniformity of either standard is not to be expected with 22 senior men who do not even meet each other in conference." Is it the case that the 22 senior inspectors never held a conference with regard to uniformity?—Never, so far as I know. They held a conference in 1908.

8796. I think that is the only one?—I think that was the only one that could be called a conference. They were all summoned before the Board a couple of years ago, but that was not a conference.

8797. That conference was called in 1908 to secure greater uniformity. That was one of the objects?—That was one of the objects, I think. I can give you a copy of the report of the conference. I will bring you another copy, because this one that I have here has nothing of my own.

8798. We have asked for that. Then your proposal under this head is the restoration of the old district system with the supervision of six or eight head inspectors?—Yes, I think that would be more desirable than the present system.

8799. Now you say a uniform standard becomes quite impossible with the sub-division of the merit mark into "good" and "fair," and so on. We have spent a great deal of time on that, and we should like to have your opinion, as you have seen three different systems. Would you kindly explain how it is that the merit marks cannot be assigned with perfect uniformity?—Well, the difference between "excellent" and "very good" is merely a matter of opinion. One man would lean a little more one way, and another man another way, and it is very hard to know where to draw the line in such gradation from "very good" to "good," and from "good," to "fair," and from "fair" to "middling."

8800. Would it mean one thing to an Inspector in Cork and another to an Inspector in Portmah?—It might, indeed.

8801. Mr. COVERT.—Would you not go further and say that it might mean different things even to the same inspector?—Undoubtedly, it might mean a different thing to the inspector one day from what it might mean on another day.

3800. The CHAIRMAN.—Did you ever know of any attempt seriously made to analyse or define the meaning of "excellent," "very good," "good," "fair," and "middling," as applied to schools and teachers?—Oh, yes; it is in this report.

3801. What did you think of the attempt?—Well, it was noted by the senior inspectors.

3802. Mr. HARRISON.—To what are you referring?—The report of the conference of the senior inspectors.

3803. The CHAIRMAN.—Sir Hiram Wildkinson requests that you would give as a specimen of that, the attempt to define "excellent" in that report?—This is the "report of the conference of 1903"—"With a view to secure uniformity of inspection an agreement should be arrived at as to the meaning of 'excellent,' 'very good,' 'good,' 'fair,' 'middling,' 'bad,' in reporting on the general character of a school; also as to 'highly efficient' and 'efficient' in describing the character of a teacher." Now the answer the inspectors gave was this:—(1) An excellent school is one in which the whole programme is taught in a highly creditable manner; (2) in which the best methods of teaching are in use; (3) the educational equipment ample; (4) the tone and discipline of a high order; (5) order and tidiness exemplary; (6) the school records neat, correct, and complete; (7) house and premises of a good class and in good order."

3804. That is the whole?—That is the whole.

3805. Taking that analysis of the idea of "excellent," will it help the inspectors to acquire absolute uniformity under these heads—on every one of these heads might the inspectors not differ in opinion?—They might.

3806. Mr. HENRY.—Perhaps Mr. Purser would give us the notes the inspectors have written on "good" and "very good," and the way they try to define them?—It is in the same thing. There is a note here that I think is somewhat important under that answer of the senior inspectors. The note is—"It is obviously impossible to formulate precise definitions of 'very good,' 'good,' 'fair,' etc., schools owing to the various possibilities under the seven heads suggested in the description of the 'excellent' school. The following table is drawn up to indicate approximately the value attached to 'excellent,' 'very good,' 'good,' 'fair,' etc., first, by means of a numerical standard, and secondly by descriptive epithets or phrases." The answer of the senior inspectors also defines the meaning of the other marks; I have already read you out the definition of "excellent." I group together these four points—programme, methods, tone and discipline, order and tidiness. For "excellent" these must be "highly creditable." For "very good" they must be "creditabile." For "good" they must be "satisfactory." For "fair" they must be "neither praiseworthy nor blame-worthy." For "middling" they must be "unsatisfactory under two of these heads," and for "bad" "unsatisfactory all round." Then as to the buildings, the house and premises, under this standard of 1903 for "excellent," "very good," and "good," there must be "of good class and in good repair," then for the other three they must be in "fair repair," and for "bad" there is nothing at all.

3807. The CHAIRMAN.—Is that analysis of those various descriptions of schools and teachers likely to help an inspector?—Not unless he was present at the conference. I think it might possibly be of help to him then, but I do not know of any other way.

3807. You do not know that any inspector would be helped?—I think they would be more likely to be helped the other way, that it would be rather a disadvantage to them.

3808. Mr. KIRKLE.—I think we might have the definitions as to the school records?—For "excellent," "very good," and "good" they should be "neat, correct, and complete;" for "fair" or "middling" "correct and complete" (they need not be neat). Do you wish to know about the highly efficient teacher?

3809. Yes?—There are two descriptions given of the highly efficient teacher and the efficient teacher. "The highly efficient teacher should show special apti-

tude in developing the intelligence of his pupils in cultivating habits of order, neatness, attention and industry, and in maintaining a firm but pleasant discipline, and his preparation for work should be thorough, and his pupils should attain a highly creditable proficiency. If the above be modified by the omission of the underlined words" (that is the word "highly" where it occurs in two places) "it will then define the efficient teacher."

3810. The CHAIRMAN.—That is all the difference?—That is all the difference.

3811. Mr. COFFEY.—By whom was the query submitted; was it submitted by the chiefs of inspection?—No, there was no chief of inspection at that time.

3812. Then by the chief inspectors?—Well, the chief inspectors knew a conference was going to be held, but they were certainly not consulted about it.

3813. Was it the Resident Commissioner who submitted that query?—I could not tell; it was submitted, I am quite sure, by the secretaries.

3814. The chief inspectors had no official knowledge of the conference, nor of its decisions?—Not at the time, but, of course, they were submitted to as later on.

3815. Mr. HENRY.—You were not present?—No, I was not present.

3816. The CHAIRMAN.—Now may I call your attention to your statement in the preface about the way in which the inspectors' reports were dealt with under the old system. You say they were dealt with by the clerks in charge of the several districts?—Yes.

3817. Was one clerk charged with certain specified districts?—Oh, yes. I forget how many clerks were employed in what was called the long room, but the districts were equally divided among them.

3818. Were those clerks merely clerks, or had they had any educational experience?—Oh, they were merely clerks. A few of them might have been teachers before they became clerks. In fact, I know some of them that were.

3819. I just wanted you to bring out the difference between the manner of dealing with these reports under the old system and under the new system of examining. It appears to me, and I wish you would explain it, that the clerks of the chiefs of inspection in those days, being mere clerks, had a considerable discretion in dealing with the reports?—The clerks had exactly the same discretion in dealing with them then as they have now, but there was one special clerk told off to attend on the chiefs of inspection.

3820. But still there were certain reports that were treated as merely routine by the clerks, and that never passed out of their hands?—I think not.

3821. You say the clerk "looked through the reports to see these matters had been attended to, and in ordinary routine cases he drafted orders on them"?—Yes, that was the clerk that was attending on the chiefs of inspection, but that order of his did not have any effect till the chief of inspection put his initials to it.

3822. You say "cases requiring special consideration be brought to the chiefs of inspection for noting"?—Yes.

3823. That was a special class of cases?—He would bring down a bundle of reports, as to some of which, of course, he would not feel sure about what noting ought to go on them, and he would consult the chief of inspection.

3824. Did not that leave, after all, a certain discretion to the clerk in dealing with the report as to the amount of direction he should get from the chief of inspection?—Yes, but we had to check all that when it came down to us.

3825. The BRUCE or ROSS.—And the cases that the clerk did not bring before you for your special consideration and the affixing of your initials in some instances would be mere matters of routine?—Yes.

3826. So that, after all, the determination of the reports requiring special consideration and ordinary reports that the clerk himself might note upon would really rest with the clerk, with a check on the part of the chief inspector?—The chief inspector went over them all afterwards.

1924 March, 1913.]

Mr. ALFRED PUGH, examined.

[Continued.]

3827. Every one?—Every one, even the most insignificant report, and sometimes when the clerk thought that no noting was necessary at all, that it was merely a trivial case, the chief of inspection would put his noting on it.

3828. The CHAIRMAN.—But then he took the clerk's word for the fact that the report did not require special attention, for you say "cases requiring special consideration he brought to the chiefs of inspection for noting"?—To know what noting was to be put on them.

3829. The point then is this, that the examiners, as they are now, have a far larger discretion than the clerks of the chiefs of inspection—they have now a larger discretion in dealing with the reports than the whole staff had?—Yes, a great deal more, not more, though, I think than the chiefs of inspection.

3830. We have it from Mr. Pugh that the examiner now exercises a much larger discretion with regard to these questions in relation to their superiors than the clerks of the chief of inspection?—Oh, about that, I do not know what power the examiners have in comparison with the clerks, because what they do as examiners never came before as an chief.

3831. Mr. HENRY.—The point Sir Samuel wants to bring out is this, have the examiners of the present day, who are more clerks, more power under the present arrangements than the clerks had when there were chiefs of inspection there?

The CHAIRMAN.—That is what I want.

Mr. HENRY.—That is whether the examiner can do now what no clerk could have done at the time when the chiefs of inspection were there?—Certainly, the examiners, as I take it, are, to all intents and purposes, chiefs of inspection. They are the chiefs of the inspection department.

3832. Mr. KERRIE.—I understood you to say that under the old system the chiefs of inspection read every report, even a routine report?—I did not say he read every report, but he looked through every report, an incidental report might merely give the number of children present, and that things were going on all right, and that the accounts were correctly kept, and you would see that at a glance, and besides that it was the duty of the clerk when he first received that to underline any irregularity no matter how trifling.

3833. But the chief of inspection was, under that system to some extent, dependent on the clerk?—Yes, the reports had to be looked through first of all by the clerks, and he was usually dependent on the clerks for correct noting being put on those reports as to the previous history of the school, or the previous history of the teacher, but we certainly read through all the reports in the ordinary sense of the word. I used to be kept there till all hours in the evening.

3834. The CHAIRMAN.—I think that is one of the most important things in your paper, the comparison between those clerks of that day and the examiners of the present day?—There is one paper I have—a paper I drew up at the time the chief inspectors were appointed—and I made out a list of our duties (the duties rather than used to be ours, but were taken from us), and to whom they were assigned.

3835. Taken from you in the year 1907?—Yes, and to whom they were assigned, and also the duties given to us, and who previously performed them. I have that. I prepared it at the time of the change, because I need scarcely say that I objected very much to the change, that it lowered my status completely. I hand that in.

3836. It is understood that that will be printed?—Yes (paper handed in).

3837. Sir HENRY WILKINSON.—Now the paragraph numbers in this paper referred to the numbers in the *Journal* with regard to the duties of chief inspector, that is so far as the first three columns are concerned. The paragraphs in the fifth column refer to a similar document referring to the duties of examiners?—Yes.

3838. The CHAIRMAN.—In your paper you say the reports then returned to the clerks in charge, those

which required the Board's fiat having first passed the Board. You observe these words?—I do not know what you want to know about it.

3839. What class of report would that be?—For instance, if the teacher was fined, the clerk would not note that in his district book until the clerk finding him had passed the Board. Then the returns would go back to the clerk, and he would note that order in the book, at least he would note that fine against the teacher.

3840. That is a class of cases that now go before the Board. We have had it in evidence that cases of fines always go before the Board?—But there would be other cases too. I only mention that as one sort of case.

3841. I do not know whether you could give us any idea of the range of those cases in the old times that went before the Board, my object being to see whether more cases went before the Board in those days than go now?—Do you mean with reference to teachers or to schools as well, because there might be questions about the schoolhouse.

3842. I refer only to the case of teachers?—I do not know whether they were much more plentiful before the Board in old days than they are now.

3843. We had it in evidence from the examiner yesterday that cases of suspension did not go before the Board, but all cases of fine and dismissal go before the Board?—Yes, but that was certainly so in the old days too.

3844. You do not think that there were any other cases that went before the Board?—I think not, unless there was something peculiar in the case.

3845. Mr. COFFET.—Of course, in the results days there were very few appeals?—Very few, and the fines and such things were generally very clear cases, either that the accounts were wrong or that there was gross neglect of some sort.

3846. The CHAIRMAN.—Now you say under the new system the reports are, in the first instance, dealt with in the same manner; but instead of coming to the chief, they go to the higher clerks who have been appointed examiners. These, you say, have no knowledge of school matters, and are not in a position to decide on the merits of the schools from the report. Was some of the three examiners ever in charge of a school or inspector of a school?—No, there were only two in my own time, and I am only referring to my own time. There were only two examiners when I was in the office.

3847. Is it your impression that the delays that are so much complained of in the case of adverse reports are due to the examiners not being more numerous?—No, I do not think that that affects it at all.

3848. Then you say that as the examiners were not experts the decision regarding merit marks and diplomas was more haphazard, first to Mr. Strong, and afterwards to Mr. Wyse, who was a junior inspector. Did the examiners decide at first with regard to merit marks and diplomas?—I think at first the merit marks scarcely came into it.

3849. They form the principal part of Mr. Wyse's duties now?—They do, but for the first year or two they were of very little importance, because it was not until people were coming on into the third year of the triennial period that they became of importance. At first they were not important, and it was the examiners that dealt with them, and they dealt with diplomas entirely, where, of course, merit marks did not come in.

3850. What is the point of your reference to Mr. Dale's report, if I do not quite follow it?—Well the whole of the changes that have been brought about have been largely due to that report; all the changes since the big change in 1900 depended on this report of Mr. Dale's, and it is always brought up as a reason for doing as-and-so. Now Mr. Dale, in that report, draws attention to the difficulty of coming to any standard or having a standard.

3851. He gives reasons why inspectors are not qualified accurately to assign the merit marks?—Yes, the inspectors would be in a difficulty in assigning a correct

merit mark. In the last part of Section 97, page 29, he says that the relation between the inspectors of schools and the teachers is different from that between the head of the department and the clerks employed in it, quite a different relation. And then he goes on to say:—"A Government inspector, however, who only sees a teacher for a short time on two or three days in the year will be able to form a general judgment on the capacity of the teacher, but he cannot hope to acquire the full knowledge and evidence which would be necessary in order to enable him to compare unhesitatingly the respective merits of school candidates all more or less suitable, and to justify his selection if it is challenged. Partly for this reason the local authorities in England, who have a large number of teachers in their employment, have, as a rule, employed inspectors of their own, who, owing to the small size of their district, are able to keep in very much closer touch with each school than is possible to a Government inspector. Nor does the fact that in France the inspectors have a similar power in the promotion of teachers afford any argument in favour of the system. In France the atmosphere of respect for Government ordinance, fostered as it is by the traditions of military service is conducive to a much more unquestioning acceptance of the verdict of a Government official than can be obtained in Ireland or in England." I think he ought to have added there that in France the teacher is a Government civil servant. He is more in the position of a clerk in the office to the head of the department than the teacher is in Ireland to his inspector. "It is not to be expected that a teacher who sees his colleagues in charge of a school of nearly equal or similar size promoted while he is left in his existing grade, will not use every means in his power to put himself in an equally favourable position. There can, I think, be little doubt that appeals to the central office or to individual Commissioners against the judgment of the inspectors will be common, and in order to avoid the difficulties thus created there will naturally be constant pressure put upon the Commissioners by managers and teachers to increase the number of teachers in each of the higher grades, so as to make it coincide more nearly with the number qualified by the size of their schools for promotion in the grade." He draws attention to the fact that we are sure to have a large number of appeals.

3850. THE CHAIRMAN.—Will you explain these words in your paper:—"Not particularly his prophetic about appeals."—Well here it is a man who, judging on mere *a priori* grounds, asserted that this thing would probably come, and that is the very thing that has occurred, appeals becoming plentiful.

3851. Under the present system?—Under the present system.

3852. THE BRUCE OR ROSS.—As the paragraph was read, the question arose in my mind as to how his method would have solved the difficulty. It seems to me that the difficulty he raises is that the present Inspector of the Board has too many teachers and too many schools under his supervision, and therefore he cannot get an intimate personal knowledge of each teacher. Is not that so?—Yes.

3853. What he states is that in England the local authority has inspectors of its own, for instance, the County Council or other local authority, and that the inspector has a small number of schools to examine, and therefore he can get a more intimate knowledge of the teachers. Is not that so?—That is what he implies.

3854. I think he states so. Now you see finally brought back to the personal element of the individual mind. The local inspector has to form a judgment on the actual teacher as to whether that teacher is highly efficient or efficient or not efficient, so you work back to the personal equation?—Yes, you do.

3855. How would that better the conditions if it is so utterly impracticable for any one man to pass judgment on another, as you seem to indicate earlier in your evidence—how does it better the situation that you would have a fewer number of people to judge?—That would not be my view at all. My view is that if you are going to have an inspector judging these things

you must make it perfectly definite what he is to judge, and particularly the grounds on which he is to base his judgment.

3856. Would you have him to judge men; will you have an inspector to judge another man?—Well he would be rather judging the school. I do not think there would be any difficulty.

3857. Well you say earlier in your evidence that it would be impossible for him to decide upon the discipline of the school and upon a number of things, whether he could distinguish that they were satisfactory or unsatisfactory, or whether they were creditable or highly creditable, but don't you still come back—does not the old difficulty still face you?—No, I think not, if you do not make these excessive subdivisions.

3858. What subdivisions would you suggest?—I suppose you would see no difficulty in deciding between a bad school and an excellent school?—Oh, certainly not.

3859. Would you be able to interpose a *medius terminus*?—I would consider whether the school was fairly conducted or not fairly conducted.

3860. That is, you would have two terms?—I would only have the two. I think that is all you have in England.

3861. Then the other point of Mr. Dale apparently was to shift the friction from between the central authorities and the teacher, to shift that friction on from the central authority to the local authority, and leave the local authority to fight the question out with the teacher. Is not that really what he suggests?—I dare say it is.

3862. How does that advance us—if you have the friction, where is the advantage of having the friction between the local authorities and the teacher rather than between the central authority and the teacher?—No advantage in having any friction at all. I am not supporting Mr. Dale or Mr. Dale's proposals even. I bring forward merely the point that Mr. Dale, judging from what he knew of such schools, stated that if you adopt this system you will have appeals, and I say you have appeals.

3863. Why, then, should some other system have been adopted?—If you have a system, such as you had at the results time, of individual examination, you will at once take away the greater part of this very thing.

3864. Then your remedy would be to revert to the results system?—To revert to the individual examination, not to the results system.

3865. Mr. CORRY.—By individual examination, are I to take you as meaning that each individual child in a class should be examined?—Each individual child to be examined in the class.

3866. And any inspector with experience and a fair amount of capacity ought to be able to judge from the examination of the class whether the teacher had done substantially good work?—Yes.

3867. THE BRUCE OR ROSS.—I was going on to this very point about the examination, you say on page 7, "Inspection alone affords no evidence how far the teacher's instruction has reached the minds of his pupils;" would you call it inspection to sit watching the teacher giving a lesson?—Certainly.

3868. Would the inspector not see whether the teacher was actually influencing the minds of the pupils there?—He could not.

3869. By the manner of the children and the teacher's manner and the answering, and so on?—Well, with a few of the children, but you certainly could not with the general run of the class. I could not.

3870. You want to increase the element of examination as compared with inspection in the present system?—Yes.

3871. Now to go back to what Mr. Coffey asked, what would be the examination that you would have?—I would have every child in the school examined in what are generally considered the essential subjects—reading, writing, and arithmetic. In the other subjects, which are to my mind of less consequence for boys, I

would be satisfied with a general class test of the whole thing to see that the subject had received fair attention. Of course, the written work would show a great deal.

8872. You say that the best inspectors examine freely under the present system?—I think they do.

8873. Do they follow your method?—They follow their own methods. It is necessary to examine very largely.

8874. And examine the children individually?—Every child individually, but the only thing is that they do not put down the marking too. I think it would be an advantage to the schools if the marks on the three R's were all put down.

8875. Might I take you as meaning this, that there is a great difference in method among the inspectors, some rely more on the mere inspection of schools in general, and others introduce a large element of examination?—Yes; I think that is so; in fact, I am perfectly sure it is.

8876. And the merit mark might be determined in one case a great deal more on inspection and in another case more by examination?—Yes.

8877. And would that account for the varying of standards?—Only partially, because even in the case of the examination there would be a considerable difference between the tests that one man would apply and the tests that another man would apply.

8878. But you say that relying too much on inspection leaves too much room for the personality and idiosyncrasies of the inspector?—Yes, I think so.

8879. But that would not apply so much to examination?—It would not apply so much, and if regulations were laid down it would apply very slightly to examination.

8880. It could be limited very much?—It could be limited very much.

8881. What do you mean by saying that there should be a definite programme for each school or grade of school?—I mean that it should be laid down exactly what subjects should be taught in that school, and approximately, at any rate, how far each subject should be carried.

8882. I do not quite understand—a definite programme for each school?—Yes, each school should have its own programme. Of course, a great many schools may have the same programme, but because a certain programme is the programme for school A, it does not follow that it should be also the programme for school B.

8883. In the present system there is a programme which does not require to be absolutely adopted, but which may be modified by the manager and teacher?—Well, nominally.

8884. Within certain limits?—Nominally it may be altered.

8885. Does that differ much from your suggestion—apparently you would give a considerable latitude?—You are leaving out what comes after that about the grading of the school. That is part of the point that I was making here. What I say is that there should be a definite programme for each school, or grade of school, and a definite examination on each programme. My notion was, that in the case of a school doing, let us say, at present unsatisfactory work on this big programme, the Commissioners, through their officer, will say to the teacher: "You are not able to do that, you must take a much simpler programme, you must limit yourself to the three R's, or something of that sort. We won't judge you on this extensive programme, which is beyond your power, but we will require you to do this curriculum," and it would be the lowest grade of school.

8886. And that programme is laid down by the officers of the Board?—It would be laid down in its main lines; but, of course, to the manager and teacher, as at present is nominally the case, would be given the power of suggesting the exact extent to which the inspector should be allowed to look.

8887. The CHAIRMAN.—The manager should be consulted by the authority before it is laid down?—He should be consulted through the inspector, you.

8888. Would you extend the discretion as regards the manager or teacher more than now?—I would extend it more than it is at present, because at present this supposed right that they have is really not a right at all. There is always an objection; if they propose to leave out any subject, they are told "No." They are told that such a subject is obligatory.

8889. Mr. CORRY.—Do I grasp the idea that is passing through your mind to be that a certain number of essential subjects, such as reading, writing, arithmetic, and spelling, and some measures of grammar, geography or composition should be obligatory in every school, but that outside that a certain number might be given, such as agriculture, geometry, algebra, as optional subjects, to be taken at the discretion of the teacher and the manager, and not to be enforced by the Board. That strikes me as the idea?—It is, but the subjects that you name are not exactly the subjects that I had in my mind.

8890. That certain subjects should be obligatory in every school?—Yes.

8891. And that outside those a certain number of other subjects might be specified, to be taken at the discretion of the teacher and the manager?—Yes.

8892. And that none of those subjects, useful to be sure, but not essential, should be forced on a school by the Education Officer?—My action was to grade the school according to the number of subjects which the teacher was able to take. I am going on the line that we have a definite programme to be laid down by the Commissioners, and that certain essential things must be taught in all schools. I take it that if the full programme were efficiently taught, the school would be entitled to rank in the highest grade; but supposing the teacher, for one reason or another, was unable to take up the whole course, that he might be allowed to leave out some of those. That would immediately put his school in a lower category. If his school was being badly conducted I would leave it to the inspector to say, "You must not take up all these subjects; you must take a fewer number till you have shown your qualification to teach them."

8893. The CHAIRMAN.—When you get to the lowest grade that you are thinking of, what would be the minimum of necessary subjects that you would require a teacher to give lessons in?—The minimum would be reading, spelling (of course, that would come in with either reading or writing), writing (which would include a little composition in the higher classes), and arithmetic. I am not quite sure that in the lowest of these grades I would ask grammar at all. If I would, it would be the very simplest elements (but I would rather leave out grammar), and a little geography; and in the case of girls' schools needlework would always be essential.

8894. These would be essentials for the lowest grade to which you would give any recognition?

Mr. HENRY WILKINSON.—What is the minimum of the Board now?—English, which includes reading and spelling, and includes history, and includes writing, and includes composition and grammar; then geography, arithmetic, singing (whether the man knows it or not), drawing.

8895. Is singing compulsory in all schools?—Yes. Of course, if a man is utterly incompetent, I do not know whether he is forced into it, but he does it, and then, of course, you hear a most discordant noise in the school, which is only doing mischief in it. Drawing is another subject, and needlework. Manual instruction is required only in the lower classes. Then there are Elementary Science and Hygiene (Health and Habits), and that is a subject very few of our teachers have any notion how to teach. There is also physical drill, and I think that is a thing that ought to be taught in all the schools. For girls' schools you have also cooking and laundry work; domestic economy, or domestic science, as it is sometimes called, now includes these two.



13th March, 1915.]

Mr. ALFRED PURVES, examined.

[Continued.]

3886. Mr. HENLY.—You leave out Nature study?—Nature study comes in under the head of Elementary Science.

3887. The CHAIRMAN.—You say in your précis that all the sub-divisions of the merit mark "excellent," "very good," "good," "fair," "middling," "bad" should be abolished for increments, promotions and diplomas. Now would you explain the system that you would put in place of that. We have had certain suggestions made, and I want to hear what you would put in place of the present system?—I would give the increments after a probationary period.

3888. You would begin by putting the teacher on probation first?—Yes, on his coming out of the Training College, or after first appointment for two or three years, because I think that in the time they should be closely looked after, and if they showed no aptitude they ought to be got rid of. But as soon as they have been definitely appointed, and have got a definite certificate, then the increment should begin if they get a favourable report on their school. I do not want these sub-divisions, but simply that the schools should be favourably reported on, and that they should then get their increment, and should get their diploma.

3889. You say there that the increments should not be withheld except for unfavourable reports?—Yes, the report must be favourable or unfavourable; we would only have the two reports, favourable and unfavourable. The unfavourable would bar it, and the favourable would give it—the increment and also the diploma.

3890. A man with a satisfactory report would get the increment?—Satisfactory is a word I do not quite understand.

3901. What do you mean by favourable?—I mean that the inspector should use the word "favourable." "I have to report favourably on so-and-so."

3902. Would it be a positive recommendation, or should it be an absence of censure?—Oh, yes; there is a difference. To report favourably implies a certain amount of merit.

3903. Your words here do not seem to imply that. They read, "should not be withheld except for unfavourable reports"?—Well, that is the same as to give it for favourable reports.

3904. Mr. COFFEY.—They would become automatic?—They would become automatic.

3905. I have thought the standard for increment should be that the school could show substantially good work?—I think you might even be satisfied with something less than actually good work.

3906. The CHAIRMAN.—Would you give these increments for something between favourable and unfavourable reports—you would give them for mediocre work?—No; because mediocre I look upon as unfavourable. The way I distinguish is this. There were two words, "fair" and "middling." Some people hold that fair does not show merit. I say fair does show merit, because if you put "very" before it you improve it, but if you have "middling," and you put "very" before it, it makes it worse, and, therefore, a fair report I consider shows merit.

3907. The BISHOP OF ROCHE.—That is a very good point?—That is what I have constantly felt, that one shows merit and the other not.

3908. Mr. KESTER.—You want a general scheme of automatic increments?—Yes; increments, I think, ought to be automatic, promotion not.

3909. The CHAIRMAN.—Have you considered the question as between triennial increments and annual increments?—Not very much.

3910. There are great objections to the triennial system apparently that have been urged before us?—Yes; but you might require three good reports or three favourable reports before you give the increment, but that they need not be in consecutive years. Of course, I think the present system is quite indefensible, under which, if a man gets two good reports, and then a fair report, though he may get for the next two

years two more good reports, he is barred. I think in that case plainly the man should get it who has shown merit in four years out of five.

3911. One of the conditions for promotion is to pass a certain examination?—Yes.

3912. And that would go on through the teacher's career up to the first grade. Promotion would depend on several things you say, training, scholarship (to be tested by examination), efficiency and service. Would you hold an examination for a rise in grade?—Yes.

3913. Did it ever occur to you that for a middle-aged man that is a serious thing, while it would be a very different thing for a youth of 18?—I do not think so. I don't know.

3914. You did not happen to consider that?—We never found teachers of 35 or 40 objecting very much to go in; but, as a rule, they got their promotion about that age.

3915. They have never had examinations for promotion in England?—No, it would only be the certificate.

3916. Now, another question that I want to ask you is how it would work. Would this sort of promotion that you recommend, depending on these various considerations, not bring the thing back in the end to one man's decision, would one man not have to make the decision as to whether the teacher was to be promoted or not, and to decide on these various points?—That is excluding the examination?

3917. Under your proposal it would depend on training?—Certainly, and on scholarship, and that does not depend on one man.

3918. Who is to judge it—the examiner?—The person who marks the papers; but it won't be one man who will mark the papers.

3919. Surely efficiency would be a matter for individual opinion?—Certainly. That would depend on the reports on the school. We had that under the old system.

3921. I am not putting the thing controversially at all. I only want to make out what you mean. You say in your précis that after every inspection or examination the inspector should confer with the teacher. Do they not confer at present?—Very often they do not, I think. They make their observations in the observation book, and then walk out of the school with "Good evening."

3922. Or without?—Or without; and they certainly do not discuss the matters that they have written in the book with the teacher before leaving the school (a great many inspectors do not), and I think that is a very wrong thing.

3923. The CHAIRMAN.—So you refer to it as a defect in the present system?—It is not so much in the present system as in the action of some of the staff. The rule that they should confer with the teacher ought to be strictly observed.

3924. There is a circular requiring the inspector, I think, to confer in a friendly way with the teacher?—I remember distinctly as one of our conference the head inspector informing us all that we should, before leaving the school, go over these ratings with the teacher, and I think it was a very good rule.

Mr. HENLY.—I got a letter last night from an excellent of ours, saying she had a visit from the inspector, and he wrote in the observation book (and she gave me a copy of the observations) that a considerable improvement had been effected since she took charge of the school, but still defects required to be remedied, and that she would find what the defects were by looking through the previous pages of the observation book.

3925. The CHAIRMAN.—Now, on page 8 you say—"In judging the merits of a school, they should duly consider if the instruction is sound and intelligent; if discipline and order are well maintained; if cleanliness, neatness, decency and good habits are promoted. A day school should not be held responsible for the formation of character, or for more than a proper effort

to promote the points above referred to." Now would you adhere to that in the broad sense?—I do not think the teacher of a day school should be held responsible.

3996. But surely the day school teacher is responsible to some extent?—Well, I confess, certainly, that the thing I had in my mind was some very nasty habits children sometimes have—spitting on the floor for instance. I would not say that is character exactly.

3997. Not as affecting the character of the pupils?—I refer to ugly habits that some children have. I couple decency and good habits.

3998. Social habits?—Habits refer to decency.

3999. Do you think it would be generally accepted that a schoolmaster was not responsible to some extent for the formation of character?—I would hold him responsible to some extent, but I would not punish him because a child did not turn out a model man. I do not think, at any rate, he could have very much power of forming character in a day school, where the teacher will have the child for about twelve hours in the week.

4000. I quite agree to a certain extent as to day schools, that you cannot hold a day schoolmaster as responsible for moral influence over the boys as a boarding schoolmaster, because day boys live with their parents; but I could not quite agree that the day schoolmaster is not responsible to some extent?—I think he is, too, and if you look at what I have written you will see that the inspector is to see if discipline and order are well maintained, and I think that is as far as the teacher can go in the way of formation of character.

4001. The Bursar or House?—Would you hold him responsible for trying to make the children truthful and honourable?—Yes; certainly I would expect him to try to do it, but I would not hold him responsible because he failed to do it.

4002. You would not hold him responsible if he failed, but would you give a special mark to the man who succeeded in rearing a straightforward, upright, and truly manly lot of boys?—Certainly.

4003. You would give him a special mark for that?—Yes; that would be one of the marks of a highly efficient school.

4004. And that would come into your idea of the favourable school?—Yes.

4005. The CHAIRMAN.—I think a thing that has caused a good deal of confusion is that you cannot separate intellectual from moral influence, and a really good teacher, to my mind, in teaching any subject, will have a moral influence over the boys?—Certainly.

4006. Might I ask you one more question. It relates to the last page of your report, as regards the Board dealing with appeals. You recommend that a Committee of the Board should be appointed, and should sit more frequently than the Board, I presume, in order to deal with these. You say, "The Powis Commission recommended a small permanent Committee of the Board; such a Committee would be useful to consider appeals, and some other matters to be laid before the Board?"—Yes. Do you note that that is not a suggestion of mine? That is a suggestion of the Powis Commission.

4007. But I assume that you rather approve of that?—Yes; but I would not venture myself to make such a proposal. Having been proposed by such a Commission, I think it would be very impertinent of me to suggest it as from myself.

4008. In connection with that, you think that a greater number of cases would go before the Board than do at present?—Yes, probably a greater number would go.

4009. Is there not some difficulty in asking an unpaid Board to undertake an amount of work of that kind?—I do not think there would be very much work, because I think appeals would not be so plentiful.

4010. If it was known that there was a Committee of the Board ready to receive them there would not be so many?—I do not think there would; but I do not think there would be too much for them to do, even if they had four or five appeals to consider every day that they met.

4011. I think your point is this, that you would like to have a larger number of cases, possibly, that might go before the Board, and that a Committee should be formed to deal with these, and that the effect of that would probably be to diminish complaints and appeals?—Yes; what I think is, that the teacher has a right to have his case considered by somebody else than a mere examiner. If he has got a proper ground of appeal, it ought to be considered properly by the Board, or in this case by a Committee of the Board beforehand, who would report to the Board, and give their opinion about it. May I ask whether the Committee have got any report forms from the Office, forms of the Inspector's general report? It would be a great convenience if you had some to show how the inspectors answer the questions.

4012. Mr. KERR.—We have asked for them?—You will see that Mr. Dale in this refers to the French system. I can give you a few French reports\* if you like to have them. (Reports handed in.)

4013. Mr. HARRIS.—Up to 1909, how many Chiefs of Inspection were there, say, from 1870 up to 1907?—Two.

4014. Can you tell us concisely what their duties were?—Did I not mention that in my paper?

4015. Now, when the report from the Inspector reached the Office, what was the first thing that was done with that report?—It went to the clerk to be noted, and a noting was made on it of previous action, in connection with that school if any, and also to note the receipt of that report, and to note in the Register any change in the staff, and so on.

4016. Take an ordinary routine case, what was the effect then of the clerk's noting, was it final?—No, it came on to the Chief. It could not be put away in the Records till it had the Chief's initials on it.

4017. So that the Chief had the sole responsibility for that noting—he was really responsible?—He was the person really responsible, but I do not think you could say he had the sole responsibility, because, of course, the Secretary always had a right to see the report, and might even question the action taken by the chief.

4018. But in case the clerk were in doubt, what would he do then—if he were in doubt as to the proper action to be taken?—Do you mean the chief inspector's clerk?

4019. The chief inspector's clerk?—Well, of course, if the chief inspector's clerk, getting the report after it had been dealt with in the inspection room, had any doubt, he would bring that report down to the chief of inspection that it belonged to.

4020. And then?—He would consult the chief as to what action should be taken, if any, and the chief would note, or, perhaps, the clerk would note, while the chief was looking over another paper. Then the chief would initial or sign the noting.

4021. Well, if it were a case of more than ordinary difficulty, would it go beyond the chief of inspection?—The chief of inspection would bring it in to the Resident Commissioner.

4022. That is, he would bring it to the Resident Commissioner in Committee?—In Committee, yes.

4023. What are we to understand by that expression "in Committee"?—The Committee was the Resident Commissioner, attended by one of the higher officers of the Board; it might be a chief of inspection, it might be a secretary, or both.

4024. Did the Resident Commissioner at that time take any action in these matters on his own sole responsibility, or did he act in Committee?—I think he always acted in Committee.

4025. And if the case were a matter to go before the Board what was done?—At that Committee it would be settled that the case was to go on to the Board. The chief of inspection would bring it back to his own office, and he would write on the document, "For Board," and, perhaps, he would indicate also what action he thought ought to be taken; but more generally he would in that case write a minute attached to the

\* Vide Appendix XVIII.

18th March, 1913.]

Mr. ALBERT FURBER, EXAMINER.

[Continued.]

paper, and marking it, "For Board," send it down to the Secretary, who would put the case on the agenda paper.

3966. And it went to the Board in the usual course?—It went to the Board in the usual course. Very often it would also have the initialling of the Resident Commissioner, as well as the initialling of the chief of inspection.

3967. So that where it was decided that matters were to go before the Board, that decision, I understand you to say, was always taken by the Resident Commissioner in Committee?—Practically so, I think.

3968. That is, the Resident Commissioner did not decide those cases on his own sole responsibility?—I should like to make that quite clear. It was possible that when the chief of inspection took in a paper to the Resident Commissioner, he might say, "I won't send that to the Board," or he might say, "This is an inopportune time to bring it forward; let that lie over." I do not think it was brought to the Board at any time without the Resident Commissioner's sanction.

3969. But that sanction was always given in Committee?—In Committee, so far as I know.

3970. Are you aware of a radical change that was made in regard to that in or about 1902?—There was certainly an order that the Resident Commissioner was to be the sole authority as to what was to go before the Board.

3971. And what was not?—And what was not, yes; but, of course, he always had that power of deciding that a thing should go before the Board, or should not go before the Board, I think, but it was decided in Committee; that is to say, he would have a veto on the thing being sent on to the Board if he objected.

3972. Then what steps did the chiefs of inspection take to secure uniformity of standard amongst the inspectors?—In the results days?

3973. In the results days?—Well, they had three conferences with the head inspectors first in Dublin, and then the head inspectors had conferences with the district inspectors. They had those check examinations (I don't know whether they were referred to or not)—there were check examinations in addition to examinations held for re-inspection.

3974. When the two chiefs of inspection called the head inspectors together, or assembled them, did the examination of schools always form part of the subjects of discussion?—With the head inspectors?

3975. Yes?—I think not always, but they did sometimes. I remember having to take it myself, but I do not think that in the earlier stages it was ever done. I think it was only a later development.

3976. In 1900 the chiefs of inspection were sent out of the Office?—Do you mean they were sent to visit schools again?

3977. Yes?—Oh, yes, they were.

3978. And the title was changed?—to chief inspector.

3979. And the duties were changed in some respect? Oh, yes, they were changed, but I think they were made lower than that of a head inspector.

3980. The duty, then, of noting reports was transferred from them to the examiner?—Yes, to the examiner.

3981. The examiners were clerks in the Office before that?—They were.

3982. Had they experience in the inspection of schools?—No, certainly not.

3983. Now, what is the precise difference in the status of an examiner and the status of a clerk, so far as the noting of a report is concerned—you have told us that before the examiners were appointed a

clerk noted the reports, and brought those reports, with the notings on them, to you, or to the other chief of inspection, and now they are brought to the examiners, and the examiners themselves are clerks?—Yes.

3984. What is the precise difference between the function of the examiners and that of the clerks who were noting the reports before they were appointed?—The function of the examiners is exactly that of the former chiefs of inspection, I should say.

3985. Perhaps I might put it in this way, that before the appointment of examiners the clerks had simply to note?—Yes.

3986. The responsibility for that noting rested solely on the chief of inspection?—It did.

3987. At the present time the clerks note, and the examiners decide, that is they read the report, and then decide of themselves, without reference to any higher authority, what action is to be taken?—Yes; that is what the chiefs of inspection did.

3988. We had it yesterday from one of the examiners—Mr. Percell—that when the inspector sent him a report, and recommended certain action, that action was endorsed, and the reprimand, or other thing of the kind, was sent out without any reference to a higher authority, and that the recommendation of the inspector was always acted upon. Now, was that the case in the older days, or before they were appointed?—The inspector recommended action, if an action was required, in the old results days, but it did not necessarily follow that that action was carried out at all. It was quite possible that the chief of inspection would recommend a different action.

3989. You did on some occasions?—Oh, yes.

3990. Then was it a customary thing for the chief of inspection, on reading a report in which no action was recommended, to send out a reprimand to the teacher?—I should think such a thing would occur.

3991. Because we had it in evidence yesterday from one of the examiners, that on reading the reports, and even where no action is recommended by the inspector, he sends a reprimand in some cases to the teacher?—In some cases the chiefs of inspection would have done that too. For instance, supposing a new inspector had come into a district, and that he found something wrong in the school, he would probably not know that teacher's previous history very well, and he might say to himself, "this man might get another chance, and I won't recommend any adverse action at present," so that he would not recommend any adverse action, but just, perhaps, to caution the teacher. Well, that report came up, went through the ordinary office routine, was noted by the clerk as to previous action, and was then sent on to the chief of inspection. The previous action might show that that teacher was, perhaps, fined for exactly the same negligence that was now brought to light in this report, and in that case, in which the inspector had not recommended any action, the chief of inspection would certainly think it necessary to take some action in consequence of the previous history of the man.

3992. In case he decided that action was necessary, did the case go beyond the chief of inspection?—It depended upon what the action was. If it was only a reprimand or admonition it certainly would not go beyond him. If it was a fine it would.

3993. So that the difference then, so far as the teachers were concerned, seems to be this, that the chiefs of inspection were men who were trained, and who had experience of the work of inspection of schools, and that the examiners have not?—Yes, that is one of the differences.

3994. Is there any other difference?—Well, I think there is this difference, that the chiefs of inspection were in constant touch with the Resident Commissioner, and the examiners are not. The examiners do not take the papers into the Resident Commissioner's

12th March, 1910.]

Mr. ALFRED PUGH, examined.

[Continued.]

room as far as I know, and the chiefs of inspection always did. There was never a day when the Resident Commissioner was in attendance at the Office, while I was chief of inspection at least, up to Dr. Starke's appointment for a few months, that I did not go into the Resident Commissioner with a bundle of papers to consult him. I think the matter is referred to in the Foris Commission by Mr. MacDonnell, who was then Resident Commissioner, and I think he refers to that very thing about his presence in the Office. He was asked the question, "Do the Board ever examine into these routine cases?" and he replied, "Very seldom; they take it for granted that when we do not bring forward a case as being one of importance, that they ought to deal with thoroughly themselves, we have decided upon it, and decided fairly. I conceive that if we were to present a great number of these routine matters it would be impossible to get the Commissioners to go into them. Their whole time would be consumed in going into matters that I think every one will admit the chiefs of inspection, and the secretaries, assisted by myself, would be able to settle much more satisfactorily. I am always on the spot, and am always ready to meet in sub-committee a secretary, chief of inspection, accountant, or whoever else has business to be performed." And that is a thing that I do not think at present holds. I do not think the Resident Commissioner meets the examiner.

3984. Do you think it was a wise change to take the duties from experienced men like the chiefs of inspection and transfer them to the examiners?—Oh, not but I am a prejudiced witness.

3985. You can hardly be regarded as a prejudiced witness, inasmuch as I suppose you are not a candidate for office?—But, of course, those things were taken from me, and I felt it very much.

3986. Now, under the two chiefs of inspection how many head inspectors were there?—Six head inspectors at the time I was appointed.

3987. What were their duties?—Their duties were to look after the district inspectors in ten or eleven districts; to see that they kept up a proper standard, and also to hold important inquiries, if inquiries became necessary.

3988. Can you tell us in the results days what steps they took to secure uniformity?—I understood you to say, that in order to secure uniformity between one head inspector and another, the chiefs conferred with them?—Yes.

3989. Now, what means did the head inspectors take to impress that uniformity upon their subordinates, if I may use the term?—Every year the district inspectors had to meet the head inspectors in conference. It was generally the time when the examinations came off, that is, the teachers' examinations, and the head inspectors and the district inspectors together went over the examination papers, and regulated their classification and promotion, and advantage was taken of that meeting to have a conference on the programme generally. The head inspectors had got instructions when in Dublin from the chiefs of inspection and the Resident Commissioner to put certain things before us, which were generally put before us at these conferences, sometimes followed by circulars from the Office. At that conference, then, the rules were laid down that were to govern our examinations, and, as I said before, an examination was held by one of the inspectors in presence of all the others. That is as far as the conference went. Then, subsequently, the head inspector was always going round and never came into a district, I suppose, without trying to confer with the district inspector. I know I have had conferences with them. That is without the others being present, but simply the head inspector and myself, and sometimes the head inspector would take me into a school, and we would go through the examination together in the school, and try to come to an agreement if there happened to be any disagreement. And in addition to that the head inspector would hold check examinations; that is to say, the district inspector's examination of a school might be

on a Monday, and the head inspector might drop in the next day, or some day that week, and re-examine that whole school again from top to bottom, and get marks exactly in the same way as the district inspector did, and then these were compared in the Office, and a table drawn up to show the agreement and disagreement, and this was sent down afterwards to the head inspector, and also to the district inspector; and if there was any marked difference, the head inspector was directed to confer with the district inspector, so as to try to avoid such discrepancies in the future.

3990. How many of those check examinations were held?—I do not think there was any fixed number, but it was left to the discretion of the head inspector. There would possibly be a couple every year.

3991. And then if he found a district inspector was adopting a standard different from the one he would hold check examinations there after?—Oh, he would, and he would take the inspector about with him. I do not know, on the average, when I was district inspector, that I had two check inspections in the year. It would probably come to one check inspection in the year.

3992. Did the district inspector get notice that that check inspection was going to be held?—Oh, no, he did not know anything about it.

3993. It came like a thief in the night?—It did. He was at liberty to examine the school before the inspector's examination, as well as after it, but in that case, of course, the inspector would not know what marks the head inspector gave, and the only difference it would make would be, that he would be a little more careful if he knew that the head inspector had been there before him.

3994. I saw the head inspector in my own school taking a show out of the hands of a district inspector, and not allowing him to finish the examination?—Well, his marks were counted just the same as if they had been made by the district inspector.

3995. In addition to those check examinations and conferences, were there any standard tests adopted in certain subjects which were uniform all over the country?—Yes. You will find them in the 1890 Rules.

3996. By those means you secured a pretty large measure of uniformity?—There was a considerable amount of uniformity; but you must remember a man's manner made a considerable difference in the result of examinations. Two men might ask a question; one might get an answer, and the other might not.

3997. Do you think that uniformity has been secured under the present mode of dealing with schools?—Oh, no; no uniformity. I do not believe that there is any uniformity.

3998. We have before us certain figures from the Blue Book in reference to Clonmel, from which it appears that Mr. Brown and the two circuit inspectors, gave 137 marks for "excellent" and "very good," and Mr. Welby gave 70?—Mr. Welby by himself, or by means of his inspectors?

3999. I cannot exactly say that, because it does not say whether he gave it by himself or by the inspectors under him. He reduced the "excellent" and "very good" from 137 to 70. He reduced the "goods" at the same time from 154 to 156. I need not ask you can these figures be considered consistent with a uniform standard; but was not Clonmel circuit within your jurisdiction as chief inspector?—It was.

4000. And you were chief inspector while this 541 of marks was taking place?—I was part of the time, certainly, but I do not know. I think Mr. Welby had not come to the district more than two years before the date that I left.

4001. I suppose you are aware that the Clonmel teachers sent up an appeal against the marking of Mr. Welby. Was that appeal referred to you as chief inspector?—Oh, no; I knew nothing about that until after I had gone out of the service.

18th March, 1915.]

Mr. ALFRED FORBES, examined.

[Continued.]

4002. You did not know that that great change of marking was taking place?—No, I did not know that there was any change. When I say I did not know, I had no official knowledge of it, but I could guess very well that Mr. Weiply would give a smaller proportion of higher marks than when Mr. Brown was there, because Mr. Brown is certainly an easier marker than Mr. Weiply.

4003. But as a matter of fact, the question was not submitted to you as chief inspector, to investigate whether the teachers had just grounds for their appeal or not?—Oh, no, I was not informed that there was any appeal whatsoever. When I said I did not know of any appeal, I did not know it till about a fortnight before I was retiring, and then Mr. Hynes informed me that he had orders to go down and inquire into matters.

4004. The *Banner* or *Boss*.—Did you read the report?—Yes. Of course, it was quite absurd not to refer it to me when I was just going out.

4005. Mr. Hynes.—The report went up to the Office in June?—I don't know.

4006. When did you retire?—I retired on the 4th November, 1911.

4007. Could you give us any reason why it was that an appeal coming up from your division was not referred to you?—Appeals were never referred to us. The Belfast appeals were not referred to us till after the Belfast teachers had been seen by the Resident Commissioner in the Education Office. The Clonmel appeal, you say, came in June. I do not know whether it did or not, but if the appeal came up it would be necessary to make inquiries, which might, of course, have delayed it some little time. I don't know whether that was necessary, or whether that occurred or not, but I know that it was not referred to me, and officially I know absolutely nothing about it till the day I retired.

4008. The head inspectors were abolished in 1905?—Yes.

4009. Those of them that had the rank of head inspector became senior inspectors?—Yes.

4010. Did any of them object to that arrangement?—They all did.

4011. And their objections were over-ruled?—Their objections were over-ruled. One of them informed me—I do not know whether you are going to hear any of them or not, but one of them, Mr. Sullivan, informed me the other day, when we were talking about it, that they were distinctly given to understand that if they did not withdraw their objection they would be called on to resign. I have a copy of the memorandum they sent into the Office, objecting to the change, and asking the Commissioners not to enforce it.

4012. Have you heard that Dr. Moran objected very strongly to the change?—Not more strongly than any of the others, so far as I know.

4013. Mr. Corry.—Dr. Moran told me himself that he only accepted the change under threat of dismissal?—Yes, that was what Mr. Sullivan told me the other day, too.

4014. Was not the post of district inspector practically abolished at the same time?—It was, in my opinion. The district inspector was a person in charge of a limited district. He had sole charge of that except so far as the head inspector superintended him, and he was responsible for everything that was done in that district, and he was held responsible for the condition of the district, and he might even get a reprimand on the head of it, if serious neglect were found to prevail in his district, but under the new system, with three men following each other in that district, that had to be given up.

4015. Instead of chief of inspection, head inspectors, and district inspectors, we have got two chief in-

spectors, and twenty-two senior inspectors?—Yes, and junior inspectors.

4016. Those twenty-two were placed in charge each of a certain circuit. How many inspectors went along with them?—In most cases two, but in a few cases three, because there were some assistant inspectors.

4017. What was the arrangement with regard to the division of duties amongst them at first?—For nearly a year things remained as they were; the new districts were not mapped out till 1901. Then the new districts were mapped out (circuits they were called then), and the circuit was divided into three nearly equal sections. Each of the three inspectors in the circuit took each circuit in succession for examination of the pupils, and for making an annual report.

4018. Then the effect of that would be, that if one of these was more severe than the rest all the schools of the whole circuit would suffer from his severity?—Yes.

4019. Why was that arrangement altered?—Well, it was partly due to the circumstance that it was seen that it told unfairly on the teachers, but also because it was found to be extremely wasteful of the inspector's time, and extremely extravagant in the matter of travelling expenses. I may mention, for instance, that there were three inspectors living in Temecklo, and in the case of one of them, his nearest school was, I think, fifteen miles away. And then if you look at the map of the County Cork, the western part of Cork formed one circuit, and going out from Cork City there were three long lines, quite narrow at first, and for many miles out from Cork, they were not more than half a mile across, so that all that part of the country was travelled over and over again without visiting any school, and all that expense went for nothing, and, of course, an inspector having to go down to Castletown-Berhaven from Cork lost at least a day going down, doing absolutely nothing else but travelling, and another day coming back, so that it was found wasteful both as regards time and as regards money.

4020. What arrangement was substituted for it?—The new circuits were drawn up after that, and these old circuits were done away with. The new circuits were drawn up, taking as a whole the county as a basis, that is, the whole of a county, as far as possible, put into one circuit. As a rule, that was the basis of it, though in some cases it is impossible. There was then an arrangement that the senior should live in the most convenient part of that circuit, and the two junior inspectors were each placed in charge of about half of the circuit, in about the most convenient places for their business. The senior inspector would have a small district, perhaps, of 15 schools; but for the rest, they were in charge of three or two inspectors, just like the old districts. They were to remain there permanently and not to move about from one to the other.

4021. What means were taken to secure uniformity in the circuits?—It was laid down originally that there was to be a circuit conference every month. The senior inspector and his two men were to meet once a month. Well, that was found utterly impossible. They had nothing to talk about, and by degrees it was dropped, and they were to have two conferences in the year. That was the arrangement up to the time I left, and at one of these conferences the chief inspector was to be present.

4022. Was it found that uniformity was maintained in that way in the circuits?—No.

4023. Because we have a circular here, issued by the Commissioners, saying: "The attention of the Commissioners has been specially directed to the large number of cases in which disagreement has occurred between the senior and the circuit inspector in the assignment of merit marks of the schools"; so, of course, the promulgation of that circular is a sufficient proof that uniformity was not maintained within the circuit. What steps did the Commissioners take then—did they not make a change in the status of the three circuit inspectors with regard to altering or lowering

19th March, 1913.]

Mr. STUART PRINCE, examined.

[Continued.]

the mark?—Not in my time, or only just before I left. But absolute uniformity was never attained, even in the results examinations. There was a very close approximation, but it was not absolute.

4034. But then as to the inspectors that were placed in the different circuits, was there much difference in point of service or experience or ability between the senior and the others?—Sometimes, the senior was a very much superior man, and sometimes one of the juniors might be a very much superior man.

4035. But they had not, in all cases, the advantage of seniority?—No; in some cases the junior inspector was very much longer in the service than the other, and in some cases he was, I should say, the better man. That arises partly from the fact that we have these two religious divisions of Protestant inspectors and Roman Catholic inspectors. There might be a vacancy for a Roman Catholic inspector, say, and then a Roman Catholic is appointed to that, even though there might be a Protestant inspector who was senior to him, and quite his equal in ability and in everything concerning inspection; but, of course, there being a vacancy for a Roman Catholic, he would be appointed, and he might be sent to a district where there was a Protestant inspector of longer service, and there was no difference really between the two in point of merit.

4036. Then in cases the senior inspector wanted to enforce his view on the junior inspector, had he power actually to enforce it?—I do not think he had, except, perhaps, by influence. A strong senior inspector, who was a man of great push and ability, would get his inspectors to work exactly as he wanted. If he had not that power, the junior inspectors would take every little notice, and would go on with their own system.

4037. In a case in which the senior inspector would not be superior, either in length of service or in ability, or in skill in testing schools, he would have very little influence?—Yes; that is where his power of control would come in, I think, and I do not think the fact of the inspectors being his equals in service or anything like that affected the matter very much at all.

4038. Mr. COFFEY.—What you have pointed out is that the junior inspector or district inspector might be a man of more force of character and of more ability?—Well, he might not be a man of more ability, but he might be a man determined to have his own way.

4039. Mr. HENLEY.—What steps were taken to secure uniformity as between circuit and circuit?—I think, except that conference that the senior inspectors had in 1908, there was nothing beyond the circulars, issued from the office.

4040. Was not the chief inspector engaged to confer with them once a year?—Yes; the chief inspectors conferred with them once a year.

4041. Were those conferences regularly held, do you know?—They were by me.

4042. Because we have had a statement from Dr. Beatty that from 1904 to 1907 there was no conference in his circuit, and from 1907 to 1909?—Yes. Well, I have had some correspondence with Dr. Beatty, too, for he is an old friend of mine, and he referred to that point, and I immediately asked him for a return of the times and the districts he was in, and the dates; and when I got that, I compared it with my own connection with it, and I found that as long as he was with me conferences were held regularly. That was up to 1904. Then I ceased to have charge of the North, and went to the South, and he was at that time in Ormagh, I think. He was transferred afterwards to Clemaal; but, unfortunately, his health was bad and he never took up duty there; so I had no opportunity of having conferences with him in the South. I know, so far as I myself am concerned, I held my annual conferences with perfect regularity. I have in this book here the dates at which I held the conferences.

4043. Suppose those conferences were regularly held, do you think they would be sufficient to secure uni-

formity?—No; they had very little to do with uniformity. We seldom discussed questions like that. Of course, if there was a difference between the circuit inspectors they would probably put it before the chief inspector on that occasion. If one thought such a thing would be sufficient for giving a good mark and the other not, they would mention that, and the chief inspector would give his opinion, or he would make inquiries when he went back, for the chief inspector had no authority.

4044. If he did not refer to subjects such as uniformity, might I ask what were the subjects discussed at the conferences?—We discussed various matters connected with the schools.

4045. The CHAIRMAN.—Mr. McNeill gave us a record of one of his conferences and uniformity was never touched on?—Well, he was present at some of mine.

4046. This was one he held himself?—I held one at Limerick, and Mr. McNeill, who was at that time a senior, was there. The first item of that conference at Limerick was the question of Rule 127B not being enforced.

4047. Mr. HENLEY.—That is not relating to uniformity?—No; the next was in reference to extras, whether notice was required to be given to the schools, and if notice was given, had the teachers a right to keep the lad boys out or should all the pupils in the class be presented for examination. The next was whether examination was necessary in certain cases. The next was with regard to the history reader. The next was a question of the regulations of the Bishops as to what certain assistants were to be paid, that is lay assistants in convents. That only cropped up incidentally. And then a question came up as to visiting the managers, and I laid down a rule that they were to visit the managers whenever they possibly could. And a question arose also about drawing; and these three were occasionally such things as this; why so-and-so had not been given his promotion, though he had been recommended for it.

4048. Mr. COFFEY.—A teacher?—Yes. That was a conference I had with Mr. McNeill's circuit.

4049. Mr. HENLEY.—Then I suppose we may take that these conferences could not be a very efficient means of securing uniformity?—No. I remember one conference I held at Athlone for the Galway circuit. I took the three inspectors to Athlone school, and we spent about an hour and a half there, one of them examining. I believe we were all inspecting the school rather than examining, and then we met together and discussed it, and two of us thought one thing and two of us thought another.

4050. What suggestion would you make with regard to the changes that would be necessary, if any, to make the system more efficient, and more conducive to sound education, than at present?—I believe in examining the pupils, and that they ought to be strictly examined.

4051. But now as to the machinery, do you find that the present arrangement of circuit and senior inspectors would work?—No. I think that the old system of having a district for each inspector, and making him responsible for the work in that district, is the best. Then I would appoint a certain number of inspectors; six, if anything, would be too few, I think, to superintend these men and go about like the old head inspectors from district to district.

4052. We have had it in evidence that the Commissioners are applying for four divisional inspectors at present?—Yes, Mr. Hynde and I made that recommendation years ago.

4053. Do you think four would not be sufficient?—Four might be sufficient if you keep up this system of senior inspectors and circuits, because they would only then have to visit twenty-two centres, but if you return to the old system of having sixty districts, I think the four would be quite insufficient.

4054. And then beyond this would you think any change is desirable in the duties of the chief inspectors?

15th March, 1918.]

Mr. ALFRED PURSER, examined.

[Continued.]

—I think the chief inspectors would be much better employed in dealing with the reports in the office than in going out on few occasions. They are generally sent out or go out at more haphazard, as we very often did, to find nothing particular, but just put in our time. We had no definite object in going. We went out simply to see the schools. We might drop into a good school, or we might drop into a bad school.

4045. So that you think the old office of chief of inspection was more conducive to sound education than that of chief inspector that we have at present?—I think it was more conducive to the good management and arrangements of the work. I think it would be very much better that the chief inspectors should deal with these reports than that the clerks should.

4046. Now in the case of an appeal coming up to the Board, will you tell us precisely what is done at present, supposing a teacher appeals against the report of an inspector?—I never knew of such a case. The appeals never came to me.

4047. Mr. CORRY.—No appeal ever came to you?—No, I think not. I do not think the appeals ever went to the chief inspectors.

4048. Mr. HENLY.—Who would deal with them?—I do not know. In this Clonmel case that I referred to in my memorandum, I did not know that the teacher had appealed twice to the Education Office before a reprimand was sent down to him, and I did not know that such an appeal had been sent up at all till after the meeting in Dublin at the end of last October. The teacher seeing it in the paper, then wrote to me something about this thing, and he mentioned quite haphazard in this letter that he had appealed twice to the Resident Commissioner in the months of November and December, but this was absolutely unknown to me till that time.

4049. Mr. CORRY.—That was November and December of what year?—Of 1910.

4050. Mr. HENLY.—What way do you think, with your wide experience, should appeals be treated?—Appeals should come to the chief inspectors, I think, and be taken in by them to the Resident Commissioner after due inquiry.

4051. Then how should they be dealt with?—That would depend upon each case individually; it would be probably sufficient to send it to the senior inspector if it was the junior inspector who was concerned, and ask the senior inspector to look into the matter and report again to the office. Of course, it would then depend upon what he reported, what further action would be necessary. If it was the senior inspector against whom the appeal was made, I think it ought to be looked into by one of the chiefs.

4052. Or one of the heads if you had one?—Well, if you had the divisional inspectors; but under the present machinery, where you have no divisional inspectors, one of the chief inspectors ought to look into that.

4053. What class of appeals do you contemplate when you say that in some cases no action would be necessary, only to consider the appeal?—If the teacher has been never known to merit a good report under a great many different inspectors, and if he has been always getting poor reports, then because he gets another poor report that would be no sufficient reason in my opinion to grant him an appeal. If previous reports were all right, it would be different. Of course, a great many teachers have been kept on time after time when really the reports were most unfavourable. There was a teacher in a school in the Clonmel District who was utterly useless as a teacher, and I met him 20 years afterwards in the County Wick, when I was head inspector, still holding on. He had held on all that time, and that man ought to have been got rid of long before; but if he were unfavourably reported on in the school where I met him last, I would not think that he had any case for appeal.

4054. That is, in other words, if the report that the teacher gets is in accordance with a long series of re-

ports, you think no action would be necessary?—No, action, unless the action likely to be taken was dismissal. Then I would consider it desirable that the matter should be inquired into by a higher officer before he was dismissed, even with that record against him.

4055. But in all other cases you think there should be, as a matter of right, an inquiry into the appeal?—Certainly. Of course, in the results time when we had the formal examinations such a thing was not necessary in many cases. When a teacher got a bad report the first thing that was always done, either by the office or by the head inspector to whom it was referred, was to get up the written exercises of that school. Looking through the written exercises you could tell almost certainly whether the report was right or wrong. You could tell at any rate whether the marks given for the written exercises were correct or not, because you had the written exercises before you. The teacher, of course, might plead that the children were not given time enough, and that was certainly a case where the head inspector should go down and investigate it himself; but supposing that these papers were all very creditable, but that the oral part of the examination was unsatisfactory, and it was on that that the teacher was getting into trouble, the evidence would be rather in favour of the teacher than against him, and there I think a re-inspection would be ordered at once.

4057. Of course, a man with the experience of a chief inspector would be the proper man to decide such a question as this?—Well, they would know what the thing meant, at any rate.

4058. There is another question in connection with the inspection. From time to time it has appeared that the inspectors behaved rudely towards the teachers?—Yes.

4059. Now, from your experience, have the teachers any grounds for making statements of that kind?—It certainly has taken place.

4060. And no effective steps are taken to redress these grievances?—Do you mean in recent years?

4061. Yes?—I should like to say that I had not to take any steps; but I do not know that steps may not have been taken by official letter or official reprimand to put the inspector right that was doing anything of that sort. I know under the old system inspectors were several times punished for that sort of thing. I remember one case particularly in south-western Cork, where the inspector was removed away because of some impertinent observations he made in some schools.

4062. The teachers have complained to me that inspectors going in to them do not speak to them or salute them, or bid them "good evening" going away, and would you think that mark of discourtesy in presence of their pupils should be taken notice of, if those statements were true?—Any misbehaviour is possible; but it is against the rule if they do so. It is distinctly laid down in all the Board's circulars that the teachers are to be treated properly, we have had it again and again in every circular that the teachers are to be treated with courtesy and good manners.

4063. Does not the re-issuing of these circulars again and again show that there is something that the circulars have not settled?—I do not think any regulations could settle that. You will always have some men who now and then will behave badly, some men who are naturally rude.

4064. When the inspector makes a note such as this in the observation book, "arithmetic weak," "reading might be improved," what help are such notings to the teacher?—Very little, except that the teacher sometimes does not know it. The teacher does not know that the reading in the school is bad, because he has had no experience. That is the reading that he has been accustomed to for 20 years, and he is surprised to hear that it is bad reading.

4065. Supposing he gets that, in what way does it show him that the reading is defective?—It is of no use that way; but the inspector, as I said before, should

19th March, 1913.]

Mr. ALFRED PURSER, examined.

[Continued.]

go over—and ought to go over—his observations with the teacher. He should point out in what way the reading has been defective, and he should explain it to him, and that record "reading weak" is rather for himself and for those who come after him than for the teacher, except to remind the teacher that that was noted. It was not at all an uncommon thing for an inspector to go a second time and say to the teacher, "such a thing is still wrong in your school." The teacher could then not say, "I never heard of this before"; so unless there is a record of that in the book the inspector is liable to that sort of remark from the teacher.

4066. But I am assuming now that the inspector goes to a school and puts a noting of that kind in the book, and as in many cases does not discuss the matter with the teacher, and I want to know in what way does that help the teacher?—It is no help at all.

4067. Then do you think that it is desirable that there should be some instructions given to the inspectors either that they must confer with the teacher and discuss their notes properly, or that the notings should be made in such a way that they would really be helpful to the teacher himself?—Yes, it should be of that class.

4068. For instance, I have seen this, "reading might be improved," and I could not make out in what way, or what was wanted; and I have heard of a thing being "weak"—I am afraid we must all plead guilty to that; but undoubtedly in the results time that was a help to the teacher, perhaps not at the last examination, but at the inspection between two examinations it was a help to the teacher to be informed by the inspector that such and such a thing was not up to the mark, and that that subject required a little more attention before the formal examination came round.

4069. Do you think that by any mere system of inspection an inspector could judge of the character of the school?—I could not.

4070. Do you think could any inspector?—I do not.

4071.4. In the results days was it a system of examination alone, or was it examination plus inspection?—Well, it was examination plus inspection; but, of course, with some inspectors there would be very little inspection, because examinations took up so much of their year and time that they really had not time sometimes to pay a second visit to the school during the year, and in that case, of course, there would be no inspection.

4072. Mr. HENRY.—Even during the results examinations did not the inspector take note of the order and discipline of the pupils, of the regularity of their movements, in cases it was necessary to move them, of the state of the buildings, and other things of that kind?—Certainly he took notice of these things, but still that could hardly be called inspection. He could not take any note of the manner in which the teaching was done. Of course, discipline and order, as far as they could be judged during the examination, he had to see and to remember. But he took the work of the school out of the hands of the teacher while he was examining, so the teacher was scarcely responsible for the order and discipline except in so far as the children talked together or copied from one another. Of course, he might find fault with the teacher under these heads, and that often happened. I am referring to the regulations that were in force. These were the Commissioners' rules for 1898: "In furnishing his report on any school, the inspector when calling attention to defects in the proficiency of the classes should indicate where the responsibility for the particular defect complained of chiefly lies. The inspector should not fail to report his judgment on the moral tone of the school and the observance of discipline, cleanliness, and order, and also bring under notice defects, if any, in the condition of the school houses and premises." That is in the Commissioners' rules.

4073. So that every results examination implied a certain amount of inspection?—It certainly did, as

regards these points; but as I say the teacher could hardly be held responsible for everything that went on during the examination—the thing was taken too much out of his hands.

4074. I always held myself responsible?—Well, if the teacher stood by and allowed the children to do an improper thing like prompting, he was certainly responsible.

4075. Can even an inspector judge of the manner of the teaching during the year by hearing a lesson?—You could only judge of the manner in which it was done at that particular time.

4076. That is, there might be a show lesson given by the teacher, and the lessons during another time of the year might be of a very different order?—You might have a show lesson, of course, but probably an inspector of experience would see at once that it was a show lesson, and only a lesson got up without the children having the previous necessary knowledge for it. He would at once detect it I think.

4080. But it might be a lesson that the pupils have been drilled in?—Yes, but then the pupils would be too ready. I am quite sure though there were a great many show lessons given to me that I did not know were show lessons.

4081. Mr. HENRY.—Over and above the visits of the inspectors to schools, we have had in recent years visits of some of the higher officials. Dr. Starke, Mr. Dilworth, and others, we have had it in evidence, visited the schools?—Yes, I was round with Dr. Starke on one occasion myself.

4082. Were those visits of long duration as far as you know?—When Dr. Starke went out first, he used generally to go on his bicycle, and then his visits were sometimes, in the middle of the day, extended to an hour or more; but as a rule the visits were only about half an hour, and I understand since the use of a motor car was allowed for official purposes the visits only extend from 10 minutes to 20 or 30. At the same time, I have never been round with Dr. Starke in the motor car, and I cannot give you any personal experience.

4083. What I want to come at is this, not exactly the length of the visits, but had you any official knowledge whether Dr. Starke communicated with or influenced the local inspectors in any way with reference to the reports?—Well, the only thing I remember is that after he had been round some of the schools in the Clerkenwell circuit one time, years ago now, he gave me a list of some of them that he had been in, in which he thought the marking was not correct, and I said I would look into the matter the first time I was in the neighbourhood, and I took an opportunity that I got of going round to that part of the country, and I looked into the inspectors' reports and the state of the schools, and I said that I thought the inspector's reports could be very well justified.

4084. Who was in charge that time?—The schools I visited then are in Mr. Yates' section.

4085. Who was the senior?—Mr. William Brown, I think.

4086. You have not told me whether you know that any communications were or were not sent to local inspectors. Do you know in your official capacity?—Well, none were sent through me; but I know that letters were sent out to inspectors.

4087. Do you think would such visits and such letters coming from Dr. Starke be likely to influence the judgment of local inspectors?—Certainly, and they were meant to do so.

4088. To raise or lower the mark—which was the tendency as far as you know?—Well, I think the tendency generally was rather to lower the mark than to raise it; but there were cases where the effect of the letter would be to raise the marking.



4088. Do you think it right for men like Dr. Sturkie and Mr. Dilworth, having no training as inspectors, to thus try to influence the marking of the schools?—Well, I do not think it is a proper thing to do; but Dr. Sturkie is Resident Commissioner, and as representative of the Board he has a right to visit schools; however, I do not know whether he ought to interfere with the Inspector. As regards the secretary, Mr. Dilworth, I think it is quite contrary to the regulations for him to do anything of the sort.

4090. Has he any training for the business?—Not only that, but I have here a letter from Dr. Sturkie in 1902:—"The Board have recently decided that the Departments of the Chief Inspector and Secretaries are distinct and independent." The secretaries used to be appointed from the inspectors. A change was made, and they might be appointed from clerks, or people having no knowledge of school work at all; and the notion was that the Chief Inspector was to be the controlling person. The Secretary lost all right to interfere in the school matters, except as regards reports.

4091. The CHAIRMAN.—Might I ask one question. Did the former Resident Commissioners that you have known pay these visits to the schools in the same manner? Did Sir Patrick Keenan?—Sir Patrick Keenan never visited schools, I think, except when he was away on summer holidays. For instance, he would go down to Newcastle, and then would drop into a few schools around; but he never visited with the Inspector.

4092. But he visited them?—Oh, certainly; and in the same way, when he went to Donagh, he visited schools; but there was never any question of sending a letter to the inspectors afterwards about it, nor did he interfere with the judgment of the inspectors.

4093. Mr. HENLY.—Then you think it would be better if neither the Resident Commissioner nor the Secretary would visit the schools with any intention of interfering with the judgment of the men placed in charge, namely, the inspectors?—I think it would.

4094. Do you think that any of the present difficulties have arisen from those visits?—I do; but I could not say the judgment of those inspectors has been very much interfered with by those visits.

4095. And, consequently, the schools must suffer?—I do not know. The schools are very liable to suffer; but I think it is a great mistake that the Inspector should not be left in an independent position as possible.

4096. What is your opinion of this merit marking that we have of the schools?—I would do away with the merit marks.

4097. You think they should be abolished?—I do.

4098. I think you are aware they were tried in England, and found unworkable?—Mr. Harrison can tell you that better than I.

4099. Mr. HENLY.—I would infer from your general evidence that you would rather favour annual increments?—Well, only in one sense. I would like to see that every good report carried some weight, but I think it might be quite possible not to give the increment till you had three good reports, three favourable reports. I would not like to give a man an increment merely because he puts on a spur and works well one year; but I would like to give him credit for that, in case he continued to carry on that spur, and do good work.

4100. Well, his lordship the Bishop of Ross has submitted a scheme in which it would be possible to pay the third grade (that is all teachers in it) the same sum of money as at present by giving them an initial salary of £88. I think, with eleven annual increments. Now, what would be your opinion of that scheme of his lordship's, as compared with the lower initial salary and the triennial increments that we have at present?—What will the annual increments be?

4101. A pound?—Well, that is a very small increment. That would be, I think, a very good system; but the increments are really very small, and they are scarcely worth considering; but, of course, they mount up.

4102. The increments are very substantial, for this reason—that the present salary is £88, and if the teacher starts from £89, he gets the increments on from that?—Yes, from year to year; but it is a very small thing, and therefore I do not think it is much matter whether he gets it in one year or three years.

4103. The advantage, to my mind, of one year is this, that if the teacher's work is good, his £1 is secure?—I have not made myself clear. My objection would fall away very much if your increment is so small as only £1 a year. I would see no objection to giving the increment annually if it was so small as £1. I think it would be better only to give a large increment of £7 when he has got three favourable reports.

4104. You think a change of that kind that is suggested by his lordship would be beneficial?—Yes. I think the increments in the lower grade should be automatic.

4105. And you think there would be a sufficient stimulus to get the teachers to do good work?—I think so, because it would require to work up to a certain height before he could get promotion into the second grade. That is what would be the real stimulus. It is not the £1.

4106. If he wants to get into the second grade, I think I understand from your memorandum that you are in favour of a test of scholarship and training and service?—Yes.

4107. On what grounds would you recommend a test of scholarship or any further examination?—I would like the teacher while he is young to go on with his studies. The examination would not be such as he gets now on leaving the training college. It would rather be a test that he continued his studies in some line. It need not be on the same lines as in the training college; but it would be on some particular line to show that he has been making progress all that time.

4108. The CHAIRMAN.—Would you allow him to take one subject in which he felt greatly interested?—I would not limit it to one subject.

4109. Suppose he wished to become a good Latin or French scholar?—Yes, I would allow him to take other subjects; but I would not ask him to go to all the trouble of learning algebra and geometry, and other things, if they were not in his way.

4110. Mr. HENLY.—In other words, you would allow him to select a certain number. At present is there any danger that a teacher leaving the training college would fall into idle habits?—Yes; a teacher was speaking to me recently about that, and he said that he knew the majority of teachers read nothing but the daily paper.

4111. Would you say that the efficiency of the teacher would be maintained in that case?—Not unless they have a high class school that requires them to make such preparation as will continue their studies.

4112. Do you think the change that has been made of grouping in the schools has been beneficial to the working of the school—and you know that grouping is practically compulsory?—I think if the teacher is able to do the work, he ought to be left to decide on those matters himself. If he finds that the grouping system suits him, let him group, and if not, let him teach the classes separately.

4113. I remember the time when we were liable to be punished if we grouped, and now a teacher is liable to be punished if he doesn't?—I think that the grouping system is not made obligatory under the rules.

4114. The rules do not affect it. It is the practice of individual inspectors?—I know at my conferences I always told the inspectors they had no right to enforce these things, if they were not in the rules; and if the teacher was doing good work, they should not interfere with him.

1884 March, 1918.]

Mr. ALFRED FURBER, examined.

[Continued.]

4115. What is the test of service that you would apply to a teacher aspiring to rise from the third grade to the second?—I would like the school to get a good report.

4116. Would you have a subsequent examination for getting into the first grade?—Yes, and I would have only one first grade.

4117. And what conditions as far as the school is concerned?—The school should be very well reported on for a considerable number of years. We had a system of promoting teachers before this new system came in, in which a teacher got promotion from one class to another by mere service, what was called "highly efficient" service. A teacher could get into the first of first class by seven years highly efficient reports. He got into the second of first I think by three or four, and he got into the second by something of the same sort.

4118. But antecedent to that you had examination plus service?—Yes, that is to say, the service counted for giving him permission to come in for the examination. If the teacher was not getting a good report, the inspector would not allow him in for promotion, and there very often, particularly for promotion to first class, the head inspector was called in. In fact, up to the year 1884 or 1885, I think, the head inspector always came round and reported on the man's school before he was let in for first class.

4119. Did he ever visit the school after making the passing of the examination contingent on a good report?—I do not think so, at least there might have been an odd case, but I could not say. Of course, the thing was not to let him in at all till he got a good report.

4120. Mr. CORNER.—Did he not very often examine the school between the written and oral examination?—The oral examinations ceased from 1878.

4121. Mr. HENRY.—I passed the examination for first of first at Easter, and I got no indication as to whether that promotion would be sanctioned or not till after a visit of the head inspector on the 14th of the following September?—That was before 1878, was it not?

4122. No, I think not?—I know it was sometimes about that that the oral examinations were given up.

4123. Now, what would be the effect of this on the formation of the character of the teacher brought up under this system; in other words, in what way would it influence his habit of work, and influence him as a student?—Well, there is very little encouragement to a man to study.

4124. I am speaking of promotion by service and scholarship combined?—He had to continue his studies.

4125. And with regard to the school, and sometimes it was good for the school, and sometimes it was not. I have known a few cases where the schools suffered.

4126. With regard to the schools, how far do you think there ought to be an individual examination test?—I would examine every individual pupil in the elements, and I would have his marks written down on a sheet in the school for the parents to see.

4127. Would you have the teacher perform any part of the examination in your presence—would you see any objection to the teacher giving out dictation, or examining the reading, provided the inspector fixed the lesson?—I would not see any objection to the teacher setting arithmetic, provided the inspector saw the exercises; at present, of course, there is a form for the teacher to examine the pupils every year. That, I do not think, is of much use.

4128. Take, for instance, the class examination in geography or history, would you think it desirable that the teacher should give a series of questions to the class to show what the class knew, and which the inspector might not possibly draw out, and then that the inspector might subsequently examine the same class, so as to indicate the lines that he thought they ought to be examined on?—I do not see any objection to that.

4129. But the combination of the two, I think, would remove the possible objection that the teacher taught in one way and the inspector examined in

another way; in other words, that the inspector examined them on what they did not know, instead of what they did know?—I think it is the inspector's business to find out what they do know. I see no objection at all to the teacher taking part in the examination.

4130. Would you not think it beneficial that the inspector should happen to see the lines on which the teacher worked?—I think it is, and that would be very useful; but I think he would do that better by an inspection that at these examinations. There is just the danger that some inspectors are not fonder of work than other people. They may devote too much to the teacher and give themselves no trouble.

4131. With regard to the programme, I understand you are in favour of what we may speak of as the essentials. Then would you have optional subjects, which might be taken at the discretion of the manager and the teacher, or would you have a wide programme, in which you would limit the teacher and the inspector, in case the schools were not efficient, but that if they wanted to extend, they must still take off that programme an optional subject?—Yes, I think so; I think I might take it that the Board would lay down the subjects and allow a more limited programme for schools unfavourably circumstanced.

4132. That the school might take up, for instance, Modern Studies?—It might take a limited number of the subjects that are on the programme, on the general list.

4133. But would it not be better to leave a general liberty to each school manager to take those subjects which they thought most beneficial for their pupils?—Yes, that is what I mean.

4134. And would not that leave a wide range of optional subjects?—I do not think I would like to make it very wide. The Board would lay down a considerable number of subjects and leave the selection of three to the manager and teacher.

4135. Supposing you have the three essential subjects, and that then you had a wide set of optional subjects, would you limit the manager and teacher so that they could not take more than a certain number of these, so that if one manager thought it was important that he should have agriculture, or any other branch, he could not take more than a certain number, but you would leave him a choice which he would take?—Yes, that is what I mean.

4136. That is what I mean by optional subjects, too?—Yes; but I would have the Board lay down a programme of optional subjects which the manager might take. I would not allow him a town school to take agriculture, nor in an inland place would I allow him to take navigation, and probably I would not have navigation on the list at all.

4137. But then, with the single exception of a man like agriculture for a town school, and navigation, which I think we need not consider, we may take it that you would be in favour of optional subjects, of which the manager could have choice of a certain number, and be limited to that number?—Yes, I think so. I would like to qualify that a little. I think there should be a right of veto either by the inspector or by the officer, to see that the manager did not choose an unsuitable subject.

4138. Then the manager might take them subject to the approval of the authorities?—Yes.

4139. Now, with reference to the amount of reading that the pupils have to do in the schools, do you think it that beneficial?—I think a smaller amount goes into thoroughly would be more beneficial.

4140. You have travelled a good deal in Germany, I believe?—Yes; I visited schools there.

4141. What amount do they read, or are they held responsible for, in the German schools?—It varies very much. In schools like those in Leipzig, which are on a somewhat higher level than the country places generally, I think it is 60 reading lessons in the year.

4142. Of what length?—Some of them had a page or two or three. I will bring you some of the reading books to-morrow, if you like to look at them.

13th March, 1913.]

Mr. ALBERT PERREN, examined.

[Continued.]

4143. What is the difference between the way they deal with the reading lessons and the way reading lessons are dealt with in our schools at present?—Oh, they go into the lessons most minutely, and I think the book contains matter that is far more worth reading carefully and studying and remembering than our books. It is generally good literature, for one thing, taken from good authors; at any rate, when you get beyond the merest elements. And they go through these lessons in the most careful manner. They are read through and the substance of them analysed carefully, paragraph by paragraph. Then the whole lesson is taken together, and the children are expected to do that in their own words. There is a paragraph given, and they are expected to read it and to say what is the substance of that paragraph.

4144. Mr. CORRY.—Is there not a difficulty in limiting reading to that extent; does it not become monotonous to the children to read the same lessons all through the year?—I do not know. It does not seem to. You see, there is not so much reading done. A great deal of this lesson that they go over is not mere reading. They have to take up the subject matter of the lessons and explain some of it, first the subject matter of it, and then to give out all that lesson again in their own words.

4145. Mr. HAZEL.—Do you think anything has been gained in our schools by the large number of subjects introduced under the new programme?—Certainly; some of the subjects have not only increased in volume, I may say, but they have also improved, owing to the extra attention given to them. For instance, singing now is one of them. Singing was taught in a considerable number of schools. It is taught now practically in almost every school, and except where the teacher has no ear or voice, it is generally fairly attempted. It is partly because we have more people now able to teach singing than we used to have, and, of course, the Board went to a great deal of trouble in providing teachers for the teachers. But, I think we have too many subjects, and the children's attention is scattered over too many.

4146. Mr. BROWN says in one of his Reports that it is better to have patient, accurate instruction in a few subjects than an ambitious attempt at many, which cannot be dealt with so fully as to benefit the pupils, either by the amount of information imparted, or by the mental and moral training resulting from such instruction. Would you agree with that statement of Mr. Brown's?—I think it is very fairly put. I think I have made some similar statement myself.

4147. That is, you think, thorough teaching of a small number of subjects would be better than superficial instruction in a larger number?—I am quite sure that that holds true for the junior classes. There is too much attempted now in the junior classes. It is quite impossible for a child really to learn all the things that are attempted.

4148. And the result is that they know all the subjects very imperfectly?—Yes, very imperfectly, and they have no proper foundation for going on to the higher classes.

4149. Mr. CORRY.—Had the chief inspectors a tabular statement in the office showing the condition of the schools with regard to the lowering of marks in a particular district?—Never that I know of.

4150. So that you really had no knowledge of the education in your district, except from your personal observations and what you heard at the conferences?—Except at the annual conferences. Of course, my own personal observation could not tell me anything, because I could not visit more than half a dozen schools in each of the circuits in one year.

4151. It seems to me extraordinary that the chief inspectors should not be furnished from time to time, say from month to month, with a tabular statement showing the marks given in the different districts under their charge?—I think so, too; and I asked several times that all the reports might be sent to through us, so that if we did not actually deal with

them, we might look at them, and, of course, we had a right to call for any report at any time; but what was wanted was to see the reports as they flowed in. There is one thing I would like to mention; I know I have a note in some of my diaries, taken at the time these changes were going on, that there was a distinct statement to me from Dr. Starke, that we should see all the reports, that we were to see all the reports. However, when the scheme finally took shape, we saw none of them. Dr. Starke's notion, I have no doubt, is a perfectly good one, and it was that we would do more good by going out and seeing the schools, and know more about them than by reading the reports in the office.

4152. Even admitting that you were to go to the schools, it strikes me that the chief inspectors had not a full grasp of the whole work of the districts from the point of view of the progress of the pupils, and the lowering and raising of the marks?—Yes; I think it was a mistake that they should not have had that information.

4153. You are a very experienced official, thoroughly familiar with every phase of education, and am I to take it as your considered opinion that you did not feel yourself, with all your experience, capable of making a proper award of merit marks to a school, as I think you told us?—I would not like to be bound down to any statement I might make about a school like that.

4154. I am talking of schools generally, and of the present system of inspection varying so much from day to day. I think I understood you to say that you yourself did not feel that you could conscientiously do your duty to a school without examining it?—I could not.

4155. I understand you to say further, and I am quite in agreement with you, that without examination of the schools there is no accurate and no proper test; but on another point, I do not quite agree with you, where you seem to favour individual marking. Do you not think that individual marking, even though money payment is not attached to it now, would lead to some of the viciousness of which we were cognisant in the results system?—I do not think it is desirable that all the children of the class should be brought to a uniform standard. Do you not think that individual marking would lead to abuse in any system of examination?—Well, I do not know much about that sort of abuse.

4156. I have no doubt that there ought to be class examinations, each child being examined, and that class examination would be quite sufficient?—How will you decide whether a pupil is fit for promotion?

4157. I would leave that largely to the teacher. I think there is a sufficient guarantee for the State if the pupil has the privilege of examination, and if the inspector reports that the teacher had done his duty by the children in the way of teaching?—Yes. Might I give you one case of a school that I visited two years running. The teacher had 87 pupils, and in his return he marked the whole 87 as promoted. Next year he had only 52 pupils (of course, that was a year after) and he marked 62 as promoted. How many do you think he had promoted the first year out of the 87? One. The second year he promoted 84.

4158. So that you think the obligation should be on the inspector to say who should be promoted?—I think it is very desirable to have a check on the teacher to prevent him doing a thing of that sort.

4159. Yes; the great difficulty was in tracing how long the children had been in the class?—That was the point, and I think it would be desirable that some check should be put on it. Of course, it might be met with in other ways. You might require to have every pupil passing promoted.

4160. Would it not be met with in this way, which I think obtained to some extent prior to the results system, that the inspector intimated after the examination of the class, that 14 of the children in a particular class should be promoted?—Yes.

4161. Without specifying the particular pupils?—The teacher might select the wrong 14 in that case.

13th March, 1913.]

Mr. ALFRED PUGH, examined.

[Continued.]

4162. The teacher knows who are the best children?—Then he should not promote 14, if the 14 the inspector thought ought to be promoted were not, in the teacher's opinion, fit for promotion, and I would not object to the teacher not promoting some of the pupils, even though I thought were worthy of promotion, if for any reason he thought they should not be promoted. I have had several times myself to caution a teacher against promoting pupils (I am sorry to say even their own children) who were quite unfit for it physically.

4163. Mr. HENRY.—Would Mr. Coffey's point be met by this—that it would be a sufficient check on the promotion of the pupils to say that the promotion should not be too long delayed?—That is what I said; that the teacher should be bound to give a reason for not promoting any pupil.

Mr. CORRY.—I am afraid individual marking would lead to some of the great abuses of the results system. There would be a temptation to the teacher to leave the bright children standing at a certain standard and to bring up the weak children to the same level, and I think that the class should be examined as a whole.

4164. Mr. HARRISON.—I think you condemned the present system of merit marks?—The sub-division of merit marks.

4165. On the grounds that they are unworkable?—Yes.

4166. Now, as regards the recommendation that you make in your report about the promotion of teachers, surely that would be a reversal to the old system in a large part, would it not?—Yes.

4167. That system was tested for many years and found wanting, was it not?—Where?

4168. In Ireland?—I do not think it was ever found wanting.

4169. Was it not by the Powis Commission—was not the system of promoting teachers by examination condemned by the Powis Commission?—I do not remember, it may have been. Perhaps you are thinking of the Manual Training Commission.

4170. I am thinking of the Powis Commission?—I came in after the Powis Commission, and the thing remained on years and years after.

4171. Were not teachers in those days promoted by examination?—Partly.

4172. Did not that cease after 1870?—No.

4173. When did it cease?

Mr. HENRY.—1890?—And even before 1890, there was this modification that I have told you of.

4174. Mr. HARRISON.—It was given up probably for good grounds?—On the same grounds on which the merit mark was introduced.

4175. This had been tested and had been proved a failure apparently, in the opinion of the authorities, and you propose to revert to it?—Yes; but it is in the Reports of Manual Commission that it was recommended.

4176. What was the recommendation?—To give up the examination of the teachers. At any rate, the reason given was that the teacher would have more time for their own studies if they had not this examination.

4177. Have you had much experience of teachers studying for degrees?—A few of the teachers have got degrees.

4178. Did you not find that while they were reading for degrees they were barely able to do justice to their schools, and if they did, it was only at a very heavy strain for themselves?—The whole course of study was too severe for their work; but the examination I would rather institute would be a very much easier thing, but a thing that required continuous attention to one or two subjects.

4179. In the note you have given us, you bring a certain charge against inspectors, you say the Commissioners and their officers should show more trust and confidence in the teachers, and inspectors should treat them with courtesy and as fellow-workers. I presume that means that in your experience you find that that has not been done?—In several cases.

4180. Has that been at all general in your experi-

ence, in a good many cases that have come under your notice, or only from hearsay?—Of course, there is just the thing you say.

4181. I am asking you as a chief inspector have they come under your personal notice, or is this merely a matter of general hearsay?—Do you mean have complaints reached me?

4182. Complaints that actually reached you, or instances that you have seen in the schools yourself, when you have been with your colleagues?—A few. Remember I was chief of inspection.

4183. I am asking you as chief inspector?—As chief inspector certainly nothing came under my notice.

4184. No cases were brought to you officially?—No.

4185. Then you give a certain amount of hearsay evidence?—But before, when I was chief of inspection, cases did come.

4186. When you were acting in the office here?—I was always there since 1898.

4187. Until when?—Until 1911. I was in the office, but I was not getting the reports.

4188. Would cases of that sort be brought to you?—Not lately.

4189. You would not have to investigate them?—Unless a formal complaint was sent in to me to investigate.

4190. Had you any of those formal complaints to investigate?—These connected with Belfast.

4191. That is recently?—Yes.

4192. Had you to investigate them yourself?—Yes. Mr. Hynes and I, the two chief inspectors, were sent there. We were sent to enquire generally into these Belfast complaints. It was rather a question of the state of the school.

4193. I wanted to know whether it was within your personal knowledge that there had been on the part of your colleagues any serious lack of courtesy to the teachers?—Only a few cases.

4194. And, therefore, this might be more moderately worded. You put the case as if it was general, or as if there was a considerable amount of it?—The important point, I take to be there, is not so much courtesy as the second part, "fellow-workers."

4195. You say, "should be treated with courtesy"?—Yes, they are not to treat them as if they were high and mighty people and the teachers quite below them.

4196. Have you had instances which have come under your notice of that being the case?—Yes.

4197. A large number?—Not a large number; but quite enough to make it noticeable.

4198. Attaching a considerable number of your former colleagues?—Yes, a good many of them.

4199. Did you, as chief inspector, take any means to put things on a better footing?—At our conferences, yes. I always spoke of it.

4200. With effect or without effect?—Well, you cannot really affect some of the men.

4201. You think it a serious fault?—It is liable to be; but I do not think it is, to a large extent, because there are only a few inspectors who do.

4202. I think you talked about the rights of head inspectors. I presume their salaries are not affected?—Oh, no.

4203. Only their functions?—Their functions.

4204. They had functions after 1900 which were not as important as those they had before?—Yes.

4205. Would you think it was a good thing for the chief of inspection to remain in the office and do a good deal of clerks' work?—I do. I think they would get better information of what is going on in the schools by seeing reports than by going out to an odd school here and there.

4206. I think in Ireland that the chief inspectors do not keep up their own work in the school—they have no districts of their own?—No.

4207. Then as between Protestant and Roman Catholic inspectors, are they equal in number or what is the position?—Not quite equal, but very nearly.

4208. But, surely, when they are once on the staff, they are all equal for promotion, are they not?—No; there are 23 senior inspectors. These are half and half.

4209. These must be half and half?—Yes.

18th March, 1913.]

Mr. ALFRED PUGH, examined.

[Continued.]

4210. And that is how it is that as vacancies occur in one denomination, promotions may be more rapid in that one denomination?—The same thing occurred with the head inspectors.

4211. That is, the 22 senior inspectors?—Yes.

4212. I see that you say that you would recommend that none of the junior mistresses should be appointed. Tell me why, for I thought they would be very useful people?—Well, they have no qualifications.

4213. These junior mistresses come into schools which could not possibly afford qualified mistresses, and they do exceedingly useful work in regard to the young children?—I do not know what you mean by saying that they could not possibly afford.

4214. I mean that the funds at the disposal of the Board would not afford it?—Why should they have them at all?

4215. Let us take a concrete case. Take the case of a small country school under a master. The number are not sufficient to allow of a qualified assistant mistress, but they would be sufficient to allow of a woman who has got certain motherly instincts, and who will look after the very young children. Is it not better to put these young children under her than to leave them to the tender mercies of the master, who already is pretty well occupied?—He should be trained to look after that number.

4216. But it is natural for little children to be looked after by a woman?—I don't know that it is natural to a woman at all.

4217. But you think that in these cases a woman is better than nobody?—In some cases it is not so.

4218. Your evidence in this respect is contrary to the opinion of a good many people?—I know a good many people would not agree with me. My opinion is that these young children should not be allowed into the rural schools at all. It is extremely injurious for them.

4219. I have not asked you about the children, but whether it is not better to have a junior assistant mistress?—But if you get rid of the children you will get rid of the system of junior assistant mistresses likely.

4220. But that is not the point that you put?—But it is one of the reasons, because very often it leads to serious abuse. I was in a school in the County Mayo some years ago. About 60 children or so were present; certainly two-thirds of them were being taught by this junior assistant mistress, or were supposed to be taught by her, all the day long, while the highly qualified master was teaching about 15 children, some of them boys and some of them girls. Then the junior assistant mistress at needlework time got all the girls, including the master's and all her own set into the bargain, and the master had about five left, and I do not think that is right employment.

4221. Who arranged that?—The master did; but it is laid down in the rules that these people are to be employed in teaching the junior class.

4222. But the point is this. The fault was not, in that case, on the part of the junior mistress?—On the part of the master, who expected too much, and the rules give him power to do such a thing.

4223. Supposing you take away from that man this junior assistant mistress, how would then the school be worked?—It was worked before she was appointed. How many children would each teacher in England have?

4224. He would have in that case to take the whole school himself?—How many children would there be to each teacher in England?

4225. That would depend on the qualification of the teacher. You mean possibly that we allow for a supplementary teacher 20 children, and they must be quite young, and, as I imagine, that supplementary teacher would correspond to your junior assistant mistress?—I would like to know what the number would be, for in Ireland you have one teacher to every 27 children, and do you know any country in which there is such a large proportion of teachers to children?

4226. My point is what this particular master in the case you gave was to do if you took away the junior mistress?—He would teach that school.

4227. Infants and all?—Infants and all.

4228. The CHAIRMAN.—What was the size of the school?—I think it was under 50.

4229. Mr. HANBROW.—And would you prefer to see him doing that rather than have the use of the assistant mistress?—I do not allude to the mistress?—I would rather have an assistant mistress in the school.

4230. Now, with regard to appeals, I understand that it is not the practice in the case of appeals from teachers that the matter should be necessarily referred to the chief inspectors?—Not when I was in the office.

4231. It has not been the practice, so far as you know?—It has not been the practice.

4232. Mr. KAVANAGH.—I want also to take up this question of appeals. You say in your preface that teachers have no means of making an effective appeal. Tell us exactly what comprises their appeal, for your sentence is that the teachers have no means of making an effective appeal?—Of course, that is touching on the O'Connell case. Well, I take it to be exactly the same point as Mr. Harrison raised, that things are not put before the chief inspector.

4233. That they do not go before the chief inspector?—That was what I was referring to.

4234. I understand that you would recommend that there should be a Committee of the Board to hear appeals?—Yes, that all appeals should be brought before this Committee, if such a Committee were appointed. Of course, the other recommendation I made was that the old Committee system that existed should be re-established, that is, the Resident Commissioner attended by one of the higher officers should look into the appeal.

4235. Would that give more confidence, do you think, to the teacher?—I think it would. I think they would like to have some security that whenever they did make an appeal it would be considered.

4236. Do you think that that would increase the number of appeals?—It might, in the first instance, for a very short time; but they would very soon get to learn exactly where appeals would be effective, and where they would be ineffective.

4237. Mr. PUGH told us yesterday that there were very few appeals, but you seem to think differently?—I do not know how Mr. Pugh would know.

4238. He is an examiner?—But the appeal might not go to the examiner.

4239. Do they not come to the examiners for their notes?—Well, not necessarily; at least, I do not know. I really have no knowledge. I do not know exactly what the examiner does.

4240. But, in your opinion, there are a good many appeals?—I think there are a good many addressed to the secretary or to the Resident Commissioner.

4241. Then there is a paragraph in your preface about the examiners, in which you complain that these examiners have no knowledge of school matters, and you think that is an important point?—Yes; I mean practical knowledge; that is to say, they have never been in the habit of visiting schools and taking part in the inspection or examination of such schools.

4242. And therefore their making note on the report is not of so much value as if they had been inspectors themselves?—I do not think they understand the meaning of reports exactly, just as if I were to get a report from a fireman in a building yard or a ship-building yard. I would not understand what it meant. I might understand the English of it, but the effect of it on the actual work of the place would not be dear to my mind.

4243. They only emphasise what the inspector says, they do not make any comment on it?—They recommend the action to be taken, I think.

4244. But then it goes on to the chief inspector?—No, the chief inspector does not see them at all.

4245. You think that with the knowledge that inspection would give them, they would be able to comment better on the reports?—That a person who had been inspector would be better able to decide what should be done in the case.

4246. Now, about this famous tone circular; I suppose you have read it, of course?—Oh, yes; I saw the tone circular.

19th March, 1913.]

Mr. ALFRED PUGH, examined.

[Continued.]

4247. Yours is an independent opinion of the present system, and would you tell me exactly what you think of the tone circular?

4248. Mr. COFFEY.—Were not you in office in 1911?—Yes, I was; but I was out in November, 1911.

4249. Mr. HENRY.—You did not draft it?—I never saw it till it was given to me.

4250. Mr. KAVANAGH.—I heard it described yesterday as a most brilliant and well-headed document. Would you agree with that?—I do not know. I think it is quite right to emphasize it in that way. But I would not decide on the merits of the school by tone alone. I do not know how you could do it.

4251. Had you any difficulty in judging the tone of the school as inspector?—I had no difficulty in deciding on the discipline and knowledge of the school, and also, of course, on the truthfulness of the children, and order and good behaviour during the examination, and that was the only part of tone that you could well get in the school.

4252. You did not find any difficulty in judging the tone?—Not if you take it in that sense.

4253. Mr. COFFEY.—Could you draw a line determining whether a school was "excellent" or "very good"?—I could not draw a line in that case more than in the case of other points. There are some schools in which I would have no hesitation in saying that the tone of that school was "excellent."

4254. Mr. KERRY.—What would you mean by that?—That I had no doubt to find.

4255. A sentence in the circular is, "where the tone is good, deficiency in the acquisition of knowledge and even defects in method, may be to some extent disregarded," and our difficulty is how are you to get good tone coupled with deficiency in the acquisition of knowledge and defects in method?—The difficulty I would have would be about the defective method, because I do not know what the defective method is, except by judging of the result of the method. A

method may seem to be utterly wrong and may produce excellent results, and a method that may be quite right for one man may be quite wrong for another man.

4256. Mr. KAVANAGH.—I think that as inspector you were asked to judge of the tone of a letter?—I was not asked to judge of the tone of any letter. I was asked for my observations upon that letter.

4257. As to the question of uniformity; now, you handed in a circular as to the definition of "excellent," and so forth?—Yes.

4258. How could inspectors arrive at uniformity without some sort of a guide?—I do not think they could.

4259. Do you think a document of that kind is necessary?—I do not think it would enable them to come to uniformity.

4260. Take a young inspector; how could he arrive at what your idea of uniformity was, unless he had some printed guide?—By working along with his colleagues for six or twelve months, with the result of their giving him good advice.

4261. There are three men in a circuit, I understand?—Yes.

4262. Would not those three men want some sort of a guide in print before them—you want some kind of definition in print, do you not?—You do.

4263. And don't you think that document is a good guide to inspectors?—No, I do not.

4264. Mr. HENRY.—Is it not the fact that in a note they say, "it is obviously impossible to formulate a precise definition of 'very good,' 'good,' 'fair,' 'middling,' 'bad,' owing to the variations possible under the seven heads enumerated in the description of an 'excellent' school"?—Yes.

4265. Mr. KAVANAGH.—The whole intention is to explain what is meant by "good," "excellent," and so forth?—That is the intention; but I do not think it is effective. At least, that is my view.

## NINTH DAY.—FRIDAY, MARCH 14TH, 1913.

At 23, Kildare-street, Dublin.

Present:—Sir SAMUEL DILL, M.A., LL.D., LL.D. (Chairman); The Most Rev. DENIS KELLY, D.D., Bishop of Ross; Sir HIRAM SHAW WILKINSON, LL.D.; Mr. JOHN COFFEY, Mr. HENRAGE E. B. HARRISON, Mr. JEREMIAN HENLY, Mr. WALTER McMURROUGH KAVANAGH, B.L., and Mr. THOMAS MICHAEL KITTLE; and

Mr. ARTHUR J. DONNELLY, M.A., B.Sc., Secretary.

Mr. A. PUGH, further examined.

4266. Mr. COFFEY.—There are one or two further questions I wish to ask?—First of all, I wish to hand in the papers I was asked to bring. With regard to the report of the conference of senior inspectors in 1906, I should like to say, as, perhaps, you may not have understood it yesterday, that that was only the report made by them. It was an Inquiry by the Board. There are not official orders or anything of that sort. There are merely suggestions made to the Board. I have been looking over the papers since, and I find some nothing, which makes me sure that subsequently to this there was a conference between eight of the senior inspectors and the two chief inspectors on the same matter, as

least to some extent. It had reference to the programme made, but I have no papers connected with it to show what we recommended. But this went on to the Board then for consideration with our report. There is one other thing. I was asked, I think, to bring you the book of the rules for 1908, showing the conditions laid down for papers and such things, and I hand in the book. I have marked it here. It begins with "Instructions to Inspectors in reference to examinations, programme of examinations."

4267. The CHAIRMAN.—Is that all?—Those are all the papers I was asked to bring.

4268. Mr. COFFEY.—What I wish to ask arises from a question yesterday, on which I want a little more

141A March, 1913.]

Mr. ALFRED POWELL, examined.

[Continued.]

explanation. You told us yesterday that you were not put in possession officially of information as to how the schools under you as chief inspector were doing, that is, the schools generally, and I think it is important that we should know exactly how the conditions were dealt with?—Generally some cases had been referred to me in the Office; it might be a case of some irregularity on the part of the teacher, and when I had a bundle of six or eight referring to one part of the country, I would go down to that part of the country and visit those particular schools, and at the same time, as far as there was time to do it, I would visit schools in the neighbourhood.

4270. But those papers referred to you were not in any sense appeals from the teachers. They were complaints made against the inspector, or something in connection with the buildings?—No, I do not think they were cases of appeal. They were cases in which the Inspector had found fault with the school. I remember two of these in particular. One was in Killarney circuit, and the other was in North Kerry, in the Limerick circuit.

4271. When you spent a good deal of time in the Office, what were the duties that you were engaged on?—We had to arrange about the work for the examiners, for instance. We had to look over the inspectors' journals, which we got, on a case which was to be considered by the Resident Commissioner. Occasionally, of course, the examiner might send us in a paper.

4272. That was occasionally?—Very occasionally. He was not bound to do it at all.

4273. So that although you were chief inspector, no report on the school came into your hands, unless for the convenience of the examiner, who might send you papers from time to time, but who was not bound to do it. They were not sent to you officially, but because he wanted your advice on them?—Yes. We got very few at first from the examiner, but when Mr. Sturges was in the Office, and afterwards when Mr. Wynne came into the Office, the papers they were dealing with used to be sent down to us; but we had no power to interfere with them, except to make a suggestion. For instance, with Mr. Sturges occasionally I would go and discuss a matter. Mr. Wynne did not like any interference, and rather objected, in fact, to it; and here is a note I have got on that point from Dr. Sturges. This is in reference to the reports coming before us from Mr. Wynne, and I wish to let the Committee see how far we had the power of dealing with those reports.

4274. Sir HIRSH WILKINSON.—And is this document that you are about to read now a written instruction that you have got?—Yes, a written instruction, signed by Dr. Sturges.

4275. What is the date?—The date is 8th November, 1903. "Chief inspectors—Please note, that notices made by chief inspectors on Mr. Wynne's recommendations are solely for Mr. Wynne's information, and should not be circulated through the Office. Mr. Wynne is the final authority subject to me on these questions. In cases where he is in doubt, on account of advice tendered by the chief inspector, my final decision should be sought by Mr. Wynne." I may explain what is meant by "circulating them through the Office." These papers, of course, were handed in to us in a bundle put in a tray. If I noted papers taken out of the tray, I threw them back into the tray to be sent to the different departments they belonged to, and I dealt with those reports from Mr. Wynne in exactly the same way as I dealt with any other paper that was submitted to me. I sent it back to be distributed by the clerks in the Office, and that was what Dr. Sturges objected to in what I have just read, where he says that Mr. Wynne is the final authority.

4276. Mr. CORRY.—So that although you and Mr. Wynne were chief inspectors, and Mr. Wynne was a junior inspector, he, according to that, was a higher authority in the Office than you were?—He was in that matter.

4277. The CHAIRMAN.—Does Mr. Wynne's power, that we heard of from himself, date from that precise time?—Mr. Wynne succeeded Mr. Sturges, I think, about that year. That is the 11th of November, 1903, and I think Mr. Wynne came in earlier in the year. I may mention one other matter in connection with these reports. When Mr. Wynne went on leave these reports were dealt with by me at least for some years, but in the later years in which I was in the Office they never came in to me, whether he was away or he was there.

4278. Who took his place when he was away?—They were simply left undone till he came back.

4279. Mr. HARRISON.—Would they go before the secretaries or not?—After being dealt with by him?

4280. By Mr. Wynne, yes?—They would go to the secretaries merely to be presented to the Board, that is, to be laid on the table.

4281. But they would have no sort of power of revision over them?—No.

4282. In that respect they would not be his superior officers?—No, the Resident Commissioner was the only authority over him. In connection with that, I may, perhaps, refer to another circular that I have here. It is headed, "Chief inspectors and examiners."

4283. Sir HIRSH WILKINSON.—What is the date?—It is dated 15th October, 1901:—"All communications on the subject of the business of the Board should be addressed through the secretaries. When a proposal from an examiner or an inspector is made, if it is not a matter of mere routine, the views of the chief inspector should be ascertained before action is taken; but it must not be assumed that the action recommended by the chief inspectors should be followed as a matter of course. Full weight, however, will naturally be given to their recommendations. If the chief inspectors should happen to be on outpost duty, or on leave of absence, action cannot be delayed until their return. The principal duty of the chief inspectors should be to take measures that the work allotted to the various out-door officers by direction of the Commissioner should be faithfully and efficiently discharged."

4284. Mr. CORRY.—How was the chief inspector to know whether the work of the out-door officers was efficiently discharged, if the reports were not sent to him?—Though he had not the reports, he had their weekly journals. He could see that they were doing a reasonable amount of work; that was all.

4285. But he had no means of knowing how the work was done?—No, except by these annual conferences, and the occasional visits he paid to the district.

4286. That would be a small number of schools visited in such a large area. In 1900, you were chief of inspection?—Yes.

4287. Mr. Downing was chief of inspection at the same time?—He was, yes.

4288. At that date the revised programme was introduced, making these sweeping changes in the curriculum of the National schools?—The revised rules were introduced. I am not sure that the programme was.

4289. In 1900 or 1901—you were, at any rate, chief of inspection?—Yes.

4290. In the drafting of that programme were you and your colleague, Mr. Downing, chief inspection officers of the department, consulted?—Oh, no.

4291. Were your suggestions asked before it was drafted?—Certainly not.

4292. Was any opinion of yours asked before the matter was finally drafted and submitted to you?—No.

4293. And the same would apply, I suppose, to your colleague, Mr. Downing? Is it within your knowledge that he was not consulted either?—He was not consulted. There is no date on this document. We got word that changes were going to be introduced.

14th March, 1913.]

MR. ALFRED POSEY, examined.

[Continued.]

That was the first we heard of it, except what I told you before, about a clerk coming in and asking were we going to be turned out of the office.

4295. So that you and your colleagues, Mr. Downing, as the chiefs of inspection, and as experienced officials of the Board, were not taken into consultation in the preparation of the revised programme?—No, we were not; but I think it is not, perhaps, quite correct to talk of the preparations of the revised programme in that case. I think you mean rather the changes that were made in the system. It was not merely the programme, but the whole system, that was changed, and we were not consulted about that in any way.

4296. You were not consulted about the changes in the system, and you were not consulted about the new programme?—The only point that we were asked about in the new programme, so far as I recollect, was this. We were asked to meet Professor Fitzgerald, who took an interest in the new Science programme which was being introduced, and he wanted to know what we thought would be the best way of introducing that. Mr. Downing and I suggested that it should be done gradually, but that did not meet with Professor Fitzgerald's approval or with the approval of the Board, and they preferred introducing it all at once in every school. That is as far as we were consulted in anything connected with the new programme.

4297. You told us yesterday that though you were chief inspector of the National Board, you got no official intimation of the trouble which had arisen in Clonsilla?—Yes, that is so.

4298. You have had experience of the results system, and of the present system?—Yes.

4299. Do you think the education in the schools has improved or deteriorated?—I think it is possible that it has improved in some directions and deteriorated in others, but, on the whole, I do not think that there has been progress.

4300. Do you think that pupils leaving our National schools at present are as well fitted and as well equipped for making progress in life as they were 20 years ago?—I do not know. I should hardly say so. I do not think they are. I think they find it harder to get attention than they did in those days. They are not as well prepared for certain situations that are going. I think they find it hard, that is, the pupils coming out of National schools, to get into Training Colleges.

4301. It is within your knowledge that a very considerable proportion of the pupils of the National schools made their way into the public service?—Yes, they did.

4302. Do you think that pupils leaving the National schools at the present time have the same chance of winning a position in the Civil Service?—No, I do not think they are as well prepared for examinations of that sort as they used to be.

4303. Prior to 1900 the monitors or pupils of the National schools were fitted for entrance to the Training Colleges?—A great many of them.

4304. Those who desired it were largely prepared?—I think there was very little grinding of them afterwards in those days.

4305. But is it not within your knowledge that the education given in the National schools not being sufficient, candidate teachers have now to go and attend special classes away from their homes?—I know they do attend special classes.

4306. The mother of a monitor in a large Convent city school spoke to me the other night as to where she should send her girl for the last year to prepare her for the entrance examination to Caryfort. So that you do not think, on the whole, the education standard in the schools has been improved?—I do not think there is any marked improvement. There may be improvement in one direction, but I think there has been a falling-off in others.

4307. Now, with this Book of very comprehensive Notes for Teachers, I am sure that teachers of schools in all parts of Ireland would think that these were prepared, or largely prepared, by the chief inspectors. Had the chief inspectors practically anything to do with the preparation of these Notes to Teachers?—They had with some of them. That was one of the things prepared, or, at least, partially prepared, at the conference between the chief inspectors and the eight head inspectors, but the Notes have been altered materially since then. I could tell you about some of these. The first in that book is on reading, and English. They were drawn up by Mr. Stronge. I don't know what the next one is.

4308. Mr. HENRY.—Who drew up the rest?—I think they were drawn up by Mr. Ross at that time, and I think that subsequently that was done away with, and a new edition in the arithmetic was prepared. Perhaps I have not sufficient grounds for asserting, but I think it was prepared partly by Mr. Conen, and partly by Mr. Dilworth. I am not quite certain, but I always understood that was so.

4309. Mr. CORRY.—So that you and your colleagues, as chief inspectors, did not regard yourselves as having any responsibility for the preparation of these Notes as a whole?—Oh, no; there were some of the things I would not consider myself competent to do.

4310. There are some of the suggestions here that you would think ridiculous?—Some of them are suggestions that I would not put before the teachers.

4311. There are some that you would disapprove of—I will not go so far as to say that you would call them ridiculous?—Oh, there are some that I did not approve of, that I would not think right.

4312. And as an official you had to impress the importance of these on the teachers?—I never did. My notion was this, and I think you will find it in the beginning of that (at least it used to be in the beginning of that), that these Notes are not obligatory, that it was left open to the teachers to adopt them or not, and that was a point I impressed on our inspectors at our conferences again and again, that they were not to force these Notes on the teachers if the teachers were otherwise doing good work.

4313. Mr. HENRY.—As a matter of fact, did they not force them?—Some of them undoubtedly wanted them taught in the particular way that was pointed out there; and in some cases I think it will be perfectly justifiable, if a teacher was doing bad work on his own method, for the Commissioners to issue a book like that, and say "you must try this method."

4314. The BARRIE or ROSS.—You became an Inspector before the introduction of the results system?—I did, yes.

4315. There was a mass of opinion at the time, I believe, that the schools were not as efficient and active as they might be?—Oh, they were very inefficient.

4316. And it was thought necessary to apply some very strong stimulus to the teachers?—Yes; I think, my Lord, when I went to Ballina, the teachers there, and, perhaps, in the whole of the North-West of Mayo, appeared slack. I doubt if there were twelve pupils in the whole of that large part of the country that were in the highest class of the school (the fifth class was the highest class at that time). I doubt if there were a dozen pupils in the highest class in the whole district.

4317. So it was agreed that some change was required?—Yes.

4318. Did you approve of the change that was actually made?—I was too young an inspector at the time. I was only six months appointed at the time the thing began to come into force.

4319. And I suppose when the change came into force you worked it energetically and enthusiastically



for a time?—Certainly; I worked it to the best of my ability.

4330. Had it the effect of improving the work in the schools, the energy and activity of the teacher, and the studies of the pupils?—It certainly had the advantage of creating a more rapid stream of promotion among the pupils.

4331. And it had a stimulating effect?—It had. The requirements were raised considerably, and at the same time the numbers went up. The numbers examined in the year I was appointed were only 240,000 in all Ireland. Before the results system was in force very long the number had gone up to 430,000 and more, and towards the end I think it reached 330,000.

4332. So that at the beginning, at least, there is very little doubt that the system did good?—I think it did a great deal of good.

4333. As time went on did certain defects begin to manifest themselves?—Well, I suppose they did. Faults were found with the system, and certainly I think some of them were justified.

4334. And as the system went on longer and longer were those defects becoming more marked?—I could not say these were.

4335. It is an inference from the terms of your own petition. You say that various modifications were made from time to time in the regulations regarding the pass mark?—Yes.

4336. And the general effect was to make the examinations rather mechanical, and to open the door to cram?—Yes.

4337. Those defects were manifesting themselves?—I think they were. It was partly on account of the regulation (I marked them in the 1895 Rules) which I handed in, governing the pass, or what was considered the pass.

4338. About the same time as the results system came in, the minor positions in the Civil Service were thrown open to public competition?—I suppose it was about that time. I do not remember, but it must have been about that time I think. Before I was appointed an Inspector I was a clerk in the Record Office in London, and I got the post on limited competition, the same as I got the Inspectorship. Even up to that time all the offices had not fallen under the Civil Service Commission.

4339. As Mr. Coffey suggested, in those earlier days several of the National schools succeeded in passing their pupils for those positions?—Yes.

4340. Did the idea grow up more or less generally that the great object of education was to prepare pupils for those passes?—I dare say there was a good deal of that.

4341. Remember we are discussing a National system of elementary education?—Yes.

4342. For the entire population of the country?—Yes.

4343. Now, is that idea of preparing a certain number of pupils for offices, so as to get positions and salaries, an adequate and proper and correct ideal of a system of elementary National education?—If that was the sole object I would say "No," but it is not the sole object, it is one of the by-products.

4344. If it were the main object would you say what?—I think one of the main objects would be to fit the pupils to occupy whatever position in life they are thrown into.

4345. Now, we are dealing with the whole population of Ireland, four millions of people?—May I just interject one remark. I am referring now not merely to situations in Government offices. I am referring to all sorts of situations, clerkships, &c., in Railway offices and other places.

4346. In Railways, but not in the direction of manual work. There are two distinct points. One

point is to fit the pupils for the position they occupy, and to make progress in it. That is one thing, and another thing is to pass an examination and get a situation?—Well, I do not agree about the examination.

4347. These are totally distinct things. You take the professions, and the officials and the various clerks, and they number some thousands of the population?—Yes, I think they are different things.

4348. Now, the labourers of Ireland, the fishermen and farmers and mechanics, and all those living by manual work, are millions. Now, supposing that the two ideas were incompatible, whether should a system of elementary education make provision for the many or for the few?—It should make provision for all.

4349. And, therefore, when we are discussing this question, the main thing to keep before our minds is the making of progress in life of the wealth producers of the country, the workers of the country?—Well, that is rather a debatable point, as to whether they are the wealth producers of the country or not.

4350. You might think you and I are producers?—Certainly.

4351. Very indirectly; but the greater good of the greater number should be looked to in any case, so, therefore, you will agree with me, will you not, that it is not an adequate idea to prepare for pass examinations?

Mr. COFFEY.—You put in a very far-reaching, qualifying word, "incompatible."

The BARNES or ROSS.—The main object to keep before one's mind is the greater good of the greater number.

Mr. COFFEY.—But the two things are not incompatible.

The BARNES or ROSS.—I asked you, Mr. Furber, if there was not a strong idea growing up in the "petition" that the great object was to pass examinations?—That was, of course, in a certain class of people.

4352. And amongst a large number of teachers?—But they did not teach the children with that sole object.

4353. And amongst a considerable number of officials of the Board?—They did not prepare them in their school to pass examinations for the Civil Service, or for the Bank, or for anything else. That was not the notion, but the pupils that were fit for that they were glad to send on to that.

4354. Mr. KEVILLE.—Now, did not that notion of passing examinations specially in order to get into the Government Service, as the ideal of education, communicate itself to secondary education also?—It was the general feeling of the country.

4355. Had we not to reconstruct the system of Intermediate Education to get rid of it?—I think it is still largely the notion of Intermediate Education.

4356. The BARNES or ROSS.—Do you think that a sound notion from the point of view of the good of the whole country?—If you have to prepare people for these posts, and I suppose people have to be prepared for them, whether the notion is sound or otherwise, I do not see why the National school should not do it, and, therefore, if they have some pupils that are fit for that thing, why should they not send them on to it. The others who are not fit for such a post will not be prepared for that, but they will be prepared on a different programme.

4357. Would you draw a distinction between a system of National education on the one hand, and Civil Service Academies, Medical Schools, Ecclesiastical Seminaries on the other—on there not a broad line of distinction between the two things?—No, they run into one another.

4358. What is the object of a Civil Service Academy?—I do not know.

14th March, 1915.]

Mr. ALFRED PUGH, examined.

[Continued.]

4249. Is it not to prepare candidates to pass examinations for the Civil Service?—It may be. I never went to one of them, though I got three different positions in the Civil Service.

4250. I think we agreed a minute ago that the object of a system of elementary national education is to prepare the pupils for their position in life?—Certainly, and that is what is done in the National schools.

4251. A minute ago you told us that it was still the great idea of both elementary and secondary education to make pupils who were fit to pass examinations to get these situations?—Yes, that is what is done with certain pupils, but it does not all interfere with the general principle underlying the work of the school.

4252. Now, in a system of National education, whether should you look more to the development of the intellect of the pupils or to the acquisition of knowledge; in other words, to the developing of their minds, so that they would have special aptitude and special power if they were farmers to do farming work, if they were street sweepers or chimney sweeps to sweep the chimneys and the streets, better than if they had no instruction at all—should not that be the object, or should it be the object, to give them certain snippets of information?—Certainly there should be no such thing as giving them snippets of information.

4253. If the results system, as time went on, was having the effect of crippling the minds of the rising generation, would you think that a good system?—No.

4254. Do you think that it was having that effect?—No.

4255. Now, in reading, for instance, had the inspectors, in examining reading, any opportunity of testing, or were they allowed to test whether the pupils understood what they read or whether they did not?—Certainly. If the pupils did not read the passage well they were given a second trial, and that has nothing to do with teaching in one sense. The teachers, of course in certain things, went beyond what was required for the mere pass. In the lower standards a very small thing was required for the pass, but when the child got up into the fourth or fifth standard, they would be drilled enough, and a ready recognition of the words would be insisted on, while for the No. 1 pass, proper attention to phrases and good articulation would be required in each case, and the pupil would be expected to answer simple questions on the words and phrases of the lesson read.

4256. That would give no idea of the meaning and drift of the lesson?

Mr. HANLY.—The phrases are included.

The BERNER or BOSS.—Is it a question of the meaning?—I know that is the way it was always interpreted, and in the fifth class it became perfectly plain. The conditions for the pass in these subjects included ready recognition, distinct articulation, proper grouping of the words, as well as a knowledge of the meaning of particular words and phrases in the lesson read.

4257. Mr. KERR.—We have had it in evidence that in Irish-speaking districts it was not unusual for pupils that did not speak English at all to do admirably in the repetition of one of these reading lessons. In that case it was clear that the pupils did not understand the meaning, but still secured these passes?—May I ask you who gave that evidence?

4258. Mr. O'Connor?—I don't know where Mr. O'Connor found that.

We had it in evidence.

Mr. KAVANAGH.—It was his own experience.

4259. Mr. KERR.—The evidence was that the pupils there read mechanically a limited lesson in English, although Irish was the pupil's language, and although the pupils did not understand English?—I don't see how that could possibly be.

4260. The BERNER or BOSS.—It was my experience, in dealing with schools in Clare, that the boys came in and read a passage in English; they articulated the words, they paused and so on, but it was perfectly obvious that while they were making sounds with the organs of speech, there was no current of thought

passing through their minds at the time, and I often stated that they were just exactly like the small boys who have learned Latin to repeat the answers at Mass. They utter the words with good pronunciation and at proper times, but it is obvious to everybody that there is no current of thought passing through their heads?—What because of those boys in Clare?

4261. Well, there was a great deal of trouble and tremendous difficulty to get them to understand anything. They managed to struggle through, but they never became men of intellect, though they got into the professions?—You will find that, I suppose, in every school in the country.

I am talking of my experience of twenty years, beginning in 1877 and ending in 1897. And, furthermore, it was my distinct experience that as time went on things were becoming worse and worse.

4262. Mr. HANLY.—Do I understand that you would not have given a pass under those circumstances, that if the boy read the passage perfectly correctly, as far as articulation went, but when tested showed that he did not understand what he had read, you could have denied that boy a pass?—No.

4263. He would have passed?—He would have passed, but he would have passed with a lower mark. And, furthermore, in a school where we might examine a class of, say, ten, of whom four or five might not be able to answer anything about the lesson, we would mark that their proficiency in explanation was unsatisfactory.

4264. The BERNER or BOSS.—Do you think that the system of examination, guiding, as of necessity it must, the system of teaching, led to such a result?—Not necessarily.

4265. Would it be calculated to lead to such a result?—With a certain class of teachers it certainly would.

4266. You did not think that there was any need of any change in 1900 in the results system?—I did not like the results system in several respects. I did not like the payment on individual passes, but I never objected to the examination.

4267. Why did you object to the payment on individual passes?—Well, it told very unfairly against a teacher very often.

4268. Was it unfair on the money question?—It was unfair on the money question.

4269. It was not any educational defect that you disliked?—There may have been educational defects in the matter, too.

4270. What would be the educational defects?—Oh, there was expense, you may say, for spelling, and 1/- for reading, and 9d. for grammar, and 4d. for geography, and 2d. for writing, and so on (this set of figures will do as well as any other).

4270a. So that if the child failed in any particular subject, that meant a money loss to the teacher?—Yes.

4271. In that particular subject?—Yes.

4272. And therefore was there a tendency to try to get the child up to the level of passing in each subject?—There was.

4273. And to get each child in the school up to the level of passing in all their subjects?—Oh, yes; the teacher was expected to do so.

4274. And in the effort to get the children up to that level, would the teacher always have sufficient energy left to get the better class of children to a higher level?—I think the better class of children had no difficulty in getting to a higher level.

4275. Was the system calculated to raise them to that level?—Well, the system, if properly carried out, rather tended to raise the bad children and help them along.

4276. And to leave the good children at the average level?—The opposite complaint was made again and again while the results system was in force, that the bad children were neglected.

4277. I think your point and mine are hardly the same. I think you hardly take the same point of view. Would you take the human mind as a piece of mechanism, and apply supports to the mechanism, so as to

14th March, 1913.]

Mr. ALFRED PUGH, examined.

[Continued.]

make it the strongest and best and most useful possible for whatever work in life that mind would have to do, whether it was that of the Judge on the Bench or that of the street sweeper?—I should be sorry to regard it as a mechanism. I do not think you can influence the mind except by giving it some food; but I think the word "mechanism" does not exactly suit. If you introduce that in connection with education, it may be misleading.

4878. The mind must need some food?—Yes.

4879. Are you simply to give it the food that will best promote its growth and its health and its development?—Certainly.

4880. Or will you overload it with food; will you simply pack food into the mind, independently of whether that particular food will strengthen and nourish and develop the mind or not?—I do not think you could overload the mind that way at all.

4881. So that there is no such thing as mental indigestion—mental digestion is easy, and you simply cannot overload it?—The mind will reject very quickly what is excessive, and that is the difference between teaching properly and improperly.

4882. Do you think that it is a good thing to put so much into the mind that the mind will have to reject the excess?—The mind is always doing that.

4883. Yesterday you very kindly gave us some of these French reports on schools?—Yes.

4884. Now, can you tell us a little more about the French system in the appointment of teachers, and their promotion?—The teachers have first to go through the training college, to spend three years in the training college. Then they come out and they are appointed on probation—they are called stagiaires. After they have been on probation for, I think, two years (I am not quite certain about the time), they are examined in the school to see their fitness. The examination takes place before the local inspector and one of his teachers (the teacher is brought down with the inspector), and they decide as to whether this man is fit for permanent recognition or not. If he passes the test they put him to, he then becomes titulaire, and he gets the lowest salary in the fifth grade.

4885. What would that salary be?—I think at present it is only 1,200 francs.

4886. The CHAÎMAN.—4887.—4888.—And they are promoting not only to do away with the fifth class, but also to have him begin on a fourth class salary. Then they rise automatically from the fifth to the fourth and the third. Of course, it takes a certain number of years.

4887. The BISHOP OF ROSS.—That is, their salaries rise automatically?—Their salaries rise automatically.

4888. And at the end of what period do the salaries cease to rise?—That I could not tell you definitely. I tried to look it up the other day, but I could not find it. I am not certain; but his annual increment if it is annual is something like 30 francs a year.

4889. I see here a note from Mr. Sedler's book, and it says that the French teachers start with a minimum salary and are awarded triennial increments. The minimum salary is £40 a year, and the increments are only 4s, and the maximum salary is attained by only five per cent. of the teachers, and it is 280.—Sedler, Seventh Volume, page 467.—Yes. They rise automatically in the fifth and fourth and up to the top of the third. They cannot get out of the third into the second until they get a certificate of aptitude for teaching. If they get that, they rise on to the second class without any stop. From the second to the first, they can only be promoted by selection of the inspector, that is the district inspector and the inspector of the Academy, a post which corresponds to head inspector.

4890. Well, the system corresponds to some extent, at least, with the present system in Ireland?—It does.

4891. I see in this form you have kindly sent us in that they get marks in various subjects, in conduct and keeping of the school, and all that, and I see the marks of "ever bina," "bina," and "tres bina," and I suppose the best translation of these is "fair," "good," and "very good"?—Yes.

4892. And yesterday you thought that you could not distinguish except into two classes, favourable reports and unfavourable?—Yes.

4893. Well, here we have at least three?—Is that for the school or is that for a certain subject?

4894. Merely the subject?—There is no difficulty in deciding between "good," "fair," and "middling," in arithmetic.

4895. I find at the end, "l'ensemble des résultats"?—I suppose that is the merit mark.

4896. Then I see "satisfait distingué"?—Yes.

4897. That is a merit mark?—The merit of the teacher, he has given distinguished service.

4898. I do not see any merit mark for the schools, but I do for the teacher?—You see the form of report is quite different. If he is asked to give a report on reading, he does not say "reading fair," but gives actually what was done before him. It is much more detailed. And then the teacher's increment and salary do not depend on the merit mark of the school.

4899. I am looking at it from the point of view of the difficulty of doing these things?—There is no difficulty, my lord, if you will excuse me. If there is one definite thing, I think I could distinguish "excellent," "good," and "very good," and so on, but when it comes to putting a whole lot of things together, the thing becomes difficult.

4900. So the difficulty then is the number of things. If you want to judge the discipline of a number of schools, you would have no difficulty in deciding if one school is "excellent" and another "good," and so on?—If I saw enough of the school, I would have no difficulty.

4901. If you were to judge reading alone, you would have no difficulty in judging, but a difficulty in making a compound judgment, if I may use the word, of all the qualities together?—And the difficulty in the case you put is even greater if you take several classes together. I think that report that you have is on one particular class. The number of pupils in this paper is 28 and the teacher has only that one class to attend to. It is a school consisting of 28 pupils in the first class and 33 in the other class, but the report is on a class containing 28.

4902. Now, in order to give a favourable or unfavourable report, must you not take all the elements into consideration in coming to a decision to give a favourable report?—Certainly.

4903. And in giving an unfavourable report also, must you not take all the elements into consideration?—Yes.

4904. And will you not still confront the difficulty of drawing a line of demarcation between favourable and unfavourable?—Yes; but it won't be so serious as when you have all these sub-divisions.

4905. So we reduce the difficulty, but we cannot get rid of it?—There would only be a small residuum that there would be a doubt about.

4906. But you reduce the difficulty by having only one borderline to draw, instead of three or four lines?—Yes, that is a material reduction.

4907. But we cannot get rid of the difficulty absolutely?—Not absolutely.

4908. It is inherent in human nature?—Yes; that is what I say. It depends very largely on the inspector's temperament.

4909. And each man has got his own temperament?—Yes.

4910. And must work by it. There is a passage in your report at the top of page 5, in which you say, "the senior inspector has no authority and the sub-inspector has no responsibility. He cannot now change the merit marks up or down without the consent of the senior, and so marks will tend to become stereotyped. The circuit inspectors hold condemnations, but have no means of enforcing any view, except by laying it before the chief inspector at his annual conference." No doubt, it is my fault, but I do not quite follow the train of thought in the passage. It seems to say that the senior inspector and the sub-inspector more or less reduced each other to impotence, and that the circuit inspectors seemed to be in the same plight. The circuit inspectors and the senior inspectors are

taken together. They seemed to be so helpless that they can only put the thing before the chief inspector. Would I be correct in drawing the conclusion that, therefore, the power of the chief inspector is greatly extended—that all the power finally rests with him?—Oh, no: he can only give advice.

4411. How am I to interpret the word, "the senior inspector has no authority"?—He has no right to order the other men to do this or that.

4412. Is there no authority anywhere—that is what I want to get at?—There is the authority of the Board or of the Resident Commissioner.

4413. But amongst the inspectors the chief inspector has no authority?—He has very little, I think.

4414. Then the senior has none?—Of course, where the authority comes in is that if these junior inspectors do not do what they are told to do, and what they have a right to be told to do, they get reported to the Board, and then they are called to order. That is the authority that the chief inspectors have.

4415. The inference to my mind is that the inspectors used to have authority, and now they have none?—What I mean is that the head inspectors had more authority in dealing with the district inspectors, than the present senior inspectors have in dealing with their junior inspectors.

4416. It seems to me, though, that if the senior inspectors have lost authority, what they have lost must have gone over, according to your statement, to the chief inspector, and that he gets what the others have lost?—No; because he had still more authority before, when he was chief of inspection. He is reduced now to pretty much the position of head inspector. The Chairman, I think, called attention to that yesterday, and I think I acknowledged that the remarks I made were, as he put it, a bit too rhetorical; I should have said "influence" instead of "authority," and I would be quite willing to modify that, as I see that it is, perhaps, put in a way that would mislead.

4417. Now, you told us yesterday, and you have it in your pencil also, that you do not approve of helms three or four years of age being kept in the schools?—I do not.

4418. You do not think it is the best way of developing brain cells to put youngsters of three or four years of age into a schoolroom?—I think it is extremely bad for the body of that little child, sitting on a hard form several hours a day, when he ought to be playing about on the ditches, and making mud pies.

4419. That the mothers of the children should do all that nursing?—They might not be so young as to require nursing.

4420. Mr. HARRISON.—At what age do they usually come into the country schools?—It depends on the distance of the school. Some of them will come in at three.

4421. You admit them at three?—Yes.

4422. Are there many of them that come in at three?—Not very many in the country.

4423. Are there many of them that come in at four?—Oh, yes; a great many.

4424. There would be a large number?—A considerable number. Of course, they do not attend at certain times of the year as well as the grown children; but they are on the rolls.

4425. And the teachers have no right to refuse them?—No right to refuse them. I don't think they are refused even lower than three. I remember Mr. Patterson, the head inspector, mentioning the matter to me, and saying that he found some of the children in a school that were not able to sit down themselves, and they had to be held in the arms.

4426. The BRUCE or ROSE.—You would give all that work to their mothers to do and not be paying for it out of the pockets of the taxpayers?—I was going on to make a suggestion.

4427. I see you suggest that in towns grants might be made to infante departments or play-schools?—Yes.

4428. You say that the experimenters of these play-schools should be suitable?—Yes.

4429. But they need not have the qualifications of a certificated teacher?—Yes.

4430. Would you agree that the most suitable non-certificated superintendents for these play-schools would be women?—Yes.

4431. That women would know better how to care the children?—Certainly.

4432. Nature teaches them more of the art?—Men could hardly be got to do it.

4433. So you agree, then, that they should be women?—Yes.

4434. And they need not be certificated, of course?—Yes; except that they should be suitable; that is, that they would know how to tend these children and to care them.

4435. Suppose that we called these women superintendents junior assistant mistresses, would you have any objection?—Not the least.

4436. So that Mr. Harrison and you after all are agreed?—Not altogether, certainly; because Mr. Harrison does not know the conditions of our schools. Mr. Harrison would have these in an ordinary school and I would not.

4437. Mr. HARRISON.—What do you mean by an ordinary school?—A country school; not a town school. I would have these play-schools in towns, and I would have them small.

4438. I think my point was that if you have to have them, it would be better to have these junior mistresses. I presume that if you are bound to have the children there, these assistant mistresses would be better than nothing?—Yes.

4439. That was my point?—I have not denied that it is better to have them than to have nothing. But I would get rid of the difficulty by getting rid of the children.

4440. Mr. KERR.—Do you believe in the Montessori method?—I believe in any method that is able to carry out these things; but to put the Montessori method into the hands of the ordinary teacher would be a mistake. Egeria, in Hampshire, has done very good work.

4441. Mr. HARRISON.—I know Egeria?—I suspected that you did.

4442. The BRUCE or ROSE.—In continuation of my view of elementary education being for the good of the greater number, is not the elementary education in Ireland paid for to the greatest extent, almost entirely by the taxpayers of the country?—It is.

4443. One has got to ask one's self what is the justification for putting one's hand into the taxpayer's pocket to pay for elementary education, because there must be a justification; there must be a principle at the bottom of all this. Now, if we take the police, I suggest that the justification is that the police preserve order, and they protect our lives and our property, and if there was no protection of life and property, anyone of us might suffer. It might be you now, and I some other day. And the same may be said of the Navy, and so on; but when we come to a system of elementary education, I suggest that in order to have a justification for it it must be for the benefit of the whole community. I further suggest that if, out of a system of elementary education you are going simply to get a small number of people into situations you have no justification for putting your hand into the taxpayer's pocket. Would you agree to that?—Well, I don't know. My opinion is that the State undertakes a great deal too many things; but as the State has undertaken this primary education, I consider myself bound to accept it.

4444. But you admit that thinking men are bound to see what the principle behind all that is?—I think they ought to satisfy themselves, but if they come to the conclusion that the principle of it is wrong, they have to submit to it or leave the country.

4445. Do you think that an official in charge of a system of education ought to have no views on points of that kind?—They certainly ought to have views; but at the same time, they need not unnecessarily give vent to them.

4446. I suggest that elementary education, to be justified, should contribute to the general peace and prosperity of the country, and it it does contribute to

14th March, 1913.]

Mr. ALFRED PETERS, examined.

[Continued.]

the general peace and prosperity of the country, then you are justified in compelling the taxpayers to pay for it; because all those who live in the country derive benefit from having the people round them peaceable and virtuous, and they would all derive benefit from the prosperity of that country. Would you agree to that?—That is a very big question.

4447. If you do not agree to that, I challenge you to give me a justification for spending public money on elementary education?—I have told you just now, my lord, that I think a great many things that we have to give public money for are things that the State should not undertake.

4448. But you are connected with education?—I got my bread and butter out of it, and I was very glad to get it. The things were there and I took them.

4449. Well, if it is only giving you and men, and a certain number of other people bread and butter, would any State be justified in setting up such a system?—I think furthermore that in certain things the State pays its servants too well, including inspectors of schools.

4450. Would you go one step further?—That my pension ought to be reduced?

4451. And would you say that one and three-quarter millions is too large a sum of money to spend in a country like Ireland on elementary education out of a total revenue of the country of £20,800,000?—But do we spend one and three-quarter millions? I think you have got too large a sum.

4452. Mr. CHURCH.—I take it that your answer to his lordship is that every educated man in the country will recognize that the expenditure on education is only justified by doing the greatest good to the greatest number?—That is the opinion of the State also.

The CHAIRMAN.—I think we are getting beyond our terms of reference.

4453. Sir HIRSH WILKINSON.—You propose to reduce the merit mark to two?—Yes.

4454. Increments, and I suppose promotions, would depend on these marks?—Yes.

4455. There are two points of view, whether the teachers should get their increments and promotions on receiving a favourable report, or whether they should get their increments and promotions unless they get an unfavourable report. If you, as I understand it, say that the inspector must report on the school favourably or unfavourably, I take it that the difference between the application of these two different points of view vanishes. Am I right?—I did not quite catch the question.

4456. Supposing you had increments and promotions automatic, as you put them, unless the inspector reported unfavourably on the school, there would have to be then a positive statement to prevent the teacher getting his increment of salary?—Yes, that is so.

4457. Whereas, if you say that he will get his increment if he obtains a favourable report, he then has on each occasion to justify his promotion or his increment. As I understand it, you would make, in every instance, the inspector say either one thing or the other, favourable or unfavourable?—Yes, I would.

4458. If the inspector has to say "this school is favourable" or "this school is unfavourable," the question of whether the teacher gets his increment, unless he gets an unfavourable report, is quite the same as to say that he gets it, if he has a favourable report?—If the inspector is bound to put down one thing or the other?

4459. One or the other?—Yes; quite so.

4460. And you, I understand, in your proposals, lay it down that every year, at least, there should be a statement by the inspector that this school is a favourable school, or that the teacher is a favourable teacher, or that this is an unfavourable school and the teacher an unfavourable teacher?—Yes; I think there ought to be such a statement.

4461. In that case, am I right in considering that the difference as to which point of view ought to be acted upon vanishes?—That it makes no difference whether he reports upon the school favourably—that it makes no difference whether the rule is laid down negatively or positively?

4462. Negatively or positively?—It makes no differ-

ence; but it can only be stated positively if he is to make a report in that form.

4463. Favourable or unfavourable?—Yes.

4464. Now would you make the increment or the promotion dependent upon the report upon the school or on the report upon the teacher—and I am speaking of the principal teacher, of course?—I think it ought to depend upon the report upon the principal teacher; but then, the inspector should take more into consideration than he would with the assistant.

4465. You consider that the duties of a principal teacher are more than the duties of an ordinary teacher, and that the performance of those additional duties should be taken into consideration in determining whether or not he should get his increment or his promotion?—Yes.

4466. Now, that is one of the serious questions with regard to inspection, and I should be very glad if you could give us your view, first of all, with regard to what the practice is where there is a different merit mark for the school from the merit mark for the teacher, for I understand that in certain cases the teacher does get a more favourable merit mark than the school gets?—Yes.

4467. This is not the first time the point has come on; but I should like to get the benefit of your experience on the subject. What points ought to be taken into consideration as against the teacher who has got, say, "excellent" as his personal merit mark—or, perhaps, I won't say "excellent," but "favourable," while school may be unfavourably marked, so as to prevent the teacher who had got a favourable personal merit mark from getting his promotion or his increment by reason of something really in the school. Would you kindly develop that, and say what things with regard to the school ought to weigh with the inspector, that he may say: "Although I have given this teacher a favourable mark, I consider I can only give the school an unfavourable mark; and, therefore if the recommendation remains with me, that he should get his increment or his promotion?"—Well, if the principal teacher has got a good mark and the school an indifferent mark or an unfavourable mark, I think the inspector is probably at fault. This refers to a one-teacher school.

4468. Mr. HENRY.—Supposing the teacher gets an "excellent" mark and the assistant is marked "fair," what mark is assigned to the school as a whole?—In that case, if the principal has got a good mark, "excellent" or "favourable," or anything like that, I think the inspector's duty would be to point out where the defect in the school lies, and the principal ought not to be penalised for that, if he is not responsible for it. It might turn out that the fault of these assistants, the defect in their work, was partly due to the principal's own way of arranging the work of the school; because the principal has the arranging of the time table and other such things, and if he arranged these badly, so as to prevent the assistant doing satisfactory work, in that case he should suffer; but if the fault is entirely the assistant's and that the principal has no means of correcting it, then, I think, it should not be taken against the principal; and it is the inspector's duty, in my opinion, in that case, to point out where the responsibility lies; and that is exactly what you had in something, I think, I read out yesterday:—"In forwarding his report on any school, the inspector, when calling attention to the defects in the proficiency of the school, should indicate where the responsibility for the particular defects complained of chiefly rests."

4469. Sir HIRSH WILKINSON.—What is that a quotation from?—That is a quotation from the Board's rules of the year 1898.

4470. Kindly give me the paragraph and page?—The first paragraph on page 93, I hand it in. This was before the late change was made.

4471. The CHAIRMAN.—The last years of the results system?—The last years of the results system.

4472. Sir HIRSH WILKINSON.—I only wanted to know whether that particular instruction has not been reported in the more recent regulations?—No; but it shows the view the Commissioners at that time took of the question that you raised.

14th March, 1913.]

Mr. ALFRED PRUGH, examined.

[Continued.]

4473. Now, at the present time, I understand, if I have gathered the result of the evidence rightly, the teacher may suffer for the defects of his assistant, although the responsibility for these defects ought not properly to be laid at his door?—I believe that is the case.

4474. You would revert to the old system, that is to say, that the inspector, if he finds that he cannot give the school as high a mark as he gives the teacher, would be called upon to state what the defects are and where the responsibility lies for these defects?—Yes. But remember, Sir Hiram, this difficulty would not occur if you had not this minute sub-division of the mark marks.

4475. I am glad that you mentioned that, because I was going on the point that even without that minute sub-division, I was assuming that there was a possibility of the teacher getting a favourable and the school an unfavourable mark under your proposed system. Would there be that possibility?—Just the possibility; but it would be extremely unlikely to occur. But with this sub-division of "excellent," "good," and so on, and requiring "excellent" for certain promotions, the thing becomes absolutely certain; it must occur.

4476. Supposing that the inspector found that the principal teacher was just above the favourable line, and that there were two assistant teachers who were so far below the line that the school could not be classed by the inspector consistently as favourable, would that occur under your system, although not so often as under the system of mere minute divisions?—It would; but very seldom, I think. If a man was so little above the line, I doubt if he could get a better salary than the assistant.

4477. Assuming that the inspector has been able to arrive at a definite statement of his own that the teacher, if it were not for this particular question, ought to get a favourable report rather than unfavourable, and if he is not responsible for this, why should he be in any the worse position than, seeing that he is not responsible?—The principal teacher would be paid a somewhat higher salary than the assistant, and, therefore, if he is so little above the line as to be pulled down as the result of inspection, I think he would not have any very good claim to a further increment, resting him still more above the scale of an assistant's salary.—I mean, of course, an efficient assistant's salary.

4478. Then it appears to me that he is to be punished for these things for which he is not responsible?—Well, I do not know. I would like to see the actual case. I think the inspector ought to decide all these things. I do not think there would be any difficulty in deciding on a case of that sort.

4479. You think that the inspector would be inclined to say: "Well, although really he is not to blame for this, still he must suffer"?—Of course, at present, the inspector has absolutely nothing to say to it. It is the people in the office who decide the matter.

4480. But he makes the mark mark, and his decision is practically the final decision, as I understand?—Oh, no; he may give the principal teacher a "very good," but he may give the school only "middling."

4481. And if he gives the school only "middling," will that teacher ever get promotion?—No; but the inspector gives the man a mark and the school a mark, and it is the office that decides on those marks, that he is to get promotion or not to get it.

4482. The inspector is not responsible for the rule which gives a certain effect to his reports, but his reports have a certain effect by reason of those rules?—It is nothing to him.

4483. What I understood to be the point that you wish to make is, that the inspector would act without regard to what the results of his action would be, that it is his duty to make up his mind as to which the particular mark should be and leave the rest to a higher authority?—That is his duty under the present system.

4484. And that would be his duty, I take it, under the system that you propose?—No; because I think the inspector should have authority, or should have a right

at any time to recommend even in a case of that sort that a man's superintendence should be taken into account.

4485. It is open, I think, under the form at present to make a recommendation; but it is seldom made use of?—I do not know. I do not think the inspector has any right to make any recommendation.

4486. Has he not this instruction in the case of non-observance of the rules?—"Give particulars of any violation of rules not already referred to or other matters requiring official notice. Note official action, if any, you consider necessary."—That has reference solely to those matters. I do not think the inspector would be justified in making any reference to promotion or anything of that sort.

4487. You consider that it should be open to an inspector, if he sees reason, where a case is on the border line, to make his recommendation for the consideration of the Board?—I do.

4488. Now, a suggestion was made that there is very little difference between the present practice with regard to reports that go in to the examiners, and the practice under the chief inspectors; but if I understand you right, the difference is this—that although under the old system your clerks noted what to them seemed matters of consequence in the report, you in every case read them over, and did not pass that without taking the facts into consideration?—That is so.

4489. And you, I understand, consider that the chief inspector, one who has risen to the post of chief inspector through the several grades of the service, was in a better position to determine those points than a man who had risen to the office of examiner through the grades of clerical work?—Yes.

4490. I think Mr. Dale was referred to possibly as recommending some local control. Now, I do not know that he recommended anything of the sort?—That was not in my mind at all. The only point I referred to was the fact that he knew that the result of the system of giving increment by mere inspection would lead to an increase in the number of appeals.

4491. Yes, and I understand that his reference here to the local authorities in England is merely an explanation that there are so many inspectors, that they know their schools and their teachers better than is possible under the present system, any way in Ireland?—I suppose so.

4492. And I suppose that you would not recommend the addition of such a number of inspectors as would put the two countries on an equality with regard to that point?—It would not be a very expensive thing, I think. I think these local inspectors in England are very few—only in a few places.

4493. Mr. HANCOCK.—To most of the large towns and in most of the counties; but they are local?—I would not have that at all.

Sir HIRSH WILKINSON.—I understand the lesson to be drawn from this is not that we should have local inspection; but I will read the passage:—"Partly for this reason the local authorities in England, when they have a large number of teachers in their employment, have, as a rule, local inspectors of their own, who, owing to the small size of their district, are able to keep in very much closer touch with each school than is possible to a Government inspector"; and that notwithstanding that it is not an easy task to determine what should be done.

4494. The CHAIRMAN.—Might I say about Mr. Dale that in one place he says that, for obvious reasons (that is, of course, the despatch of reasons), the case in Ireland is different, and he does not propose to deal with it?—I do not believe that under the old system we had in this country the inspectors were not very well acquainted with all their teachers.

4495. Sir HIRSH WILKINSON.—You think that there was a smaller number of schools and a larger number of inspectors?—No; but an inspector was put in charge of a certain smaller district, and he was left in the district for years and years, and he got to know his teachers thoroughly, and I venture to say that I know my teachers in the Glommal district quite as well as any inspector in England knows his teachers.

16th March, 1918.]

Mr. ALFRED PUGH, examined.

[Continued.]

4499. And it is not merely a question of the number of inspectors, but the time that an inspector is allowed to remain in the district?—Partly that, and partly that there are too many schools. At present, they have a great deal more schools.

4500. Then it comes to the relative number of the inspectors and the schools?—No, not exactly; but you put three men to look after 400 schools, whereas formerly you put three men to look after 180 schools each. There was a great deal less to be looked after. The work was split up better.

4501. It comes to this in the end that each inspector had a longer stay in his district, and a better opportunity of acquiring knowledge of the schools and teachers?—Yes; he had a very good opportunity.

Mr. HENRY.—The General district will illustrate the point you are asked about. There are 360 schools in the district. Now, of these 360, Mr. Yates has 108. Mr. MacEnery had the remainder, with the exception of 12, that is about 187. Then there were only 12 schools specially in charge of Mr. Brown, and Mr. Brown, while he had those 12 schools, was to do a fifth in each circuit, so that he would go round the fifth of Mr. MacEnery's schools in one year and a fifth of Mr. Yates's school the same year. The next year he would take another fifth in each circuit, and thus, in five years he would go round the whole of their schools; but he would not again visit the same school in each of these circuits for five years.

4502. Mr. KETTER.—You have been kind enough to hand us in those French forms, and you have referred to the reading books used in German schools?—Yes.

4503. I take it from that that you have all your life tried to keep yourself acquainted with the development of education on the Continent?—Well, within the last 20 years, at any rate.

4504. That gives additional weight to your opinion?—I visited schools outside Ireland in England, Scotland, Germany, Holland, France, Switzerland and Italy.

4505. There were really three changes in 1906, first the change from the results system, then a change in the programme, and there was also a change in Office organisation?—Yes, Office organisation, including the inspection organisation.

4506. Now, about the last of those three changes, I want to ask you something. Under the old system the reports were considered by a chief of inspection, who was a man who had had practical experience himself of inspecting schools?—Yes.

4507. And the real difference now is that the examiner is a man who, however able, has had only office experience?—That is all. At least that would be the rule.

4508. And that is the case at the moment?—It is. I suppose it is.

4509. We heard from the examiner himself that he had had no practical training or experience?—Yes.

4510. And that is the essential difference between the two arrangements?—Yes.

4511. You told me that the change in organisation was disliked by all the inspectors?—I don't say all the inspectors, but the head inspectors. We had a class of inspectors' assistant. They liked the change, because they no longer were inspectors' assistant, but they became junior inspectors with a larger salary.

4512. And the head inspectors, the men of longer experience, objected?—To-day they do not.

4513. They formally objected to it?—Yes, they sent a formal letter to the Office, to the Commissioners.

4514. You touch on that prophecy from Mr. Dale. He points out, you say, that the system suggested would lead to an increase in the number of appeals?—Yes.

4515. Of course, in every case in which there is a grievance there won't be an appeal?—Oh, no.

4516. Consequently, if it did not lead to an increase in the number of appeals, it would be calculated to produce discontent amongst the teachers?—I see your point. A man may be smothering this, instead of making his complaint out.

4517. We are already acquainted with the fact that there does exist serious discontent amongst the teachers?—Yes.

4518. And my point is, that you really weaken your case by going to the number of appeals. There may be a great increase in discontent without any increase of the number of appeals?—It is not any increase in the number of appeals that Mr. Dale necessarily means, but reasons for appeals. Though he uses the word appeals there, and presumes appeals will be made if they have a reason for it, it is really the case of discontent that he is inferring to.

4519. Now, we have to consider a system that would afford a good basis for two things that are not quite the same, for increment and promotion. I do not know exactly, but if I understood your plan of increment, it is this, that you propose to put the teacher on probation to begin with?—Yes.

4520. Then you suggested, I think, that there might be a probationary period during which he would get a succession of favourable reports in order to qualify for increment. You suggested that yourself?—I suppose there should be a series of favourable reports, the final report on his work, at any rate, at the end of his probationary period should be favourable.

4521. After the probationary period you would give him a preliminary period, in which he would work for a series of favourable reports?—Oh, yes, in order to get the increment.

4522. Exactly?—Yes. I would not like to give it to him on one report, but I would like to give him credit for that one report.

4523. You propose first a probation period?—Yes.

4524. Then a preliminary period (I will call it a preliminary period), in order to qualify for increment?—But then the next period would be a preliminary period again for the next increment.

4525. Is it not your idea that the increments should be practically automatic after the preliminary period?—After the probationary period.

4526. Then I misunderstood it. I thought your notion was first to put him on probation?—Yes.

4527. Till he has got through that he is not a teacher at all?—No, he is liable to be sent about his business.

4528. And I thought your proposal was, that once he has been ranked as a teacher, he has a certain preliminary period before qualifying for increment, and if he gets through that satisfactorily he would then be put on for increment, and his increment would become practically automatic?—I was considering, of course, the Bishop's proposal, of making annual increments, of course, and if you give him an annual increment, of course, the preliminary period amounts to just the first year, and at the end of that he gets his first increment, and if he does not get his increment for three years he has a preliminary period of three years before he gets his first increment; but it might be automatic all the same.

4529. The Bishop or Ross?—In that connection I may point out that there was a second proposal, to start with a salary of £70, and to give triennial increments, the first of £2, the second of £3, and the third of £2, and to end with £77.—The same as at present.

4530. Yes, so that you would have triennial increments the same as at present, but you would have a minimum salary of £70, and a maximum of £77, the increments being £2, £3, and £2?—I see no objection to that.

4531. Whether would the annual increment of £1 each, making eleven annual increments, or this suggestion of three triennial increments of £2, £3, and £2, recommend itself more to your mind?—The triennial increment recommends itself to my mind, provided he is not to suffer in the way he does at present. The point is, that they get two good reports, and then if they get an unfavourable report they lose all the benefit of those two years. I would like those two years still to count. I would not object to an annual increment, but I would prefer the triennial.

4532. On the whole, you would prefer the triennial?—Yes.

4533. Mr. KETTER.—Do you favour the new sort of triennial increment?—Oh, yes.

14th March, 1913.]

Mr. ALFRED PUNTER, examined.

[Continued.]

4381. You don't favour the present triennial increment?—I do not think it is quite fair to cut off that man who has given two years good service, and give him no credit for it.

4382. And then with regard to the classification of schools, you want to get rid of the excessive sub-division?—That is in the merit marks?

4383. Yes—I do.

4384. And you want to have simply two classes of reports—a favourable report and an unfavourable report?—Yes.

4385. And an inspector, of course, would not have any real difficulty in placing a school in one of those two large classes?—He would just have a difficulty with a few schools; and if there should be a case in which there was any doubt, a real doubt, in his mind, he ought to give the teacher the benefit of it; but, in any case, the senior officer could be called in to assist.

4386. Now, about promotion, promotion is by its nature controversial?—Yes.

4387. If you had simply those two modes of classification, how are you going to arrange your promotions; do you not reduce the best teacher to the level of the man who is just on the borderline?—I propose that part of the test for promotion should be the passing of a special examination.

4388. But you also propose that another test should be efficiency?—Yes.

4389. And I observe that you use the term "highly efficient"?—That was the term we used in 1898. That would rather come into the question of admitting him to the examination.

4390. Could you drop the merit mark for the school, or, at least, alter it in the way you suggest, and reserve the merit mark of the teacher not fixed on the basis of each minute sub-division—do you not think that the inspector, in the case of the teacher himself, could very well classify under four heads, say, "excellent," "good," "fair," and "incompetent"?—I never had any difficulty in deciding whether a teacher should be admitted to the July examination for promotion or not.

4391. You had no difficulty?—There is no difficulty. The head inspector came down and examined the school, and looked into the records, and everything like it, and if he was satisfied that the teacher had done good work, he said that he might be admitted to the examination.

4392. Are you satisfied that examination would give you the best men if you admit everybody who has had a favourable report without preferential treatment—are you satisfied that examination would give you the best men?—Well, examination won't, but it will keep out incompetent men.

4393. You don't want the results system back, do you?—Certainly not.

4394. And you are acquainted with the fact that this country was afflicted with what I may call an examination mania before this change?—I don't object to the examination mania, I was examined so often myself.

4395. With regard to that passage in your evidence, in which you state that the teacher ought not to be held responsible for the formation of character, do you not think that the home ought to collaborate with the school in the formation of character?—Yes, and the home ought to be held responsible more than the school in that. The school should enforce good discipline, good order, and good habits among the children, so far as any teacher can enforce them, and if these were unsatisfactory, owing to the social position of the child or its local surroundings, then I say the teacher should not be held responsible.

4396. Do you think that the National schools in Ireland ought to do more for fencing or for clerking?—I do not think the schools ought to consider either point.

4397. The Bunter or Ross.—You do not consider that the school ought to consider either point?—I do

not see any difficulty in combining the two. If you teach the school well, surely you will train up the pupils to be good clerks, and good farmers and good doctors.

4398. But that depends on your idea of education. According to that idea, you would give the very same education in an urban district as you would in a fishing district?—No, because it would not be suitable. There is one thing I wish to say. It might be thought, from what I said yesterday, that I considered that there was a considerable number of inspectors who had behaved improperly to the teachers. I do not think so. I think the number is very small, and I connected that yesterday with another expression, that they should be considered as fellow-workers, and that was what I was really thinking of.

4399. Mr. HENRY.—I suppose you could count them on the fingers of one hand?—I should think you could.

Mr. HARRISON.—It did appear to bulk rather largely on your price, and that is why I put the question.

Mr. KENTON.—In the working of the Intermediate system I think the inspectors have come to be regarded universally as fellow-workers.

4400. Mr. HENRY.—I have a few questions to put in reference to a matter mentioned yesterday. I understand, Mr. Punter, that in some cases the examiners were bound to refer certain matters to the chiefs of inspection for advice, where they found a difficulty in dealing with the reports. Can you tell us what exactly were the functions then of the chief inspector in dealing with these?—I don't think they were bound to refer anything to us. If they met a difficulty they might refer it to him. In that case we would give them the advice, but they need not necessarily follow that advice.

4401. Was there any official direction given in reference to that, that they were not bound to follow your advice?—That is in the paper, "Chief Inspectors" and Examiners." They were not bound to consult us at all.

4402. In other words, your advice was not binding upon them. To what extent, if any, are the teachers held responsible for the state of the buildings, for I see that in the definition that you gave us yesterday of an excellent school there were seven points, and one was that the educational equipment was to be ample, and another that the house and premises were to be of good class and in good order. Now, is it a fact that those items were taken into consideration in the classification of the schools?—Well, it was recommended at that conference of the senior inspectors that that should be done; but, as I said this morning, those were only recommendations, and I do not think they were ever sanctioned in their entirety. Some of the inspectors who were at that conference, however, did certainly expect that there should be good houses in order to give an excellent report. I remember that cropped up at the time when the Belfast deputation came up to the Office, and that very thing was mentioned, and Mr. Hyman and I talked about it, and the conclusion we came to was that certain of the senior inspectors still thought that it was binding. I cannot give you the instances now, but it was certainly mentioned that the Resident Commissioner in some case had said, "How could that school have got an 'excellent' or a 'good' report with such a house," but I cannot make out what school that refers to, and I do not know, and it may not have been the case at all.

4403. I think I know of that school, and we will probably come at it again?—We heard that that was the case.

4404. Now, in the circular issued in March, 1905, specifying the conditions which had to be fulfilled in regard to the merit mark, it is said, "Subject to the foregoing, you are at liberty to recommend deserving principal teachers in your district whose efficiency, as judged by the work done in their schools, by the general conditions of the schools and out-offices as regards sanitary accommodation, and sanitary hygienic arrangements, by the cleanliness and brightness of the school," and so on—how far would that make the



16th March, 1913.]

Mr. ALFRED PENNIE, examined.

[Continued.]

teacher responsible for the actual condition of the building?—That is only giving the inspector leave to recommend for promotion.

4515. But still the condition of the buildings is put in there as one of the conditions?—It is only that as these things are good they are to tell in his favour. It is not penalising him in any way. I don't know the circular.

4516. I want to know whether it penalises him or not. There is the circular. (Handed to witness.)

Mr. HARRISON.—Is that still in force?

Mr. PENNIE.—Oh, yes?—I do not know how far it could affect him at all.

4517. In the Commissioners' report for 1905-6 those words occur: "The inspectors have been strictly enjoined to pay more attention to the sanitary and hygienic condition of the school and out-offices, and they have been informed that punishment would not be recommended in the case of teachers whose schools were not above reproach in sanitation." Does that make the teacher responsible in any way for the building?—Only for the state of the out-offices.

4518. But the schoolhouse being above reproach in the matter of sanitation, would it not apply to more than the out-offices?—I do not think it was intended to apply to more than that; but I would not be certain. Of course, it would refer to the cleanliness of the school.

4519. Or bad ventilation and overcrowding—just look at it?—I could not say how far that would affect it. I daresay it would considerably.

4520. You see, they give particulars at p. 16 about schools being simply overcrowded?—Yes; I do not know how far it would affect them.

4521. But at least with these circulars, as they stand, an inspector working fairly and honestly might interpret them so as to penalise the teacher?—Oh, certainly he might, undoubtedly.

4522. Now, there is a very important question connected with appeals. I have here the Rules for the year 1907-08, part 2 and rule 96, and the words in this are: "Should a teacher have any well-grounded cause of complaint against his manager, he may submit a statement of the case to the inspector, who after due inquiry, if necessary, refers it to the Commissioners for consideration. Should any teacher feel himself aggrieved by the conduct of the inspector, he can make his appeal through the manager of the school, and it will receive attention from the Commissioners. If the matter of complaint affects both the manager and the inspector, the teacher may then submit his case in writing to the Commissioners, who, if necessary, will direct one of the chief inspectors to examine into it and report upon it for their information." Now, in the rules that we have here for 1913-14 the words are simply: "Should a teacher have any well-grounded cause of complaint against a manager or an inspector, he can submit the case in writing directly to the Commissioners for their consideration." In that rule they leave out the statement that it will receive consideration from the Commissioners, and also that they will send their chief inspector to examine and report. Does that limit the teacher's right to appeal, or at least to have his appeal considered?—I think it does. When was that introduced?

4523. I cannot tell you when it was introduced, but I have it here in the Rules for 1907-8, and here is the rule as it is at present?—Yes; I think it does limit the right. In the one case there is a distinct promise that it will be enquired into, and in the other there is no promise. It had not been in before, I would consider the last one naturally to include that; but since it has been deliberately left out, it seems to me that it was meant to take that right away.

4524. Do you think that that would be the natural reading of that change?—Yes.

4525. Now, in answer to a question on that subject which I put to Mr. Dillworth the answer he gave was: "It is not necessary to set out the words fully. I had a great deal to say, as a matter of fact, when the Board decided to bring these rules together. We wanted to get out rules into a compact form. Our rules in 1902

and 1903 were in a very scattered form, and we have got the rules together. There is no intention, I can assure the Commission, of altering the position of the teachers, or depriving them of any privilege they had." But, notwithstanding that answer, do you think it does deprive the teachers of any privilege that they have?—Oh, that would be my reading of it. That right was taken away from them as a right.

4526. And taking that away from them as a right we have also this peculiar thing, that the secretary speaks there as if he were the person to make these changes?—Well, that would only mean that he drew them up for the Commissioners to consider. What year was that introduced in?

4527. I cannot tell?—And did it reduce the scattered nature of the rules?

4528. It did not reduce the scattered nature of the rule, because all it did do as far as I can see was that it took away from the teacher certain rights of appeal which he had before. You think that the Commissioners should meet once a week, or twice a fortnight, and have a small permanent Committee. Do you agree to that?—I do not object to it. Of course, that suggestion about a permanent Committee is in the Report of the House Committee. The other proposal, that the Commissioners should meet twice a fortnight—on Tuesday and Wednesday—was made by me with a view to saving the trouble and expense of their coming up for one day—Tuesday—in each week. It would mean a great deal less trouble and expense for each individual Commissioner if they had to come up to Dublin only once a fortnight for Tuesday and Wednesday.

4529. Mr. CORRY.—During these years since you left the office of chief of inspection have you and your brother chief of inspection, Mr. Downing, ever been called into conference with the Resident Commissioner?—Since I ceased to be chief of inspection?

4530. Yes?—Oh, very frequently.

4531. Called into conference by the Resident Commissioner?—Yes.

4532. Were any suggestions from the Resident Commissioner at any time conveyed to you by Mr. WYSE?—I do not remember, but they were by other people.

4533. Who would be the other people?—Mr. LEMASS, for instance. Before he was secretary he was the Resident Commissioner's private secretary. He would convey things to us sometimes.

4534. Directions?—Directions, yes.

4535. Not in writing?—It was sometimes in writing, and it was sometimes oral too; but we objected to take it orally.

4536. Mr. HENRY.—Now, will you look at the bottom of that page, and tell us what the percentage of "excellent" and "very good" is for the whole of Ireland?—23.1.

4537. Now, will you look at the bottom of that page, and tell us how many "excellent" and "very good" are given there out of 346 schools?—43.

4538. Do you know what percentage that is?—About 12 per cent.

4539. Well, I make it out 10.8; the percentage of "excellent" and "very good" in Mr. CUSSEN's district is 10.8, while for the whole of Ireland it is 23.1?—Yes.

4540. And Glenduff school is in Mr. CUSSEN's district?—It is in his district.

4541. I understand that when that school was visited by Mr. CUSSEN the teacher was dissatisfied with the report?—He was.

4542. He wrote a letter to the Board on the subject, or to somebody in the office?—He got the inspector's minutes sent down to him, as well as I recollect (I have not the papers before me, of course), and so that, I think it was, he wrote a decidedly impertinent note, which he sent back to the office.

4543. That document was referred to you?—Yes.

4544. For what purpose?—It was referred to me simply for my observations.

4545. And you were chief inspector?—I was chief inspector.

4546. Tell us the substance of clause 5 of the document embodying your duties as chief inspector?—

14th March, 1913.]

Mr. ALFRED PUNSON, examined.

[Continued.]

The CHAIRMAN.—I have it here?—It is that the chief inspector is to be at liberty to examine any school at any time that he may deem necessary.

4587. Mr. HENLEY.—Then under that clause you were free to visit any school in your district at any time you deemed necessary?—So I believed.

4588. I asked you the same question that I asked Mr. McNeill, and he gave me the same answer, that he was perfectly free. And then, exercising the right of visiting, you visited the school at Cloonduff?—I did.

4589. What notion had you with regard to the teacher, judging from his letter, before you visited it?—I was rather unfavourably impressed by this document he sent up to the office. I thought it was only a question of going down and speaking to him very seriously, and telling him that his conduct was most certainly improper, and that if he did not make amends, he would be recommended for severe action.

4590. You visited the school?—I did.

4591. And after visiting the school and spending some time there, what decision did you arrive at as an inspector?—I thought the school was decidedly good. I had not any hesitation in giving a good report.

4592. What was the mark assigned to that school by Mr. Cusson?—He had reduced it from "fair" to "middling."

4593. And you, instead of its being "middling," thought it was "good"?—I thought it was "good."

4594. Did you take any steps to compare the state of that school with the state of any neighbouring school?—I did. I went on to the next school, as I had an hour to spare.

4595. And what was the result of your visit to that school?—I found that the inspector had given that school the merit mark of very good, and I am quite satisfied that that school was not as good as the other school.

4596. Which he marked "middling"?—Which he marked "middling."

4597. What were the facts that decided you in determining that the merit mark of Cloonduff school ought to be good?—Well, I spent nearly four hours in that school—three hours, forty minutes. I saw the teacher teaching the school. I sat there looking over the books while he was doing that, and then examined some of the children while he was teaching before the class changed to anything else, and asked them a few questions. I looked over all their writing work while I was in the school, and the whole thing seemed to me to be very well done so far as mere instruction was concerned. The children were quite attentive and quite orderly, and the state of the schoolhouse was nice and decent. There was one class I would have found fault with, that was the infant class.

4598. A class taught by an assistant?—Yes; otherwise I thought the school doing excellent work.

4599. What report did you make?—Well, the paper was sent to me not to make a report on the school, but for my observations with regard to the teacher's letter.

4600. The CHAIRMAN.—What did you take the word "observations" to mean?—That my reply was to be in the form of a letter or memo, not on one of the forms that you have there that show the form of report which is used in school inspection.

4601. Mr. COFFEY.—You got a file?—I got a file with this thing written on one of the documents, "To chief inspector for his observations."

4602. The CHAIRMAN.—Did you think that those observations ought to be derived from a personal inspection of the school?—I did not see how I could make any observations that could be of any use unless I had visited the school.

4603. Mr. HENLEY.—What was the nature of the communication you sent to the office?—I sent up a memorandum of it. I have it here.

4604. Read it for us if it is not too long?—It is long:

"The letter written to the secretaries by Mr. P. J. Kelly, teacher of Cloonduff National School on 22nd December, 1910, was a most improper one. The teacher did not, I believe, realise the importance of his remarks or intend to defy the Board." (I may mention that the substance of his remarks on the document that he sent up here referred to the statement that the manager was about to reprimand him, and he said, "I am perfectly satisfied that the manager will do nothing of the sort, for he knows that I am discharging my duty satisfactorily, and to the best of my ability.") "His view of his case is—that the inspectors' judgment on the school is not correct; that he has worked faithfully and honestly in the discharge of his duties; that his pupils are well taught; that his manager knows this to be the case, and that therefore he would not be likely to reprimand him. The teacher has some difficulty in communicating with the office in the regular manner, as his manager lives eleven miles from the school, and appears to be rather forgetful as to official correspondence. Making all allowances for the above the action of the teacher remains very reprehensible, and I would recommend very severe action only for two circumstances:—(1) As soon as I brought the matter under his notice he stated that he was not aware it was irregular to reply to an official letter sent to him; that he had no intention of defying the Commissioners, and he apologised for the impropriety of his conduct. I directed him to put his apology in writing, which he has done. It is attached. (2) I consider his school has been greatly undermarked by the inspectors—Mr. Penson and Mr. Cusson. The letter's "middling" seems to me entirely undeserved, and I would have no hesitation in assigning Mr. Kelly's own work—which, in spite of the inspector's report to the contrary, I am certain is better than that of his wife—at least 'good.' The written work of the senior classes is very good, most of it much above the average. It throughout affords evidence of careful teaching and revision on the teacher's part, and of correction by the pupils. The oral work is not without merit. Mr. Kelly is a Northern. He speaks, no doubt, a little fast, and his voice is rather loud and harsh; but during no part of my visit did his speaking interfere with the work of the rest of the school. I find it impossible to understand the mark given to Mr. Kelly and his school, when I compare it with the "very good" awarded to the neighbouring school of Bellew, which I visited the same day. Had the awards been reversed I could have understood them, though they would not have been correct. I should classify Bellew's 'fair' or 'very fair,' and Cloonduff as 'good' at least. The pupils were orderly during my visit, but many were unpunctual, and some even late for roll-call. Considering their poverty they were clean and tidy. The houses and premises were quite satisfactory. The nuisance found by Mr. Cusson at the back of the schoolhouse was said by the teacher to be due to strangers attending the neighbouring chapel. A former inspector made a noting to this effect some years ago, and the teacher has an extract from a visitor's remark to the same effect. Mr. Kelly was at one time when in Tyrone dismissed from the Board's service on account of charges which he brought against his manager. Serious charges were brought against him within the last two years, but after a full investigation extending over nearly a week these charges were not substantiated. He is the father of ten children, whom he appears to be bringing up well. One son is in Mayo; one is apprenticed to a solicitor, and a daughter is a student in Mount Pleasant College, Liverpool. That a man with so small a salary as Mr. Kelly and his wife receive has done so well by his children is strong presumptive evidence of character and meritorious service. Taking all the circumstances into account, I recommend that Mr. Kelly be let off with an affirmation, and that the just award on his school be cancelled, and 'good' substituted for 'middling.'"

4605. Now, Mr. Ward, one of the Commissioners, wrote a letter to the Independent in reference to your visit to the school. Will you give us the substance of

14th March, 1913.]

Mr. ALFRED PERKINS, examined.

[Continued.]

that letter. I have it here in your pocket?—Oh, yes, this is Mr. Ward's letter. It gives Mr. Ward's version of the whole case from beginning to end.—

# "INSPECTORS AND TEACHERS."

## "LETTER FROM MR. PHILIP WARD."

### "To the Editor, 'Irish Independent.'"

"SIR,—It is not my intention or desire at present to express publicly any opinion on the dismissal of Mr. Mansfield or on the merits of the controversy to which it has given rise.

"Without touching on this very delicate and painful subject, however, I should like to make some reference to the letter of Mr. Purser, late chief inspector, which was read at the public meeting in the Mansion House on Friday evening. My reason for doing so is that I believe he is alluding in that letter to a case in which I have been very much interested almost from the first day I became a member of the Board, and it is, I consider, only fair to all concerned that I should give my version of what took place during the negotiations.

### "WITHOUT INSTRUCTIONS."

"On the first occasion on which I mentioned the case to Mr. Purser he told me that he had already visited the school in question, and had formed a more favourable opinion of the teacher and his work than the senior inspector had done. Immediately afterwards I brought the case under the notice of Dr. Starke, telling him that I believed justice had not been done to the teacher, and earnestly appealing for a review of his case.

"He informed me that Mr. Purser had interfered in the case without instructions to review the report of the senior inspector, and contrary to the practice followed in the office, as set forth in the orders of the Resident Commissioner, and which are of many years' standing. He also told me that he had himself visited the school in the month of March, 1911, and satisfied himself that the circuit inspector's report ought not to be interfered with. I will urge strongly that as the chief inspector had been favourably impressed with the school he might, apart from the question of the irregularity of the inspection, justly award the increment of good service salary from the 1st of April, 1910.

### "A QUESTION AS TO DATE."

"Notwithstanding his expression of opinion as to the efficiency of the school and the unauthorised and irregular report of Mr. Purser, the Resident Commissioner stated to me that he would take the chief inspector's views into consideration, so far as to order that the school should be inspected by the chief inspector in the course of the following year, and that if the report then furnished were favourable the question of awarding an increment to the teacher from the date mentioned would be specially considered.

"A difference of opinion as to the accuracy of this date arose afterwards between Dr. Starke and myself. He maintained that he said 1st April, 1911, and could not possibly mean 1910, while I was equally convinced the latter was the date from which the increment was to be paid.

"Some time towards the end of June or the beginning of July, 1911, Dr. Starke informed me that Mr. Purser had written a letter requesting that his views in the case should be brought before the Board, and that to this he had replied that if Mr. Purser wished he would bring the case specially before the Board, but thought it might not be prudent in Mr. Purser's own interests, and that Mr. Purser did not press the matter further. I cannot myself recall any instance, during the past two years, in

which an appeal against the report of an inspector on the work and character of a school, or the result of such an appeal, ever came formally before the Board.

### "IN CONFLICT WITH DR. STARKE."

"Mr. Purser again visited the school on the 5th September, 1911, although the Resident Commissioner maintained he should not, according to directions, have done so until 1912, and, consequently, the report which the chief inspector sent in on this occasion was not acted on, and no increment as a result of the report was awarded to the teacher.

"After this inspection Mr. Purser submitted to me samples of written work and drawing which had been executed in this and a neighbouring school, taken, he said, as standards from similar standards in both schools. This neighbouring school had got higher report than the school under consideration, while undoubtedly the specimens of work from the lower-marked school were, in my judgment, by far the better.

"On the 21st March, 1912, Dr. Starke, carrying out his promise to me, and in accordance with his intentions and the direction already given, sent the chief inspector at present in charge of the school, and as the report showed an improvement in the school work since the preceding year, an increment of good service salary was granted to the teacher.

### "TEACHERS AND INSPECTORS."

"I have here tried to give a brief and impartial history of this case, upon which so much importance has been laid. I was very grateful to Mr. Purser for his sympathy with the teacher, and I must state here that I should like to see a similar state of feeling subsisting between all our teachers and our inspectors. Inspectors, while doing their duty fearlessly, need never forget that the teachers, too, have rights as well as duties, and that they have sometimes great difficulties to contend with. They should remember how very easy it is for an official to make a teacher's life a burden to him, and perhaps even render his teaching ineffective.

"I am bound to state in justice to Dr. Starke that he acted throughout this case in a most sympathetic manner towards the teacher, and, notwithstanding the difference of opinion already referred to, he kept faith with me in all he had promised.

### "PHILIP WARD,"

"Commissioner of National Education."

"Ballinac, 26th October, 1912."

4606. I will read a clause in Mr. Ward's letter\* of 2nd November to the Independent. "Dr. Starke states that the only communication sent to Mr. Purser was one asking him to express an opinion on the tone of a letter received from the teacher, and to say what action should be taken." Do you agree with that statement?—That is in Mr. Ward's letter of 2nd November.

4607. Was that statement accurate, was that what you were asked to do, to express an opinion on the tone of the letter?—No, I was not asked anything about the tone of the letter so far as I can recollect.

4608. Have you here, or can you give us the noting or request that was sent to you as to what you were to do, that is, have you the letter calling for your observations?—There was no letter. It was a note across the top of the document, and as far as I can recollect it was simply "For your observations." It would seem absurd that the Commissioners should want my opinion on the tone of a letter.

4609. Dr. Starke wrote a letter† to you on the 30th of June, 1911. Have you that letter?—Yes.

4610. Am I correct in stating that this is the correct reading of it:—"The teacher's appeal was formally referred to you for your observations, but you were

\* Vide Appendix XVI. (2).

† Vide Appendix XIV. (2).

14th March, 1913.]

Mr. ALFRED PENNIE, examined.

[Continued.]

neither asked nor expected to visit the school?—It was referred to me for my observations. I was not asked to visit the school, but I was in the neighbourhood, and visited the school, and I did it in the exercise of my right and discretion.

4611. And that fell within your right according to Clause 5, of course, that you were free to visit any school any time you thought necessary?—Certainly, and any similar case submitted to me from that date to the end of June, I would have treated in exactly the same manner. I thought I was doing what was right and proper.

4612. Now, Dr. Starke wrote a letter\* of the 13th of July, 1911. What is the particular objection he has taken to your action there?—He says "You held a check inspection."

4613. Did you hold a check inspection?—I hardly know what a check inspection is. I understand what a check examination is, but a check inspection I do not know exactly. But, at all events, I did not hold a check inspection, for it would certainly imply reporting on an ordinary report form.

4614. Am I right in this, that he complained that by holding it you took the decision out of his hands—was that the effect of your action?—It is the decision on the teacher's appeal that he says I took out of his hands. I do not think I did. Of course, if that paper of mine was sent before the Board it was the Board who would have the decision on the appeal in that case, and Dr. Starke could not have decided on it.

4615. Now what was the excuse that was given, or what was the reason assigned by Mr. Wyse in his letter for not bringing it before the Board?—That my report was unauthorised and irregular.

4616. In what way?—I don't know.

4617. And what was the right that he stated that you had then?—He said I had a right to appeal to the Board from the secretary's.

4618. The CHAIRMAN.—What would that appeal be about?—I did not exactly appeal. I wrote to Dr. Starke a letter stating that I was dissatisfied with the way that this matter had been treated, and that I desired to appeal to the Board—or perhaps I should say, rather, that I intended to appeal to the Board.

4619. Mr. HENLY.—Now after some time Dr. Starke visited the school?—That was long before these letters were written.

4620. Mr. CORRY.—Was it before your visit?—No; I visited it on the 27th of January, and Dr. Starke visited it about the end of March.

4621. Mr. HENLY.—Can you tell us as far as you know, or that you have heard officially, anything with regard to that visit? The teacher a few days afterwards wrote to me to say that Dr. Starke and Mr. Dilworth and Mr. Cussen had been at the school, and that he hoped they would not think that I had been too lenient in dealing with him. He then mentioned some things that took place in the school, Mr. Cussen pointing out defects to the secretary; and he said that the Resident Commissioner seemed quite satisfied with the condition of the school. That was the first I heard of Dr. Starke's visit. Then I spoke to the secretary about it a few days afterwards as he happened to come into our room, and he acknowledged that they had been there.

4622. Did you gather from him any information as to the state of the school?—He said that he thought that the school was undermarked, and told Mr. Cussen so after he came out, and he told me particularly that the boys' written work was very neatly done, and not only that, but that he questioned the boys, and found they understood it very well.

4623. Mr. HARRISON.—Who was that?—Mr. Dilworth.

4624. Mr. HENLY.—I questioned Mr. Dilworth with regard to his visit to the school, and as far as my memory goes, he said that his opinion of the school was good?—Mr. Dilworth never denied that the school was good in talking with me.

4625. I asked this question of Mr. Dilworth (reads evidence of Mr. Dilworth, pp. 1182-4). Now, after that visit,

and the opinion of Dr. Starke and Mr. Dilworth that the school was undermarked, what steps were taken, or were there any steps taken to give redress to the teacher by having the mark raised?—Oh, no steps taken by the office, certainly.

4626. And did the mark continue notwithstanding the independent view you had expressed? Well, when I saw the paper early in June it was still left. Not only was the mark left on the school, but the report remained.

4627. And was there any promise given to you that the teacher would obtain redress?—No promise at all. On the contrary, across the document was written, or at least across some document on the file, that the Resident Commissioner saw no reason for changing the mark that had been assigned to the school.

4628. Nor any promise that the teacher would get the increment that would be coming to him?—No.

4629. Can you tell us who was the next inspector that visited the school?—Did not Mr. McNeill visit it?—I visited it before that. I visited that school again in September before I retired, and approved of it.

4630. And what was the mark that you recommended then?—I recommended "good."

4631. Did the teacher gain?—No, I don't think that report was ever allowed to go in. I say that report was quashed.

4632. The CHAIRMAN.—By whom would it be quashed?—It could only be done by the Resident Commissioner. I only know that it was not dealt with. I presume that it was quashed.

4633. Mr. HENLY.—Was that subsequent visit a visit by Mr. McNeill?—Yes. Mr. McNeill was sent in the next March to visit it.

4634. Have you knowledge of what his mark of the school was?—Yes. I was speaking to Mr. McNeill about it, because I was interested in the case, and he told me that he had given it "good." He had given "very fair" first, and the report was sent back to him to say "very fair" was not a recognised term, and then he changed it to "good."

4635. It comes to this, that you were of opinion that the school was good, and Mr. McNeill was of opinion that it was good when he subsequently visited it, and Dr. Starke said it was good?—He thought it undermarked.

4636. And Mr. Dilworth thought it undermarked, and yet the mark "mildling" remained?—Yes, the mark "mildling" for that report November, 1910, remained, but that report, so far as it affected the increment to date from the following April, was cancelled by Mr. McNeill's report, so that he got his increment from the 1st of April, 1911. I understood that the promise was what he was to get it from the 1st April, 1910.

4637. The CHAIRMAN.—He lost a year?—Lost a year.

4638. Mr. HARRISON.—By whom was that promise made?—The promise was made by the Resident Commissioner to Mr. Ward. Mr. Ward has repeated that several times. He not only wrote it to me, but he wrote it to the teacher at the time, so that there can be no mistake about what he understood to have been said to him.

4639. Mr. KERRA.—Had you communicated with Mr. Ward with regard to the school?—I visited the school first on the 27th of January. On the 4th of February that despatch from Belfast was received in the office, and Mr. Ward was present. When the meeting that evening was over about six o'clock, Mr. Ward said to me when we were going out, "I want to speak to you to-morrow about Glencoliff." That was the first communication I had with Mr. Ward about Glencoliff. Next day when he came into the meeting he asked me my opinion about it, and I showed him some of the papers.

4640. Mr. HENLY.—What was the final step you took to have the matter decided by the Board?—The step I took was to write at the end of June to the Resident Commissioner stating that I desired or intended to appeal to the Board on this matter.

4641. And then why was that appeal not brought before the Board?—The Resident Commissioner wrote a letter saying that he would bring the appeal before the Board, and next day he changed his mind, and wrote

\* Vide Appendix XIV. (4).

† Vide Appendix XIV. (1).

‡ Vide Appendix XIV. (2).

14th March, 1912.]

Mr. ALFRED PURSER, examined.

[Continued.]

saying\* that he would not do so, and that it was no personal affair of mine, and that I had no right to interfere in it.

4642. And what did he say he was going to bring the matter before the Board for?—I think the letter, if you read it, says that I was to be censured.

4643. He says, "I had intended to ask the Board to censure you for your insubordination." Where did the insubordination come in?—I don't know.

4644. Mr. KERR.—Is it regarded as insubordination to communicate directly with one of the Commissioners?—No. Of course, if I wrote to one of the Commissioners against Dr. Stankie, that would be insubordination; but if a Commissioner comes and asks me "How did such and such a school do when you were in it?" I certainly think it is my duty to tell him, and I would speak to any manager about one of his own schools in the same way.

4645. Mr. HENLY.—So that notwithstanding all your efforts, Mr. Purser, to get this teacher's appeal brought before the Board or the favourable report made on the school considered by the Board, you did not succeed?—No, I did not succeed.

4646. What was the great difficulty in having this appeal to reach the Board?—I am afraid I could not tell you. The Resident Commissioner did not choose to do it.

4647. And then you think the Resident Commissioner is the only block?—Oh, yes; the only block. Under the regulations that the Board made in 1902, he has the sole right of deciding what is to go before the Board.

4648. And then failing to get redress in that case you retired?—Oh, it was only a matter of a few months. May I make a remark about this case before we go any further?

4649. The CHAIRMAN.—What have you to say?—I want to make an observation before we go any further. I had no desire that this case should come before an outside Committee like this. I did not know even that this Committee was going to be appointed at the end of October when this letter of mine was written, extracts from which were read at the Mansion House meeting in favour of Mr. Mansfield. The Board had a meeting on the next Tuesday, and at that Board meeting an order was made, and the following letter was sent to me:—

"2nd November, 1912.

"SIR,—I am directed by the Commissioners of National Education to inform you that their attention has been called to extracts from certain letters purporting to have been written by you, published in the Irish Independent newspaper of the 26th October, 1912, containing allegations against the Resident Commissioner and the administration of the Board. The Commissioners propose to investigate the matter, and desire to be informed whether you are prepared to substantiate those allegations, and if so I am directed to request you to be good enough to give particulars of the case or cases to which you refer.—I am, sir, your obedient servant,

"P. E. LEMASS."

That was passed at a meeting on Tuesday, the 30th October. Next morning appeared the letter from Mr. Ward, which has been quoted here, and which Mr. Henly has asked me about, setting forth his version of the case, which will certainly not agree with mine. In spite of that order of the Board that they intended to investigate it themselves (that was Wednesday morning), on Thursday morning appeared a letter from Dr. Stankie, that is to say from Mr. Wyse by his orders, saying various unpleasant things about me. That was in spite of this notice from the Board that they intended to investigate the matter. The letter from the Board to me did not reach me till Saturday night at half-past nine. In the meantime I had written to Mr. Ward

a private ordinary letter, and I said in that letter that he was quite at liberty to see these two letters of Dr. Stankie's to which I have referred if he liked to call at my house, and that I was quite willing to have the case investigated by a Committee of the Board—that is the Cloodagh case. Of course, I don't know that I would have done that if I had known that they had passed that resolution; but, however, I made that offer, and that offer was not accepted. In reply to the Board's letter that I got late on Saturday night, I wrote:—

"12 PALMERSTON ROAD, DUBLIN,

"4th November, 1912.

"GENTLEMEN,—In reply to the official letter of 2nd November, 1912, referring to extracts from certain letters purporting to have been written by me and published in the Irish Independent of the 26th October, 1912, may I request you to quote verbatim the allegations which the Commissioners desire to know if I am prepared to substantiate.—I am, etc.,

"A PURSER.

"The Secretaries."

In reply to that they wrote as follows:—

"15th November, 1912.

"SIR,—Referring to your letter of the 4th instant in which you say, 'I request you to quote verbatim the allegations which the Commissioners desire to know if I am prepared to substantiate,' I am directed by the Commissioners of National Education to inform you that they desired that you should furnish them with instances of cases of appeal which should, according to their regulations, have been submitted to them, but which were withheld by the Resident Commissioner. In view, however, of the inquiry which has been promised by the Chief Secretary, the Commissioners do not propose to proceed further at present with their investigation of the allegations made against the Resident Commissioner in the extracts from letters purporting to be from you, published in the Irish Independent newspaper of the 26th October last.—I am, sir, your obedient servant,

"P. E. LEMASS,

"Secretary."

However, I made the offer, and I have never withdrawn it, and I do not at all desire to have my case investigated before a Committee like this; I think that sort of thing should be investigated by the Commissioners themselves.

4650. And they withdrew their offer to investigate it in view of the inquiry promised by Mr. Birrell?—Yes, and they did not tell me distinctly what they wanted me to substantiate.

4651. The CHAIRMAN.—These letters to which you refer should be put in.

4652. Mr. HANCOCK.—There is a statement that Mr. Purser sent in his resignation on the 6th of November. Does that mean that that is the actual date when you did resign?—Yes, I did resign then.

4653. But you sent in your resignation before?—I sent in my resignation on the second of July.

4654. Now tell me the difference between re-inspection and check inspection—I imagine for a check inspection you would have to give notice?—Yes.

4655. And you would report on a certain sum?—Yes.

4656. And would there be any material difference in the method employed and in the tests applied in the two cases?—Very probably not.

4657. Then I suppose we may assume that the visit of inspection that you paid to Cloodagh school in the end of January, 1911, was a full inspection?—Well it was not called a full inspection. You see I didn't report on various things at all.

\* Vide Appendix XIV. (3).

† Vide Appendix XVI. (2).

4638. Did you spend as much time as you would at a full inspection?—Quite as much. I spent within twenty minutes of as much time as Mr. Cussen. For instance, I did not report on the accounts.

4639. But with regard to investigating the very important points of discipline and the tidiness of the children and their classification, you went into those matters as fully as you would have done at another time?—Quite as thoroughly.

4640. I think you visited the school under that paragraph 3<sup>rd</sup> of those regulations with regard to the duties of inspectors?—I advanced that as a reason why I had a right to go.

4641. I was looking at that, and I see there is another paragraph there, No. 10, that the chief inspector is to hold inquiries and special investigations when so directed by the Commissioners, and it occurs to me, would not that Regulation 10 apply to a case of that sort?—I do not think so. That regulation, at any rate, would not prevent a person visiting a school in the way I did without having got such specific directions.

4642. It only occurred to me that it was a special investigation, and therefore it seemed to me to require notification to the authorities?—No.

4643. That was the way I read it?—I was not ordered to go there at all. It was simply because I considered that I could not give any opinion about this case that would be satisfactory without making myself acquainted with the school and the teacher.

4644. I see. You did not think that it was done in accordance with the usual practice in a case of that sort, for in the case of what would be really a re-inspection you first of all send notice of your intention to do so?—No.

4645. Mr. KERRIE.—“The chief inspector is to hold special inquiries and investigations.”—That is a different thing.

4646. Mr. HARRISON.—I hold that this would be an investigation?—That is not the sense in which we use the term.

Mr. HENLY.—“Investigation” is used differently. It would refer to charges of misconduct and other things.

4647. Mr. HARRISON.—I am quite aware of that. That is the way it seemed to me that it occurred to Dr. Starke?—It is quite a common thing to send us out papers to deal with, and it leaves it entirely open to us to visit the school or not, and that was one of these cases.

4648. I am inclined to think that it would have been the practice in our official life, and I should certainly, in a case of that sort if I intended to visit, have written back to say, “I think I must visit the school in order to reply to this.”—Yes, I know, but you must remember, Mr. Harrison, that I had no intention, when going to that school, of staying there beyond half an hour or an hour at most. I really went down to make the teacher’s acquaintance, and try to induce him to withdraw his very improper letter. I went on a merciful errand.

4649. You went down to reason with him, and you then did, as a matter of fact, inspect the school?—It struck me that the report was so unusual that I ought to look into the thing, and see was there any justification for the teacher’s violent letter.

4650. Inspecting the school was an afterthought?—Quite so.

4651. In your statement you lay great stress on your thorough inspection of the premises of the school. Had the state of the premises any bearing upon the adverse report that had been previously given?—Yes, that was one of the things put forward by Mr. Cussen against the teacher, that the yard was in a very dirty condition.

4652. And that, no doubt, affected the final judgment of the school?—Oh, it certainly did.

4653. So that you and Mr. Cussen might have agreed with regard to the progress, but he found the officers in a bad state, and allowed this to influence his final judgment upon the school considerably?—No.

4654. That might have been the case?—No, I do not think so, because his report being more under the head of propriety would show that that was not what influenced his judgment.

4655. Was it probably had some effect?—It probably had some effect.

4656. Now on leaving the school, did you tell the head master, Mr. Kelly, of the judgment you at least had formed?—I spoke to him, and told him I thought his school was doing very fairly.

4657. That would be the usual practice?—I always think it my duty to tell the teacher.

4658. Now you visited a neighbouring school for the purpose of comparison, and I think you spent about an hour there late in the day?—Yes.

4659. Now would that time be sufficient to enable you to give a definite ranking?—No; I would not dream of setting up my opinion of the school against Mr. Cussen’s if it was a formal report. I merely say that after this hour I could not help thinking that Mr. Cussen had overestimated that school, and on that ground I mention that I brought away a few papers.

4660. Your impression as an experienced officer was that in five cases out of six the opinion would be correct, but might be incorrect, formed on so short a visit?—Yes, of course.

4661. Now the teacher wrote you a letter, I think, after Dr. Starke’s visit?—Yes.

4662. Did you reply to that letter, and would it be possible to put in his letter and the reply if there was one?—I was looking for that letter within the last few days, and I am afraid I have mislaid it. I think I replied to that letter, and I think what I told him was that I could not interfere any further, and that he had better apply to the teachers’ representatives on the Board, Mr. West.

4663. It struck me from your quotation of the letter that it distinctly impugned the conduct of your colleagues, Mr. Cussen—that letter of the teacher to you after Dr. Starke’s visit?—I do not think he meant that as impugning Mr. Cussen’s conduct, but I considered it a very serious fault.

4664. That Mr. Cussen was going about the school pointing out defects to Mr. Dilworth?—Yes.

4665. Was that communicated to Mr. Cussen?—Oh, I don’t know.

4666. Not by you?—No.

4667. So he knew nothing about what had been said of him?—No, but you will see that I mentioned it to Mr. Dilworth.

4668. You mentioned it to Mr. Dilworth?—Yes.

4669. Well, on this question with regard to what Mr. Dilworth said, he can examine himself and give his version if he likes, and I need not ask you anything about that. But one curious thing struck me on page 4 that Dr. Starke says that he only knew of your visit to the school in April, though he made his own visit in March. Surely when he made his visit he must have known of yours, must he not?—Oh, of course he knew at the end of March that I had been there, certainly. When he said April I presume that he merely used it in that way.

4670. That it was only just before his visit that he knew?—That was what I understood him to mean by his letter, that he only knew when he visited it; that it was at his visit that he found out that I had been there. That was the way I read his letter.

4671. Mr. KERRIE.—You had reported on the 8th of February?—Yes.

4672. Mr. HARRISON.—Dr. Starke went there, and meanwhile apparently Mr. Pinner’s report had been sent down to Mr. Cussen for his remarks which have been given, and it seems rather an extraordinary thing that Dr. Starke should not have known of this before his visit?—I think it is very extraordinary, too, especially as my report could not possibly have been sent to Mr. Cussen without the Resident Commissioner’s permission.

4673. Did you take the point yourself, and endeavour to clear it up, about the difference of dates?—Oh, no.

14th March, 1913.]

Mr. ALFRED PENDER, examined.

[Continued.]

I considered that it was quite cleared up as it was.

4694. It struck me as curious?—I thought it was quite clear.

4695. It is not to my mind. Now, on page 9 there is this remark: "As Mr. Ward failed to get any satisfaction at his interview." I suppose that is the interview with Dr. Starke?—Yes.

4696. To what does that refer?—Mr. Ward after he saw me in February took an interest in this case, and he was trying to get from Dr. Starke some action favourable to the teacher, and at this interview, whatever day it was—

Was that the first interview he had with you?—I mean the interview with Dr. Starke. Dr. Starke gave him no more satisfaction than he had done any other time, and it was evident to my mind that he was putting off.

4697. Did this occur on the occasion of your first meeting with Mr. Ward and talking of this case?—Oh no, it occurred late in June.

4698. You had seen Mr. Ward on several occasions?—Oh, yes, he used to come and talk to me about it.

4699. And these are practically Mr. Ward's own words, I suppose: "I failed to get any satisfaction"?—Oh, I do not think he used that expression. I would not like to say so. He told me that he had not been successful in getting the teacher's reprimand withdrawn.

4700. Now you visited the Cloonaduff school on the 27th of September?—Yes.

4701. For what purpose?—To hold the annual inspection.

4702. Was it due then?—Any time after the 1st of July. The school year begins on the 1st of July.

4703. In the ordinary routine of your duties?—Well, of course, it is not my duty, as a rule, to hold the annual inspection at all, but this was a case with regard to which the Resident Commissioner in his letter said that he had given orders weeks ago (that is in his letter) that this school was to be examined by a chief inspector. I was the chief inspector of that part of the country, and I thought September a suitable time to hold the inspection.

4704. But in such a case as that would it not be necessary to get instructions as to date, and that sort of thing?—I sent the manager word.

4705. But to get instructions from the Board for a very special visit of that sort?—I did not think so when I had his letter saying that he had ordered it to be done.

4706. It did not occur to your mind, as it rather seems to me to be the case that what had happened was that the decision had been taken out of your hands?—That did not occur to me at all.

4707. Sir HYAM WILKINSON.—You say in your précis that a file had been marked "confidential," and locked up in the safe. Is that usual?—No, very unusual.

4708. Are there many other cases of it in your experience?—I never heard of it before, but I know, of course, that there are confidential files carefully put away. These might refer to some officers pretty high up in the service, and they might not like to have any signs on him passing about among the clerks.

4709. But it struck me as unusual that you saw that done?—I did not know where that file had gone to, because I was asking for it week after week.

4710. And it was sent to you?—On the 10th of June, I think.

4711. It was left with you only a few days, till the 10th of June?—Yes.

4712. And you say "On 11th June I drafted a letter to Dr. Starke"?—Yes.

4713. Mr. KERRIX.—The Resident Commissioner, as I gather, visited the school in company with Mr. Cusson?—Yes.

4714. And Mr. Cusson was the inspector whose marking of the school was in question?—Yes.

4715. This is the only other point. I observe in your report that you note that this Mr. Kelly spoke with a North of Ireland accent?—Yes.

4716. And that that might be supposed to be regarded as a harsh, unpleasant voice?—I think it is, compared with the Mayo voice.

4717. I want to put to you a question that I asked a previous witness before I had any knowledge of this case, and that is, that if a North of Ireland man were inspecting schools in the South, might he, as a mere effect of difference of temperament, arrive at a conclusion totally different from another as to a school?—It is a fact we know very well; and in this case I think a certain section of the people there are disposed to look unkindly on this teacher on account of his northern habit of speaking outright.

4718. Mr. CORRY.—You say "I wrote to him on the 29th of June. That is to Dr. Starke?—Dr. Starke.

4719. Would you be able to put in that letter?—Well, the difficulty about that, and the reason I did not give you a copy was this, that I kept no copy of that letter, and if I sent you in my rough draft it might differ slightly from the letter itself if Dr. Starke still has it, and I thought it better not to put in my rough draft. If Dr. Starke cannot produce the letter, I will give you the rough draft on the understanding that it does not profess to be a verbatim copy.

4720. Mr. HARRISON.—I suggest that you should say, "I wrote to Dr. Starke to the following effect"?—I have no objection.

4721. Mr. CORRY.—And that is to be followed by Dr. Starke's letter of the 30th of June. Did you ever see that file afterwards?—Not after the 10th of June.

4722. And you looked for that file afterwards?—No, not after the 10th. I have Mr. Cusson's letter here stating that he had received no directions from Dr. Starke, that the school was to be examined by a chief inspector.

\* Vide Appendix XIV. (1).

+ Vide Appendix XIV. (2).

## TENTH DAY.—TUESDAY, APRIL 1st, 1913.

At 23, Kildare-street, Dublin.

Present:—Sir SAMUEL DILL, M.A., LL.D., LL.D. (Chairman); The Most Rev. DENNIS KEELY, D.D., Bishop of Ross; Sir HIRSH SHAW WILKINSON, LL.D.; Mr. JOHN CONVEY; Mr. JEREMIAN HENLY; Mr. WALTER MCMURROUGH KAVANAGH, B.A.; and Mr. THOMAS MICHAEL KITTLE; and

Mr. ARTHUR J. DONNELLY, M.A., B.Sc., Secretary.

Mr. EDMOND DOWLING examined.

4726. The CHAIRMAN.—You have sent us an exceedingly full statement,\* and I would only ask you some questions to elucidate points in that statement. Now as to your experience, you have been a long time connected with the National Education system, and you are now retired?—Yes; I retired in 1904.

4727. And you had been Head Master of Limerick Model School in 1893?—Yes.

4728. And you then became district inspector in 1874, head inspector in 1892, and chief of inspection in 1895?—Yes.

4729. Now it follows from that long experience that you have known of three stages of the National Board?—I have seen at least three stages of development.

4730. Your experience extended over the whole period covered by what is called the results system?—Yes.

4731. And you have had four years' experience of the new system?—Yes.

4732. The system created in 1900?—That is right.

4733. You were district inspector under the results system, and you were a chief of inspection under the new system?—Yes.

4734. As a result of that experience, I gather that your deliberate opinion is this, that first in the organisation of the office here in Dublin; secondly, in the mode and spirit of inspection, and thirdly, as to the character of the education under the new system, there has been in all these three matters a great decline?—Yes.

4735. Does that statement represent your opinion?—Yes.

4736. You confirm that?—Yes.

4737. As compared with the new system, do I understand you to think that the results system was superior?—I think it was better than the present.

4738. If you had to choose between the two, would you choose the results system?—Yes, but I was never an admirer of the results system.

4739. Not an on-stand-out admirer?—No, in fact I fought strongly against it at the commencement in a kind of indirect way.

4740. You saw its defects?—I was head master at the time the system was introduced, at the time of the Potts Royal Commission, and there was one of the Assistant Commissioners, a Mr. Stewart Laurie, a Scotsman, previously one of Her Majesty's inspectors of schools in England. He was in Limerick for four or five months, and he came frequently to me, two or three times a week, while he was in Limerick. We talked in private about the whole matter, and he was an advocate for it, whilst I did not think that it would suit Ireland; and on the last evening we had as an ungroomed Doctor Dehennas, a medical gentleman, and a very clever literary man, who used to take a great deal of interest in the school work, and he pronounced his verdict that I had made out my case, that the results scheme was not as good as it was supposed at the time.

4741. What were the great defects of the results system?—The first thing was that there was too large a proportion of the income of the teacher depending upon the mere chance of getting results. My idea would be to have the teacher to get from the Govern-

ment something to encourage him in order to do extra work, and to insist upon his doing the work well, and if he did any extra work then, to pay him for it.

4742. Then, as to the character of the education under the results system?—The regular examinations were of great advantage and benefit.

4743. They were?—Yes; that is the actual examinations, and they were very popular.

4744. And would you say that without any qualification?—Without any qualification.

4745. Had it not a tendency (because we have had it in evidence) to render the teaching mechanical?—That was because the programme was over-weighted with mechanical work. It was the programme that was to blame for that.

4746. And then you say that the results system could be worked without that defect?—Certainly; but I was not advocating a return to it.

4747. Now I proceed to the changes that you recommend in the system of inspection. You recommend first that the office of chief of inspection should be restored?—I think that the restoration of the office is the only way to rectify the present evil.

4748. Your suggestions are that the office of chief of inspection should be restored with the former duties, and that the old title of "Chief of the Inspection and Statistical Departments" should be restored. Now, will you tell us what the chiefs of inspection did in your time?—The full title was "Chief of the Inspection and Statistical Departments." To begin with, our salaries were included in the estimates for the office, not with the out-door inspectorial staff.

4749. One of your most important duties was the noting of the reports?—Yes.

4750. And that has been transferred to officers called examiners?—Yes.

4751. That is what you mean by saying that the work should be done by educational experts instead of clerks. By clerks you mean the examiners evidently?—Yes.

4752. We have had it, I think, from Mr. Purser that the noting of the report in the time of the old chiefs of inspection was not done actually by the chiefs themselves to a large extent at all, but that they entrusted to their clerks a great deal of formal noting in ordinary routine cases. Was that not so?—I know I read all reports. They were noted by a clerk, but I have had frequently to change the noting. A clerk would draw my attention to things by noting on the margin, but I invariably read the report.

4753. What I understand you to propose there is that the work at present done by such as Mr. Purser (whom we had here) should be restored to the restored chiefs of inspection, is not that so?—Yes.

4754. The noting of the reports?—Yes.

4755. Now, you were chief inspector under the new regime, were you not?—Yes, for four years.

4756. And what did your duties chiefly consist of?—I think I had very little to do of useful work at all. I had very little useful work during those four years.

4757. Mr. CONVEY.—You had very little useful work during four years?—Yes, very little.

4758. The CHAIRMAN.—Did you attempt to control the inspectors in their reports?—I had no opportunity of knowing their reports.

\* Vide Appendix XIX.



1st April, 1933.]

Mr. EDMOND DOWLING examined.

[Continued.]

4756. They never were brought before you?—No, except on a very occasional time, when there was some dispute.

4757. Were you sent down to take charge of a case of re-inspection?—I do not think so.

4758. Did you hold conferences?—I did.

4759. With a view to uniformity of reports?—I did. I have held conferences.

4760. Of whom did the conferences consist?—Of all the inspectors in my hall, that is in the southern hall of Ireland.

4761. All the inspectors?—Seniors and juniors.

4762. The juniors too?—Yes.

4763. How often did you hold these conferences, and were they held regularly?—They were held regularly; but that is now a long time ago.

4764. We want to know to some extent what passed at those conferences—were they held to a great extent with the object of securing a uniform standard of reports?—That was the object.

4765. One great object at any rate?—Yes.

4766. And it was part of your duty to go and visit any school that you chose?—Yes, that was in our directions.

4767. That was amongst your instructions?—That was one of the instructions.

4768. Now I go to your suggestion about the Office Committee. You say it should be revived?—Yes.

4769. Does that mean that no Office Committee has existed since the new system was established in 1900, and what are we to understand by Office Committee?—There was a Financial Committee that I do not know anything about; but the Office Committee consisted of the Resident Commissioner, three secretaries—that is the two secretaries and the financial secretary—and the two chiefs of inspection.

4770. Did that Office Committee meet regularly?—No.

4771. It was occasional?—It was occasional, on any emergency.

4772. What cases would it be called on chiefly to consider?—Well, it was always called on to go through the estimates—a very important matter.

4773. Then when you were chief of inspection you were consulted about the estimates?—Yes, always, up to 1900.

4774. Were cases of severe reports brought before you, reports involving reprimand or fine, or possibly dismissal?—No, not at that Office Committee.

4775. Did that not come before the Office Committee?—I do not think so.

4776. To go back to the notings of reports by the chiefs of inspection, a great many of those reports would not need any special noting or special action we know, but there were certain exceptions where the report was severe. Now where the report was severe or might seem to involve severe charges against the teacher, would that report go beyond you as chief of inspection?—Oh, certainly.

4777. To whom did it go?—To the Resident Commissioner in the first instance, and then to the Board.

4778. And by him it was brought before the Board?—Yes.

4779. What particular kinds of cases of that class were referred by the Resident Commissioner to the Board in those days before 1900?—Every case where there was a penalty inflicted.

4780. Would every case where a reprimand was considered to be deserved go before the Board?—Not at the early stage, but during the time of Dr. Walsh, Archbishop of Dublin, he found fault on those occasions with certain cases not being submitted clearly before the Board.

4781. He raised that question?—Yes, and measures were taken to have all such cases brought under the notice of the Board. The mode of procedure was this—

4781A. You are speaking now of the noting of reports?—Yes, I noted that such a man should be reprimanded. I brought that into the Resident Commissioner himself; he read it over if satisfied, and he intimated it, and it was passed on then to the secretaries to be submitted to the Board.

4782. And a case of reprimand of any sort would go before the Board?—Yes. When I was a chief of inspection I brought in a report of that kind to the Resident Commissioner.

4783. As regards the Office Committee, you have told us that one of the functions of that Committee was to consider the estimates of the year?—Yes.

4784. You have not mentioned that in your statement, but you say that important matters bearing on the efficiency of the education in the National Schools would be considered?—All important matters, anything that the Resident Commissioner wanted advice about.

4785. Any point about the new rules and regulations and programmes?—Well, with regard to the programmes, I do not think those were ever talked over with the Office Committee. They were dealt with by the chiefs. The secretaries at that time were not ex-inspectors, as they used to be in former times. Formerly the secretaries were always appointed from the inspectorial staff.

4786. You say that all important matters bearing on the suitability and efficiency of the education given in the National Schools should be considered by the Office Committee—that is preparatory to the thing being proposed to the Board, is not that so?—Yes, it should be drawn up, and what was submitted to the Board would be the combined judgment of the Office Committee.

4787. Now were you, as chief inspector, consulted on the new scheme and programme in 1900?—No.

4788. You knew of no consultation?—No, that was done with the most extraordinary secrecy.

4789. You make another very important suggestion, that the office of the two secretaries who attend on the Board should be filled in future, as formerly, from the inspectorial staff. Educational experience, apart from inspection, would not be sufficient in your mind for the office. I refer to the case of Mr. Dilworth, who was, I presume, a trained teacher. He held a professorship at any rate, and was believed to be competent to hold a professorship, but you would insist on every secretary having been an inspector?—Oh, yes, I think so.

4790. I want to be sure about this. It would not have been enough that he should have held the office of teacher. You would confine it to inspectors?—To the ones that ought to be promoted, to those that have experience.

4791. You would confine it to inspectors of experience?—Yes.

4792. Mr. CONWAY.—Don't you think that there would be a large amount of risk in bringing an out-door officer to do secretarial work in the office?—I do not think so.

4793. Do you not think that a certain amount of difficulty would arise if you asked him to take charge of the office of secretary of a large department?—There is something in that that the secretary does require the two qualities. At a meeting of the Board once an important thing occurred. Archbishop Walsh at one time said that there was no one present capable of giving him the information he wanted with regard to the school work.

4794. Mr. HENRY.—And must not the head inspector get a considerable amount of office training too?—Of course.

4795. The CHAIRMAN.—In the case that you mentioned you say that an order was given that one of the chiefs of inspection should attend. That was evidently before 1900?—Yes.

4796. The order was that one of the chiefs of inspection should themselves be present at each meeting of the Board?—Yes.

4797. That was evidently before 1900?—Yes.

4798. Now your next suggestion is that the inspection staff should consist of about four head inspectors and about sixty district inspectors. That is a restoration of the old system?—Yes, the old system of inspection was certainly better.

4799. Can you explain what means the head inspector took to secure uniformity of marking under the

old system?—Well, he went around. He was free to go around and examine any schools immediately after any district inspection.

4800. How many schools had he under him—he would have about 2,500 I estimate?—About 2,000, but he would not necessarily check all those. He would only take some. If he found a certain district inspector marking very differently from the average of his chiefs, he would keep an eye on him, and examine several of his schools. That was what we used to call a check examination.

4801. Would any startling variation of report coming up to the office in those days be sent to the head inspector for investigation?—Yes it would.

4802. It would not be only of his own motion?—He would be directed to go, but he himself would know the man that wanted watching, and he would examine a good many of the schools.

4803. And did he hold conferences?—He held conferences.

4804. And how many of these inspectors would he have at them?—Fifteen.

4805. Fifteen district inspectors at a Conference?—Yes.

4806. You have held conferences of that kind as head inspector?—Oh, yes, frequently.

4807. Were you much troubled by what might seem reckless reports? Not very much, but there were some you know. The reports of some men had to be watched continually.

4808. Had you in those days to investigate cases that were brought up by appeals?—Oh, yes.

4809. What happened under the old system in the case of a teacher's appeal against a district inspector's report if he thought it unfair or too severe?—The head inspector then was sent to report upon that or examine the school, and send up a full report.

4810. So he made a report of his own upon it?—Yes, a complete report.

4811. What happened then?—The two reports were then compared in the Education Office.

4812. Who compared them?—The chief, in the first instance, and then he submitted them to the Resident Commissioner, and then they were submitted to the Board.

4813. It went from the chief to the Resident Commissioner?—Yes. The chief would make a memorandum or statement on it, and he would submit that to the Resident Commissioner, and then if he initialled it, it was passed on to the Board for consideration.

4814. Now I have to ask you another thing that, you do not mention in your statement. How were promotions of teachers made in those days before 1907?—By examinations.

4815. Did the promotion depend entirely on examination?—It did—well that is not absolutely correct, because a man would not be admitted to the examination if there were any black marks against him.

4816. He must have had a record of good service?—Yes.

4817. And then he was admitted to the examination, and had to pass that examination for a higher grade?—Yes.

4818. And would you feel inclined to return to that method of promoting teachers?—Oh, no.

4819. What is the objection to it?—Well, it was an excellent scheme at the time.

4820. Excellent for the time?—Yes.

4821. And what causes it to be out of date now?—The teachers are better educated and trained now when they begin than they were then.

4822. You think that?—Oh, they are.

4823. Mr. CONYER.—Do you think they are better educated at the end?—No.

4824. The CHAIRMAN.—You do not think that there was some advantage (and something has been said on this point) in giving a stimulus to the teacher to continue his studies and make advances in studies that he lacks at present?—There is a great deal to be said in favour of that, but still I would not recommend a restoration of it. Some other means might be found besides that. That process of examination was very

severe for the teacher, and though it made the teacher a better scholar, it drew off a great deal of his attention from his school work while he engaged reading.

4825. And you also maintain that the teachers start on their career now better equipped for it than they did in those days?—Oh, certainly, there is no doubt about that.

4826. Was there any attempt to secure uniformity all over the country—we have seen that the head inspector tried to secure uniformity in his own province, that is in fifteen districts, but did the head inspectors confer with one another?—They were brought up to the office, and the chiefs held conferences with them. They conferred with them on certain points submitted to them, and had conferences with them, and some one of the head inspectors examined a school here in Dublin, one of the Model Schools, and it was usually the central Model Schools that were selected. One was then held off to conduct a month's examination, all the others looking on and taking notes, and then there was a criticism of that, and that was very useful.

4827. Was that with the object of securing uniformity?—Yes, and the chiefs were present also.

4828. And made criticisms?—Yes.

4829. I see you express the opinion that an inspector must be in sole charge of a district for at least two years before he has anything like a reliable knowledge of the character of the several schools, but that after those years he should have a very complete knowledge. Do I understand you to suggest there that they are changed too frequently now, and not allowed to remain long enough in a district?—I think they are. There have been a great many changes since, a total change of districts.

4830. Is it a characteristic of the system established in 1900 that the inspectors remain a very short time in charge of one district?—Yes, and for a time, of course, the inspectors had no definite district at all. There were three districts radiating from one centre, and the junior inspectors were not looked upon as district inspectors in the old sense. It was a complete change. The senior man was there, and he looked upon the whole thing as his district, and he was responsible for it. A man does not now settle down to work in that way to make himself up in his district as we used to do. In the Tralee or the Galway district, for instance, I, while in charge, could tell you everything about the district.

4831. And you think that is wanting under the present system?—Yes.

4832. You say a minute acquaintance with the teacher is not so common?—No.

4833. You say in your prints that promotions should be made on just lines—"Juniors not to be placed over their seniors who had given faithful and efficient service." Under what methods were they promoted in the old system?—In the old system it was all a matter of seniority provided there were no black marks against a man.

4834. Provided there were no black marks against him he got his promotion?—He got his promotion according to seniority.

4835. And it was never known that a junior was placed over the head of a senior?—Not except for good cause.

4836. Do you imply that that has been altered since?—Oh, yes, and there have been very glaring cases, very bad cases.

4837. Now you say in your statement that the district inspector should not be required to examine every class in every subject?—Yes.

4838. That is to a certain extent you approve of what is the present system, because the present system is one that does not require the inspector to examine the whole school. You would not require the district inspector to examine every class, but you go on to say that he should examine the pupils of the highest grade very carefully?—Yes.

4839. That is what has been objected to here as examination by sample, is it not?—Oh, no; that is a very different thing from examination by sample.

4840. But you take the highest grade as a sample of the whole school?—I think the examination by

1st April, 1915.]

Mr. EDWARD DOWNS examined.

[Continued.]

sample would be a pernicious thing, that the inspector should select at random a few boys who might happen to be all the dunces of the school.

4841. But if the inspector simply takes the highest grade of a school, is it not possible that the teacher will concentrate upon that grade, and that the others will be neglected?—He won't succeed if he does.

4842. That is because the highest grade will depend on the lower ones?—He won't succeed. Unless he is a fool he must see very well that he must give the best work to the junior classes if he wants to succeed with the senior ones.

4843. That is certainly true of classical training?—It is of every school. His success in the Senior Grade will depend on the character that he has impressed upon the children.

4844. Those boys in the higher grade have gone through all the lower grades?—Yes.

4845. Now you object very much to the present system of laying stress on the mere impression of an inspector?—Oh, yes, and that is the idea of the tone circulate—the impression gained by looking at the school, and so on, and seeing that it is very orderly, and that the children are bright, and so forth.

4846. We have had it in evidence here, I believe, that a man could go into a school, and in ten minutes form a very sound idea of the general tone and work of that school?—Whoever says that knows nothing about what he is talking of. I had as much experience in that as any man. I was reared up in a National School. I got all my education in a National School, and I was assistant teacher, and master and head inspector, and through all the different grades, and I took as much trouble in fitting myself for doing the work of inspection as any other man, and I think I can prove that, and I found, with all my teaching (I was eighteen years teaching) that I had to go through a tremendous lot of discipline to fit myself for examining schools.

4847. And was there no training of young inspectors in those days?—There was a nominal training.

4848. But you had no systematic training?—We had no systematic training at all. I went about with a district inspector, a very good man.

4849. For how long?—A couple of weeks.

4850. Now they give them six months. We have had that in evidence. Do you mean that in other cases besides yours the training would be longer?—I think in the case of some of them it would be longer, but I was only a few weeks.

Mr. CORRY.—But you have been master of a Model school.

4851. The CHAIRMAN.—And you got your inspectorship by examination?—Yes, I got it as a National teacher.

4852. But they were all appointed by examination?—I was nominated. I had to claim the nomination.

4853. Was there a certain number of positions then reserved for National teachers?—No, but I got the nomination on merit, according to rule.

4854. Mr. HENNE.—A National teacher got a certain extension of age?—I did not require that.

4855. The CHAIRMAN.—Now I go on to a subject that has occupied us very much here, and that is the six distinct merit marks. You have a great objection to them?—Yes.

4856. Tell us what your objection to them is in themselves, not merely for the purpose of promotion or increment, but in themselves?—It would be impossible to assign them accurately. No man should undertake, or could reasonably undertake, to distinguish the schools so finely so that. It is hair-splitting.

4857. You say no man, however experienced, could define these marks with an intelligent sense of what they mean. Do you think it is possible that that could be done with any decent uniformity by sixty men?—No.

4858. "Excellent" might mean a different thing to one man from what it would mean to another?—Yes.

4859. Did you ever meet with any attempt to define these things?—Never.

4860. Or analyse them?—Never. My idea is that the "excellent" schools should be very few, and I

examined in my time, I suppose, some thousands of schools in every part of Ireland, and the schools that I would distinguish as "excellent" are, I think, about a dozen out of the whole lot, that is, what I really would call excellent.

4861. Mr. CORRY.—That is excellent according to your standard?—That is what I mean, a school that stood out pre-eminently. That is what I would call excellent.

4862. The CHAIRMAN.—You say in your paper, "as for the assumption that the inspectors can with justice make this hair-splitting classification of the schools under the headings of 'excellent,' 'very good,' 'good,' 'fair,' 'middling,' and 'bad,' I must characterize it as a vain and mischievous one?"—I think so.

4863. And you deliberately say no uniformity is possible over the whole country in giving these marks?—No, not such fine drawing of lines.

4864. What would you substitute for that?—I think they might be distinguished into three classes.

4865. You would still have merit marks?—Oh, yes.

4866. As distinct from the report, stating the particular value of the work done in the school?—I would have no objection to distinguishing three classes.

4867. You would keep the merit marks?—I do not see an objection to it, but I do not see any great need of it. I think a better way would be to report generally on the school.

4868. The present system you see requires a certain combination of these marks for increments and promotion?—I know that.

4869. And failure in one of three will forfeit the increment in the third year, for instance. Would you get rid of that system?—Oh, certainly.

4870. Now, what system would you recommend, or have you any to propose, for you do not say anything about the triennial increment, which depends on this system of six merit marks? We have been told even by some of the officials of the Board that the triennial system may be very unjust to teachers, and that many of the inspectors find it difficult to work, and object to it. We have had that here, and I daresay, of course, you agree with that?—What is this triennial system?

4871. I thought you worked it yourself?—I do not think so.

4872. Mr. CORRY.—Where the teacher has to get three consecutive good marks in order to get an increase of salary?—Oh, yes.

4873. The CHAIRMAN.—He must have three "goods" in order to get the increment in certain cases?—Yes.

4874. And then failure in the third year would forfeit the increment. Would you get rid of that?—I think so. I would say if a man got "good" or "very good" one year, and then that he dropped down to "middling" the next year, and the next year got up to "very good" again, that it must be either that the inspector misjudged the school in that intermediate year, or else that it was by some accident or other, beyond the master's control, that the school dropped. I could give you some curious examples of a school dropping.

4875. You recall the system under which a man's promotion is limited by the numbers in his school?—Yes. A teacher of a school of under thirty cannot get above the third or lowest grade.

4876. The teacher of a school of under fifty cannot get beyond the second grade. Is not that so?—That is so, according to the rules.

4877. And you object to that. Now, what change would you propose in that system?—There are more than half of the schools in the country under fifty, considerably more than half.

4878. And, therefore, half the teachers would be in third grade?—Yes, or could not get beyond the second grade, and I maintain (as I know from old experience) that these are the very schools which it is hardest to teach.

4879. Single-handed?—Yes, and they are schools in remote districts, and they are in places where you would always want the most trustworthy men and women. A man would not be under supervision, as he would be in a town, and we have found them

1st April, 1913.]

Mr. RICHARD DOWSON examined.

[Continued.]

taking to drink from that circumstance. They are away from his manager, and the manager can only visit them very seldom, and the Inspector also, and in such places very trustworthy men and women are required. I would, therefore, allow this man, if he is a good man, and is doing good work there, to get promotion.

4879. You object to the present system?—Yes.

4880. And now a good teacher, who is well reported on in a school of thirty, is debarr'd from advancing according to his merit to another grade; that is your deliberate opinion?—Yes. There is no check except as to the numbers of the school.

4881. I suppose you would regard it as a great blot on the present system, as we have had it is evidence here that a man may take 36 years, or does generally take 30 years to reach the first division of first grade?

Mr. HENRY.—He must take 36 years to reach the first of first, unless in some very exceptional case, where they give him special promotion.

The CHAIRMAN.—And would you regard that as a very serious blot?—Oh, very serious.

4882. That man would be easily 50 or 60, and his last years would be over?—Yes.

4883. But we have your deliberate opinion that a man with a small school ought to be able by merit to rise to the highest grade?—Yes.

4884. And to the highest salary?—Yes.

4885. The CHAIRMAN.—You object very much to the junior assistant mistress?—Yes.

4886. Have you considered it in this way. You know these schools very well. Now, if there were 45 children under one man, is it not better to have an assistant mistress, who may be able to do something with the infants?—Yes.

4887. You admit that the junior assistant mistress is better than no assistant at all?—Yes; in a school like that it is better to have an assistant mistress than none, that is if the school is between 35 and 50.

4888. The appointment of the assistant mistresses, when they got the Treasury to provide the money, was an improvement, I dare say, was it not, in the keeping of order and discipline among the infants?—Some improvement, but very little. I know I had not very many cases of that. The master always complained that they were of no use.

4889. I could imagine that they might sometimes not be of much use in actual teaching?—I remember very well one man said, "I would be really better without them. It takes me more time to show her what to do."

4890. That may have been a very unfavourable specimen?—It might be, certainly. The woman, certainly, was a very poor specimen.

4891. Now, I want to ask you a question about grouping. You have a great objection to the grouping of the lower standards and the higher together. You say that one and the other of the group must suffer while the teaching is going on?—That is quite obvious to anyone.

4892. Now, have you considered the alternative in a one-teacher school of, say, 45 pupils—have you considered the alternative that a great number of the children would be left without any watching at all. Is not that the alternative?—No.

4893. Will you explain what will happen in a school, say, of 40, if that teacher is not allowed to group?—I would like to tell you my experience, if I did not delay you too long. The first district I got charge of was Trillick district, and there was a school there at the foot of Mount Brandon, called St. Brendan's School. The master was holding the annual examination of the school, and I was impressed very favourably with the teacher, he seemed to be a very intelligent and good fellow. On looking through the previous reports, I found that he had been reprimanded and fined year after year, and then I spoke to him and said, "Why don't you try to work up your school," and he said, "I do my best, sir, but I really do not know how to manage a school like this."

4894. What was the size of it?—It was a school with an attendance of about 35; but he had no help, and he said, "If you could tell me what to do I will do exactly what you tell me." I said, "I don't know how

to manage a school like this" (I was only beginning inspection at that time), but I wrote an official letter to the Office and a private letter to Dr. Newell, who was Secretary at the time, and an old friend, and an opponent was sent to the school. He remained there for a fortnight, and then the Parish Priest, who was the manager of the school, wrote to me, saying, "Bad as the teacher was, your opponent is ten times worse than either, and for goodness sake take him away." And so I did. I sent him back to Dublin, and I set to work to draft a scheme how to carry on a school like that, and I consider that that was the most difficult problem I ever worked out in my life. I drew up a time-table on a system that seems to be considered old-fashioned now, and selected the classes that should be in the desks and on the floor going through the instruction. Some in the desks and some on the floor, and then I laid down in which class the master ought to be at each moment of the day, and that was marked down on the time-table, and how he was to keep the others occupied; and it was in that way that it was done.

4895. That is what I want to hear. That is the alternative?—There is no other way of doing it.

4896. And you have actually seen a school of 35 kept well at work under the old system of non-grouping?—Yes. I got all my education in a National school of one master and 38 pupils. However, I left it at 14, and I never got any home study. It was in a wild mountain, Irish-speaking place, and I knew English as well as I do now when I left it, and I was as good an arithmetician as I am now, and was at any time of my life. I had read a good deal of Algebra and Euclid—six books of Euclid, and had learned as much Latin and Greek and French as enabled me to follow up study without further aid.

4897. Now I proceed to another matter. You find fault with the Board for asking you to make a report about certain neglect of duty by the managers. Is not that so?—That does not exactly convey my idea. They were not duties. They were things that we were recommending, but they were not duties of theirs. It was never any duty of the manager in those days. When the rules were drawn up, and when the manager took office, there was no such duty undertaken by him as that they must examine the schools from time to time, or that they must give annual prizes. Some of the managers are very poor.

4898. I think you observe in Rule 66 that it is not the manager who is to give the prizes, but that he is to use his influence to get prizes provided by the locality?—Oh, that is out of the question. Of course, there are some places where that could be done, but in the greater part of the country there is no chance of that; there are no people who would subscribe to the National schools either for manager or anybody else, and if the prizes were to be provided they must be provided by the manager himself.

4899. I go on to an expression of yours about dictating to the Inspector. You object to the form of dictation adopted towards the inspectors. Now, under that head you put the topics that are laid down in the form of report which he is to fill up, and you give a quotation from an official letter addressed to you when chief inspector, directing you to write a general report—"You should avoid expressing any opinions adverse to the education policy of the Board." Now, if these reports are to be given to the public, do you think that the Board could safely allow a subordinate officer to criticise their general policy in a report?—I think he should give a fair statement as to the result and not criticism.

4900. If you were yourself a superior officer, would you not find it rather difficult to allow 60 men to criticise freely the policy of the Board?—I do not call it criticising the policy. An inspector will not criticise the policy, but he will state results.

4901. He is directed not to express "any opinion adverse to the education policy of the Board"?—Oh, we understand the meaning of that, that we dare not tell the result of this policy.

4902. Would you allow a district inspector to make sweeping criticism of the policy of the National Board?—He should state the facts with regard to the schools.

1st April, 1915.]

Mr. EDMOND DOWNING examined.

[Continued.]

Unless he is a fool, he will not criticise the policy, but he will state the facts.

4003. He would not criticise the policy?—No.

4004. Mr. HENRY.—I think what is intended is that the inspector should be at liberty to state whether the source of instruction given in the schools is or is not sound?—That is exactly what I am saying.

4005. Without expressing an opinion, good, bad, or indifferent, with regard to the policy?—Yes.

4006. The CHAIRMAN.—Now, would you take this point in Mr. Henry's words, because your précis did not give me that impression?—But I may judge for myself. The topics of my report were dictated to me as chief of inspection, and I was told that I must now refer to this question regarding the managers.

4007. I thought you referred to the heads of the general report that each inspector makes of a school when he has to report on the equipment, the buildings, the cleanliness, and so on, under certain heads.

Mr. HENRY.—He is referring to the report to be printed in the Blue Book?—The topics of their report are dictated to them, and I give you a proof. I was ordered to report upon these managers, whether they were taking much interest in the school or not, and the Resident Commissioner had collected from the district inspectors a large number of statements, concerning them to some extent, and I was expected to put these in, and I think it was expected that I would not give the names of the inspectors. At all events, in one case I remember Dr. Starke asking me would I agree to strike out one paragraph that I put in, to strike out altogether both the district inspector's report, or the senior inspector's report, and my own, and I said, "Certainly, I will strike it out with pleasure. All I object to is to make myself responsible for statements that I know to be not correct." That was a school that I had visited myself, and I saw that the statement was quite unfounded.

4008. This was in the report for Parliament?—But then should give the truth.

4009. Mr. HENRY.—What Mr. Downing wants to state is this: first, that the inspectors should not be confined to certain topics, and secondly, that they should not be prohibited from expressing an opinion as to whether the system of instruction was doing really good work in this country or not.

The CHAIRMAN.—Do you agree with that statement? Yes. It would not be necessary for an inspector to criticise the policy; he should only state the facts.

4010. That is to state the results?—Yes, he should only state what subjects are proving themselves inefficiently taught. There would be no reference to the policy of the Board in it, and before the present Commissioners' time we were never told what we were to write upon.

4011. And your reports were published as they are now?—Oh, yes; but we were told to write a general report.

4012. And there was no interference with the substance of that report before 1900?—No, never a word.

4013. You never knew of any interference by Mr. Redington or Sir Patrick Keenan?—Well, I heard of one or two cases in which there was some friction, but I have no personal knowledge of my own with regard to it. I was never interfered with.

4014. And you were in a position to know?—Yes, my reports were always published, just as I sent them.

4015. Both under Sir Patrick Keenan and Mr. Redington?—Yes, just published as I sent them, and some of them hit pretty hard, and I drew attention at all times to any defects that I noticed.

4016. You say in your précis that it would be an unwise impertinence for any inspector to suggest to the manager that they should give money for prizes, but that is not what the letter to you stated—or that they should hold examinations of their school. Now, according to Rule 54, they are recommended to hold such examinations, or to have them held by competent persons. I do not quite see that you should call it an impertinence on the part of the inspector to remind a manager that a certain rule existed, but the rule did not exist in your time.

Mr. HENRY.—The rule did not exist till 1900?—No, it is a new rule, and it was first put in as a recommendation, and then it was changed subsequently to an order; but I say that the manager should have no new obligation placed upon him.

4017. The CHAIRMAN.—Is that a new obligation?—It is.

4018. Mr. HENRY.—Imposed on the managers without consulting them, and then they are blamed for not carrying it out?—The managers get a copy of the rules, and they sign their agreement, and agree to the terms laid down in it, and these ought not to be changed afterwards without their consent.

4019. The CHAIRMAN.—You also say in your statement that Dr. Starke claims that the National Board service is a Department of the Civil Service, and that he is the Chief of that Department. Can you tell us where he does that, for it is so important that I think we ought to know the document?—I think I can give that information. He suspended me as chief; he claimed that authority by suspending me from duty.

4020. Was it in a formal document?—Here is a document I hand in.

4021-3. This is addressed to "Edmond Downing, Esquire," and it is—

"EDUCATION OFFICE,

"20th March, 1900,

"Sir,—I am directed by the Resident Commissioner to inform you, that in consequence of your letter to the Secretaries of the 24th inst., on the subject of the new scheme of administration of this Department, the terms of which he considers to be insubordinate and subversive of office discipline, you are suspended from your functions as chief of inspection from this date, pending further consideration of your case.—I am, Sir, your obedient servant,  
M. S. SERRAVALLO, Secretary."

I thought you had a document which contained these very words, but you are merely interpreting his ideas?—He suspended me, and that is the act.

4023. But you have not a document where he uses these words, that the National Board Service is a department of the Civil Service?—No. I was told that by some of the Commissioners that he claimed at that time, that he had special authority from the Treasury, and that he was the chief of the department.

4024. At the time you received this letter, suspending you from your office, you heard that Dr. Starke claimed to be the Chief of a Department of the Civil Service, and to have these powers?—Yes, and that he had it from the Treasury.

4025. You wish that to go on the notes?—Yes.

4026. Mr. COOPER.—But you have no documentary evidence?—That document which I produce shows that. There was no meeting of the Board, and he suspended me, and cannot do that at all unless he was Chief.

4027. Mr. HENRY.—What was your exact offence, or your assumed offence?—Dr. Starke sent me a copy of the document. It was perfectly anonymous; no one was responsible for it, only there were the initials printed on it, "A. T. & Co."

4028. That is Alexander Thom & Co.?—Yes, and the figures 11/90. He sent me a copy in fact of that very document. He sent me that, and he asked me to criticise it and to give my opinion on it, and I gave him my opinion on the document. That was an anonymous document.

4029. And you were suspended simply for criticising that document?—Yes.

4030. The CHAIRMAN.—That was only a proposal for a change?—Only a sketch. I will quote the passage.

4031. The change in the system had not taken place?—No; but you should know the story about that, because that is at the bottom of the whole thing.

4032. Mr. HENRY.—Now, as you referred to this document, are you familiar with its terms?—Yes.

1st April, 1913.]

Mr. EDWARD DOWLING examined.

[Continued.]

4933. In this document we find the statement that £225,000 was paid to the schools as result fees, and then comes this strange assertion, "that represented payment for actual work done in the schools." How do you understand that?—That is pure ignorance of the whole facts.

4934. That is, the actual payment to the teachers at the time amounted to £250,000 and it is stated here that the sum paid in results represented the payment for actual work done in the schools. Is not that so?—It was proposed that all should be given for hand-and-eye training.

4935. It was recommended then that the whole of the results system, and the whole of the payment by chosen salaries, should be abolished?—Yes.

4936. And then the writer suggested to the Treasury certain standard numbers as the numbers for each grade, and that they should be fixed?—Yes.

4937. He suggested for the first division of first grade that there should be 300 men?—Yes.

4938. And the Treasury granted 340?—Yes.

4939. He suggested for the second section 1,050 men and 750 women, and he suggested for the second grade 2,450 men and 1,800 women?—Yes.

4940. So that the actual suggestions with regard to these standard numbers all come from the writer of this document?—Certainly, he is responsible.

4941. Is the writer of this document Dr. Starke himself?—I don't know that he is the writer of it, but he is responsible for it. In fact, I know he did not write it.

4942. But he endorsed it?—He accepted responsibility for it.

4943. And the writer suggested that all future teachers, no matter what their attainments were, should enter in the third grade?—Yes, they should all begin at the lowest.

4944. And they should go through the regular course, which he estimates would be 36 years?—Yes.

4945. Then he holds out a hope that some of them would become junior inspectors?—Yes, that was the one step that was shown to them.

4946. And he suggests further that they should get annual increments?—Oh, yes.

4947. Now, can you tell us how it was that they did not get annual increments?—The arrangements were all made by him and the three clerks. I might tell you this, that about a month or two before Mr. Redington died, we had an Office Committee one evening, and we were all in, the three Secretaries and the two Chiefs, and when we were leaving then (it was after seven o'clock) he called my name and said, "Don't go, Dowling, for a minute. I want you." When they were out I saw him wincing from pain. He was suffering from pain the whole time he was there. And then he said to me, "That is a document that I have just received from the Treasury. It is marked strictly confidential, and before I answer it I want you to read it. Don't show it to anybody. Let nobody see it, even your wife." He said it was in the nature of an ultimatum, and added, "It lays down what we must agree to if we want to be financed for the new scheme."

4948. The CHAIRMAN.—This was before 1900?—It was in 1899. There were a number of paragraphs, and he told me that there was a pencil mark in the margin with a cross, and he said, "I want to be loyal to our country, and to the Board, and at the same time to have as little friction as possible with the Treasury"—those were the identical words of Mr. Redington. He said, "Anything that we could safely allow mark it with a cross, and anything that you are certain ought not to be allowed mark with a nought, and where you have any doubt about the others mark a query. If you have time to draft it tonight." I not only drafted it, but wrote the whole reply, sitting up to two or three o'clock in the morning, and brought it to him, and it went out as I wrote it. He told me that he did not elaborate it at all. Now, there was nothing like that whatever in this present matter. There was nothing very bad in it. There was about one-third of the points that were asked that I had to mark with a nought that had no right to be conceded, but as to the rest, there was nothing very objection-

able; and here is what happened in the present case. This thing was issued by Mr. Lennox, who was private Secretary. None of the Secretaries saw the document at the time. They were excluded from the Board-room while the thing was being discussed. Copies were issued to the Commissioners by their private Secretary, instead of in the ordinary way by the Secretary for the week. They were sent out by Mr. Lennox on Friday night, as usual, for next Tuesday's Board Meeting. At Tuesday's Board, after they had spent a couple of hours talking over this, it was adjourned till the next meeting of the Board, but Dr. Starke asked the Commissioners to give up their copies, and they did. They gave up their copies on the Tuesday, not one of them having time to study it, and they never got a copy of it afterwards. I asked one of the Commissioners, "How on earth did you make yourself responsible for that document?" He said, "We did not know anything about it; it was taken up on us before we had time to study it or read it." It was for exhibiting that anonymous document that I was suspended.

4949. Mr. HENRY.—It is stated in this document that the amount expended on the school teachers of Ireland previous to the change was £200,000?—Yes.

4950. And then I find that the actual cost of the new scheme (these words are important), the actual cost of the new scheme would, it is estimated, work out in practice ultimately to about £200,000 per annum. Is not that so?—Yes.

4951. So then the author of this document contemplated saving £20,000 for the Treasury?—Oh, yes, that was the idea at the start. It was all a saving thing at the start.

4952. Now, for a man in the third grade, the initial salary proposed was £32, rising to a maximum of £73, with annual increments of £3?—Yes.

4953. Now that would take 18 years?—And only get to £78.

4954. Then in the second grade he commences with £79, and goes by annual increments of £3 up to £109. That would take ten years more, would it not, going up by annual increments of £3?—Yes, that would take ten years.

4955. Then in the second division of the first grade the initial salary is £110, rising by annual increments of £3 to £156, and in the first section of first grade the initial salary is £161, rising by increments of £3 to £191. Is not that so?—Yes.

4956. That would take thirteen years more?—Yes.

4957. Then these increments are stated to be awarded to teachers whose schools are reported as progressing satisfactorily?—Yes.

4958. The CHAIRMAN.—That was the original proposal that the increments should be awarded on a satisfactory report?—Yes.

4959. Mr. HENRY.—The increments, however, should not be granted as a matter of course to all teachers, but only to teachers whose schools are reported as progressing satisfactorily?—That is fair.

4960. That was the original proposal. I do not think I need read the scale for women. Now, the teachers were to be graded in future in respect of the schools?—Yes.

4961. Then every teacher, irrespective of his attainments, irrespective of his services, irrespective of his qualification, was to be graded according to the salary he happened to have for that particular year in which the scheme came into operation?—Yes, only that he got the odd shillings to make the complete number of pounds.

4962. So that if a third-class teacher of five years' service happened to be in charge of a large school, and drawing a large salary, he was put in first grade?—Yes.

4963. Would not that be so?—Yes.

4964. Whereas a teacher of twenty years' service, classed first of first, with a long meritorious record, if he happened to have a small school, was put into third grade?—But I do not think he would lose any salary.

4965. Mr. CORRY.—But he was degraded?—Oh, yes.

4966. The CHAIRMAN.—If a man who was in the first class before 1899, found himself in a school of under

1st April, 1913.]

Mr. EDWARD DOWLING examined.

[Continued.]

36, under the new system, he would be put into grade three?—Yes, into the third grade.

4067. Mr. KAYANAGH.—Did that entail loss of salary?—No.

Mr. HENLY.—It entailed this, and it meant this, that if a teacher who was first class, happened from any circumstances to be in that particular year in a small school, he went into the third grade, and, therefore, he had to rise through all the grades up to the top, although he might subsequently get into a larger school.

The CHAIRMAN.—And that whole system of promotion, slow as it was, applied to a teacher who had already got into the first class?

Mr. HENLY.—Yes.

The CHAIRMAN.—Did that affect many men?

Mr. HENLY.—It has affected a large number. Here is an example which, perhaps, I may read—"As an example of the application of the new scale to the case of an existing teacher the following will suffice. Supposing the present income from the State of a principal teacher is £99 10s. 8d. per annum, he would in future, under the new scale, become a second grade teacher, rising from £90 by annual increments of £3 to a maximum salary of £105. In this connection fractions of £1 would be treated as £1; thus £99 10s. 8d. would be regarded as £90." So that no matter what his salary was he would be affected by the new grading system, and a first of first class teacher might become a third grade teacher, to rise through all the ranks to the top. And in this document, too, it was also provided that no future teacher of a school, of which the average was under 50, should have any claim to promotion to the second grade?—Yes.

4068. And that is the rule as it is at present; also no teacher with a school of which the average is under 50 can rise to the second division of the first grade. Is not that so?—Yes.

4069. And that no teacher can rise to the first division of the first grade unless the school maintains an average of 70 pupils. Is not that so?—Yes.

4070. And are not these rules in operation to-day?—Yes.

4071. Now, there were a great many things proposed as a result of this. I find here, as one of the claims or recommendations for this scheme, that one of the results would be economy in the cost of the Central Office, by which it was claimed that they would gain £5,350 per annum in that one department alone?—Yes. The difference at the present time in the cost of the office is practically entirely accounted for by the removal of our salaries as clerks.

The CHAIRMAN.—I do not think the financing of the central office comes within the terms of our reference.

Mr. HENLY.—But this is money that was meant to be available for the teacher.

The CHAIRMAN.—Was that your point?

Mr. HENLY.—Yes. Now, the annual difference is exactly accounted for by the removal of the salaries of the two clerks from that head.

The CHAIRMAN.—And that brings it within the terms?

Mr. HENLY.—Yes; I think so.

4072. Mr. HENLY.—Then it was also claimed that there would be a great simplification of school accounts. Now, has that simplification been effected?—No, they are somewhat worse—not very much worse, but they are rather worse than better.

4073. The CHAIRMAN.—And are they more complicated?—They are a little more complicated.

4074. Mr. HENLY.—And then it was further claimed that there would be more freedom for the teachers with regard to their methods and the classification of the pupils?—That is all right.

4075. Has that freedom been given to the teachers?—No. Under the results scheme, the teachers were perfectly free.

4076. The CHAIRMAN.—Before 1874?—Yes. They could teach after school hours any extra branches that the children wanted, but they were not bound down to any bipartite or tripartite system, and there was no objection to the use of Irish. There was as much Irish as English spoken in the school that I was edu-

cated in, and the master spoke in Irish if a child was a very young one that had not learned enough of English, and there was perfect freedom at that time.

4077. Mr. HENLY.—I suppose it comes to this, that the freedom of the teachers at the present time as regards the question of organization, is freedom to do what they are told?—That is so; to do what is hinted; and it is hard to know what a man has to do, because every circular that comes out is contradictory to the previous one.

4078. It was stated that the new system would afford increased facilities for encouraging earnest teachers and for controlling negligent teachers?—I think it has done that. There have been a lot of dissimiles under the new scheme. As to whether they were deserved or not I do not know; but according to my own experience I should say not. I found the teachers, as a rule, very fit for their business and very willing to do it, and I had no difficulty in the district that I had charge of in getting the schools worked up. I had only to point out some few defects and to point out what they might do for the next year; and, indeed, in the Galway district, I remember my successor wrote back to say, "You have left me nothing to do. There is not a defect in the schools that you have not already noted."

4079. Then comes a very important point, and it is this, that the schools should continue to be examined and the progress of the schools tested by repeated inspection. You do not disagree with that, I suppose?—No; but I do not think that is conveyed there. But I object to very many inspections of the school at all in the year. I think three ought to be sufficient, unless there is a school where there is something wrong.

4080. But, anyway, you think it necessary that the schools should be examined, if the work of the school and the work of the teacher are to be tested?—Undoubtedly. There is no other way to test a school, but by examination.

4081. Now this goes on to state that "it should be only in very rare cases that examination in some form would be dispensed with altogether." So that evidently it was not the impressionist system of inspection that was in the mind of the writer of this paper?—I could not imagine any circumstances in which examination should not be gone through.

4082. Do you agree with this statement:—"Even the best schools are liable to become retrograde if not tested from time to time by a public examination, which arouses the energies of the teachers and pupils, and enables parents to judge of the progress of their children, and the merits of their instructors?"—The only thing I object to is the public examination. I cannot see the object of the public examination, because there is no use in holding a public examination of the schools generally. I would approve of a public one if it were possible; but in nine-tenths of the schools of Ireland, it would be impossible.

4083. Do you agree with this, that "Even the best schools" (in the words of this document) "are liable to become retrograde if they are not examined?"—Yes.

4084. And the welfare of the children and the future of the teacher and his increment and promotion should not depend on the mere visit and impression of an inspector?—No. I am entirely of that opinion.

4085. Mr. HENLY.—I want to ask you a few more questions on this document. Under the results system, the subjects were reading, writing, arithmetic, grammar, geography, agriculture in boys' schools, and needlework in girls' schools, in some instances. Is not that so?—Yes.

4086. Now, I find it stated in this document that it was difficult to attend to this array of subjects?—Yes.

4087. And that, as a consequence, boys and girls were leaving school without even a fair knowledge of reading, writing and arithmetic?—Yes.

4088. The words are, "The result too often is that no branch is well taught, and many pupils leave school without even a fair knowledge of reading, writing and arithmetic?"—Yes; there were eight subjects, I think, before, and now there are twelve. They were increased by four.

4890. Then, in this document, it was proposed, and I think that perhaps you would agree with it, that in every school the essential subjects ought to be taught?—Oh, yes.

4891. With a certain amount of freedom to the teachers and managers to add other subjects suited to the locality?—That is the right plan.

4892. Now, it is stated here, that "ordinary day-school subjects which can be taught under the new system are reading, which includes grammar, history and geography, writing, arithmetic, kindergarten and manual instruction, drawing and elementary science, ocology and laundry work, needlework, singing, school discipline and physical drill." That, I think, makes thirteen subjects?—Yes, and if you put under the head of reading, grammar and geography, making only one subject of these, that won't reduce the difficulty, by merely calling them a subdivision of reading.

4893. If the eight subjects could not be taught, how could the thirteen subjects be taught?—It is quite inconsistent.

4894. And how can that be reconciled with the suggestion that proceeds it, that the essential subjects should be taught with a certain amount of freedom to the teachers and managers to teach a programme suited to the needs of their own localities and their own pupils?—In that statement that I have given, I show that it would only allow two half-hour lessons per week for reading and two half-hour lessons for arithmetic, and only one hour per week for other subjects.

4895. The CHAIRMAN.—Two half-hour lessons to each of them?—To reading and arithmetic.

4896. Mr. HENLY.—And then it was estimated here that the total amount that should be asked for extra subjects, including, of course, such subjects as Irish and mathematics would be £2,000 per annum?—I should say that Mr. Young, who was financial secretary at the time, shewed me the estimate. He did not say whether it was with Dr. Stucke's knowledge or not, but he shewed me the estimate and asked me to read them over.

4897. The CHAIRMAN.—Was he the financial secretary?—He was the financial secretary, and one of the things I pointed out to him was, "What is the good of asking for £2,000?"

4898. Mr. HENLY.—Do you agree with this statement?—"While at school children commit to memory, with great labour, the names of countries, the heights of mountains, facts which, no doubt, are interesting in themselves; but the children form no correct idea of what the countries, mountains, etc., are like until such time as travelling enables them to see the actual places or a perusal of books, etc., opens their minds and lets in a flood of sound and useful geographical light." When would the peasantry of Ireland be able to see these places by travelling?—Well, I do not know a place where they would not have a very good opportunity of seeing mountain scenery.

4899. As an example of the freedom that was claimed to be allowed to teachers, we have this—"Writing should be from headlines on two days, from dictation on one day, and two days might be devoted to composition"; where is the freedom if the writing was to be on two days of the week in one way, etc.?—There was perfect freedom to the teacher long ago. A man had perfect freedom to do that which he conceived was best for himself.

4900. The CHAIRMAN.—Had he freedom as to the time given to a subject?—Decidedly so. No one interfered with the teacher at all, except to give him advice. In the first district I had, which was Tralee, I remember the teachers used to gather into the hotel to me on a Saturday, when I would stay over the Saturday, and there was a large number there one day, and they were consulting me about things, and I said, "Each subject is taught excellently by one or more of you," and I said in some of the schools there are some subjects badly taught, and I said: "Put your heads together, and if a subject is badly taught, you do not give it time enough, or you have a bad method, and let the teachers of schools where subjects are taught excellently tell you what their method is, and in that way you can all help one another," but there was perfect freedom.

5000. Mr. HENLY.—I find it stated here that "Arithmetic should be confined to the simple rules for the great body of the pupils." Would that be right?—It is quite wrong, and the secondary schools complain that children going to them now know no arithmetic and no grammar.

5001. Do you agree to the recommendations stated here, that "in connection with the re-organisation of school work, it is suggested that home lessons should as a rule be abolished"?—Of course, the President Commissioner saw the mistake about that very soon, because it was very early after that that a new circular was issued, saying that that was never contemplated at all.

5002. The CHAIRMAN.—That is not insisted on now?—About two years after, that was contradicted, but for a time it was insisted on that there were to be no home lessons, and the teachers thought that a very mischievous thing. I attach immense value to home lessons, and I made it a rule to examine on them whenever I went into a school. I examined the children on home lessons for that day, and it was really in that way that I best judged of the influence the teacher had over the children.

5003. The CHAIRMAN.—You examined the child as to what the child had learned for itself?—Yes, what it had learned at home, and I found that there was no better test than that of the influence which a teacher had over the children.

5004. In enabling a child to do its own work?—In getting work done when he was not present himself, having that influence over his pupils, that the work was done at home.

5005. Mr. HENLY.—With your experience as teacher and as inspector, do you agree with this statement, that many poor children are deterred from attending school by fear of corporal punishment for not knowing their lessons?—I never knew a single case. There was very little corporal punishment at the time I was inspector.

5006. The CHAIRMAN.—Was the teacher bound to enter each case of corporal punishment in the book?—No.

5007. Mr. CARTER.—They are now?—They are now, but there was practically no corporal punishment at all.

5008. Mr. HENLY.—I see here that the bipartite and tripartite systems are antiquated, and that there are many simpler systems?—No, there is no simpler system, and the writer of that did not know what was meant. The names of bipartite and tripartite only describe arrangements made to suit the time-table to the construction of the school. If a school had desks and a floor than it was bipartite, and if there was a gallery along or a room outside, then there were three places, and the system was tripartite, but it had nothing further than that to do with organisation.

5009. That was in the case of a school under one teacher?—Under one teacher or more.

5010. Mr. HENLY.—You cannot have a tripartite arrangement with one teacher?—Most of the schools had desks and a floor. In the English schools they gave up using the floor, and had all desks and every child is sitting throughout the day. I saw a large number of schools in England quietly and had all the better chance of judging of them, and I certainly would not at all change the system here for that. I think that it is better not to have the children sitting the whole time, but sitting for half an hour and standing for half an hour, and then there is a little moving, and as to the loss of time in any well disciplined school, the time for changing is only a fraction of a minute.

5011. Two or three minutes?—Less than a minute.

5012. The CHAIRMAN.—If the children are well disciplined?—In my experience, it took less than a minute in a school called Miltown, near Belfast, a large school, that I went to visit.

5013. That is near Newtownards?—Yes. I was a considerable time in the room before I could find out the master. There was one master and a lot of female assistants, and he was going on quietly with his work there, and when the half-hour came he just stood and gave a signal, and instantly they began to walk round, and they were in their new position in less than a minute.



1st April, 1913.]

Mr. EDWARD DOWNING examined.

[Continued.]

5024. Mr. HENRY.—It is stated here that the system best suited to the majority of Irish schools is one in which "every child would be under instruction in the same subject at the same time"; and then there is an example given of a single teacher having 23 children.—For example, take the case of a teacher with a school of, say, 23 pupils, ranging from 5 to 15 years of age. Of course, these children would have different degrees of proficiency in, say, reading, but a skilful teacher could instruct the whole school, formed into one class for reading at the same time. If he commenced with the most junior, and asked the seniors to explain difficulties in spelling, etc., experienced by the juniors, and when he came to the seniors the juniors would benefit by the seniors' explanation of their difficulties, or the teacher might get some of the more advanced pupils to instruct the juniors while he was engaged with the seniors. Now, do you as an inspector, a head inspector, and a chief of inspection, think that was a proper recommendation to make?—No, it is amazingly absurd, and it is a shame that officials should be held responsible for a thing like that.

5025. Would it be possible to instruct at one and the same time children of the first class and sixth class at a reading lesson?—Of course, it is very absurd. Just fancy a boy of 16 explaining to a child who spells *kat*, that it is wrong to spell it with a *k*. In reading and in arithmetic the different classes must be taught separately. There is no getting out of that. Geography may be grouped, but the writer of that did not know that the teachers were always free to group in any subject.

5026. The CHAIRMAN.—They would group them under the old system sometimes?—Yes, in any subject.

5027. Mr. HENRY.—Whenever they found it desirable?—They were perfectly free to group.

5028. The HUSBOR or ROSS.—Have not they a specialised programme for each subject and for each class?—They had, but in the case of geography it is not necessarily consecutive.

5029. But assuming that one class has the geography of Ireland and another class, say, the geography of France and Germany, I do not see how you could very well group those two classes in geography?—It would not be so wide a difference as that; it would be only the world and Ireland, and another would be only Europe, and it was only in a general way.

5030. Of course, a very specialised programme?—Not in the older time.

5031. Mr. HENRY.—Here is a recommendation in which his Lordship, perhaps, would take an interest—"In cities and towns, where there is a good water supply, swimming baths should be provided in connection with the larger schools, and grants for providing lavatories and baths should be available from the State." Where would the money come from?—I think attention should be fixed on the essential things.

5032. The CHAIRMAN.—I am afraid that is outside the terms of reference?—It only shows the ignorance of the writer. He did not know what was before him. He did not realise the work that was to be done.

5033. Mr. HENRY.—Do you agree with the recommendation in this, that once a teacher leaves the Training College he should be "done with examinations," to use the words of the document?—Well, I would leave that an open question. I do not know that there is any need of anything further. He might be encouraged; but there is one thing that I do not like at all in the new rule, that is saying that if a man's school is not progressing satisfactorily for want of private study, he will be liable to be examined.

5034. The CHAIRMAN.—That is the only case where examination of a teacher is mentioned, is not that so?—There may be cracks among inspectors. There is one important thing to keep in view, that there are several cracks.

5035. The CHAIRMAN.—And always will be?—And that such a crack will be with one set of teachers, and they are liable to be persecuted by him unless there is a safeguard. That man would go there and say, "you will have to come in to me on Saturday to be examined, to see if you are fit."

5036. I wonder does that ever happen?—I am speaking of things that I am only illustrating from my knowledge of things that frequently happen. Those are the kind of things that these inspectors would seize upon.

5037. Mr. HENRY.—Now, coming to the Office, you had, up to 1909, two chiefs of inspection?—Yes.

5038. Their work at that time was confined exclusively to the Office?—No, we were at liberty to go and visit schools if we thought that there was any need, and we would be sent out to hold investigations if necessary, if it were a very serious matter, and, as you know, we conducted the examinations of the Training Colleges.

5039. Mr. CORRY.—The chiefs of inspection?—Yes. I think it was then that the change was made.

5040. The CHAIRMAN.—The chief inspectors did not examine?—No.

5041. Mr. HENRY.—Am I right in this, that in 1874 a Departmental Committee sat, of which Mr. Gladstone was Chairman, and that that Committee recommended that the chiefs of inspection should be confined to the Office, and not go about to visit schools?—I am not aware. I cannot answer that. I do not know about the reference.

5042. Mr. CORRY.—Did a Board's Order ever reach you as chief of inspection arising from that Departmental report, forbidding you to visit schools?—No.

5043. You were not there at the time?—No.

5044. Mr. HENRY.—You had no appeals then to deal with, and no reports coming up from the ordinary inspectors, and you were reduced from the ranks of chief of inspection, and became a chief inspector?—Yes.

5045. And your work was to a considerable extent altered?—Yes, entirely altered.

5046. And the noting of reports was handed over to the examiners?—Yes.

5047. They were not inspectors?—No.

5048. They had no knowledge of the bearing of those reports, of the proper action to take in connection with them?—For a long time they had to steel in to us to be advised.

5049. Are there examiners in England for dealing with the reports?—I do not know.

5050. You have no knowledge of that?—No.

5051. Are you aware of this, that the ordinary rule of competition for first-class clerkships does not apply to the Education Office clerks, because they want expert examiners—you are not aware of that?—No.

5052. Then you had six head inspectors?—Yes, for the old style, but I think four would be enough.

5053. And those were abolished?—Yes, they were called senior inspectors.

5054. They were reduced to the rank of senior inspectors?—It was practically a reduction of rank.

5055. Under the present arrangement, under which I have heard teachers complaining about five separate inspectors within five years testing their schools, do you, with your knowledge as inspector and head inspector and chief inspector, think it is possible that an inspector can test schools in that way?—No.

5056. Or under these conditions?—No.

5057. The CHAIRMAN.—They had a new inspector every year for five years?—Yes.

5058. Mr. HENRY.—The present system encourages that?—I cannot answer for that, but all I can say is that they are very frequently changed.

5059. Mr. HENRY.—I know a district where teachers who had charge of the same schools had different inspectors every year for five years?—I have not any knowledge of that.

5060. You do not think that under such circumstances the inspector could form a proper judgment as to the work being done in that school?—I believe that, an inspector, at his first visit to a school, even though he spends the whole day there and examines carefully, could hardly do so, and he should be very slow to pronounce a very decided opinion on the merits of that school, and those in authority ought to be very slow to receive it, at his first visit. In the first place, he does not know what the school was a year ago.

1st April, 1934.]

Mr. LAMOND DOWNING continued.

[Continued.]

He does not know, and cannot at all present, or whether it has progressed.

5051. The CHAIRMAN.—But has he not the observation book to look back upon?—The observation book does not give much help. All it ought to give is a few suggestions of things that could be improved.

5052. It does not show the previous state of the school very much?—No, except in a very general way.

5053. Mr. HENLY.—Now, as a result of this change of the chiefs of inspection to be chief inspectors, you told us that Archbishop Walsh complained that the members of the Board were at a loss for want of information on questions coming before them?—Oh, yes, on one occasion he complained, and said that there should be somebody that understood educational matters at the Board, and then there was a Board (before that one chief should attend the Board in future along with the Secretary).

5054. The CHAIRMAN.—That was before 1907?—It was.

5055. Mr. HENLY.—And you told us also, and it was a very important thing, I think, with reference to reprimands, that His Grace was anxious that cases of reprimand should come formally before the Board?—Oh, yes, he took severe exception to that, and held very strong views on it. An order was then made that no letter should go out in the name of the Commissioners, except one that had been submitted formally to the Board. They were put on a list, and that list lay there, but the attention of the Board was not directed to the serious cases, you know. They were, however, on the list, and if the Commissioners knew anything about it they might look at it.

5056. The CHAIRMAN.—Do I understand that Archbishop Walsh insisted that every serious case should come before the Board?—Yes.

5057. Before a letter was sent?—Yes; that it should be brought definitely before the Board, and that the Board should be made aware that it was a serious case, and should know the particulars of it.

5058. Mr. HENLY.—And we have had it in evidence here, and one of the examiners has stated that when he reads over a report, even when no notice is recommended by the inspector, he, of his own motion, issues a reprimand to the teacher if he thinks it necessary. Would that have been possible if the regulations suggested by His Grace the Archbishop of Dublin were carried out?—If the examiner merely noted that this teacher was to be reprimanded, and if that were then submitted.

5059. But it went no further than himself?—Oh, that would be intolerable.

The CHAIRMAN.—Did it not go to the Secretary?

Mr. HENLY.—It went to the Secretary to be signed by him.

The CHAIRMAN.—But it went through the Secretary's hands, I think.

5060. Mr. HENLY.—The letter was written by the examiner, and then it went to be signed by the Secretary. Now, do you think that is a proper state of affairs?—No.

5061. To have teachers subjected to reprimands in that way?—No; in the olden time a reprimand meant only giving a slip to the teacher. There was no penalty; but now a reprimand is a very serious thing, because it would prevent promotion, and, moreover, too. In the case of a reprimand, what His Grace the Archbishop of Dublin found fault with was, merely not having the attention of the Board formally called to it, and the course that I have mentioned was adopted.

5062. Mr. CORRY.—It was placed on the table?—Yes, as one of a number of insignificant cases, and there was no attention called to it, and then the letter went out in the name of the Commissioners, and the Commissioners were responsible for that reprimand.

5063. The CHAIRMAN.—And after the Archbishop's action that could not be done without the attention of the Board being called to it?—Not while the thing went on.

5064. Mr. HENLY.—I suppose you have no knowledge of the circumstances under which the state of things was altered when His Grace withdrew from the Board?—I know we were not called in to the Board.

5065. Now, in speaking with reference to the inspectors, it is stated here—"It is desirable that inspectors of National schools should be recruited largely from the ranks of the National teachers, in order to give encouragement to the latter body." Do you agree with that recommendation?—I agree to that. I agree that the teachers ought to make the best inspectors.

5066. Then it goes on to say—"Under the new conditions inspectors should not merely have to inspect schools; they should also have to advise the teachers and managers as to school organisation, and give helpful hints on school management. For these purposes a knowledge of the details of the technique of a National teacher's work is essential. This has already been recognised in England and Scotland, where the sub-inspectors, who form the main body of the inspection staff, are entirely, or almost entirely, promoted from the ranks of the elementary school teachers." Do you agree with that?—I do; I think that is fair.

5067. And then it goes on to claim some of the appointments?—All the other appointments were to be made by favour, without any test.

5068. The CHAIRMAN.—Do you remember what was the number of inspectors who had been National teachers, under the old system?—I do not remember.

5069. There were inspectors who had been National teachers under the old results system?—Yes; I was one myself. I was a National teacher.

5070. The HONOR. OF ROSS.—I see you were the teacher of a Model School, not the teacher of an ordinary National School?—No; I was assistant in the Inchicore Model School for eight years, and was Head Master of Linnet Model School for two years.

5071. Were there teachers of ordinary National Schools who became inspectors in the early years?—Oh, yes.

5072. The CHAIRMAN.—I suppose we could get the number of them under the old system?—Oh, I think so. There were two of us who passed at the same time. Gray was a case in point; he was an ordinary National School teacher.

5073. I remember another, Browne?—And Sheehan was another one.

5074. And Connelley?—He was teacher of a Model School for some time.

5075. The HONOR. OF ROSS.—Had they to submit themselves to the Civil Service examination?—They had.

5076. Mr. HENLY.—Tell us the subjects that you think ought to be emphasised in the course for National Schools. Reading, writing, and arithmetic should stand out prominently and above all. These are the three subjects that children go to school to learn, and they are the ones that will fit them for after life, and they are the ones that will fit them for entering a secondary school, if they mean to go on for secondary education, and they are the ones that will enable them to study for themselves. I can say that from my own personal experience. I got all the education I had in an ordinary National School myself under the old system, and I was able to study and to beat Trinity College graduates and other College graduates at competitive examinations, and beat them very badly.

5077. The CHAIRMAN.—That was not entirely due to the old system in your case?—Well, I don't know.

5078. You were an exceptional person?—I don't think I was.

5079. The HONOR. OF ROSS.—You are not grateful to Dame Nature?—I know that I was not the best in the school.

5080. The CHAIRMAN.—But you developed and they did not?—It was only that I had to study when I came here to Dublin.

5081. Mr. HENLY.—Do you approve of the present mode of issuing a maximum programme to teachers?—No.

5082. What are the objections to the maximum programme?—As long as payment of the teachers depends upon examination, and upon the progress made, there should be some definite programme; if possible a minimum programme, and if that was well

1st April, 1913.]

Mr. HENSON DAWSON examined.

[Continued.]

and intelligently done, the inspector should not be at liberty to disqualify that teacher for his advancement or promotion. This maximum programme serves no useful purpose, it is no guide to anybody; it names a number of subjects that are to be taught at first, but I think the right way would be to put down the essential subjects, and to name another number of subjects that might be taught, and to suggest that the teacher should take any of them that should be taught.

5063. With regard to the system of grouping, which is allowed for certain standards, if you have all the standards grouped reading the same book at the same time, do you think that a wise arrangement?—No; that is exceedingly absurd for reading or arithmetic. These subjects must be taught with a regular sequence, and for such subjects as those there can be no grouping. In every year's work the children of the one year's reading must be taught separately, and get each their own lesson, and then in a small school the plan is to try to keep the others usefully occupied, and there are a lot of little plans that teachers have for checking them and making them do a certain amount of work. For example, one of the plans that we had in those small schools was in the writing of headlines. We had Vere Foster's copybooks, and there were two headlines, one at the top and one half way down, and there were three blank lines for the children to write on, and the children were trained to write only two of the three lines, and leave the third blank, until the teacher had marked with a coloured pencil two or three faults in the lines written. When the children saw those marks they were then to write the third line, and try to avoid the faults, and then the teacher afterwards initiated them, and gave a word of praise, or said it was unsatisfactory, and the child went on alone and did not stop, and wrote as many lines as possible.

5064. In the meantime he was teaching a class on the floor?—Yes; and then in the case of reading, he had three or four classes there on the floor, and while he was with one the others were reading, with one of themselves standing in the class as copy as a monitor. All the boys in the school were trained to that without anybody telling them, and he kept the reading going on them. That was the practice; and while the master was teaching them explanations or so on, the monitor would probably appeal to somebody who could pronounce, if there was a word mispronounced, and that was the practice. Then one of the difficult things to be taught in the multiplication table. It takes ever so much time to teach the multiplication table. They must be taught by rote.

5065. Do you think that some of the suggestions that are given in the programme (obviously enough there are suggestions given in the programme) are either necessary or advisable for the teacher?—There should be no suggestions for teaching of any kind mixed up with the programme at all. Some are bad ones. No teacher should teach writing by putting up before the child's eye on a blackboard a headline. The child would get a headache in no time looking at it. Of course, the headline should be of the same size exactly as the child has to imitate, and the same slope and everything.

5066. And would you object to the teacher going to the blackboard to point out the faults to the children?—No.

5067. But there should be blackboard teaching?—Yes, the double curves illustrated and the clumsy ones made properly, and so forth.

5068. Then you think that the teacher, if he is to be responsible for producing a proper result in the school, ought to be left free to devise his own methods?—Oh, yes; and any man who is being trained in the Training College ought to get a list of any points that would be of use, and particularly about the management of these small schools. It is a very easy thing to conduct a big school with an assistant for each grade.

5069. Do you think the arrangement for teaching the essential subjects is as good now as it was formerly?—I am told by managers and inspectors, and particularly by masters of the secondary schools, that they know no arithmetic now, that there is no arithmetic being taught, and that they know no grammar, but

they are particularly emphatic about arithmetic, which used to be a good subject.

5070. And do you think that an inspector could judge of a school by looking at the progress book and the syllabus book, and the book of preparation made by the teacher?—Oh, you could check them as being accurate; that is all they mean.

5071. It is not a test of the proficiency of the school?

—None whatever.

5072. Do you think it is necessary for a teacher to have a written preparation for lessons that he has gone over again and again?—I know my own place, and I think it would be a very desirable thing for the teacher to have. I began it here when I was assistant master in Inchoades. I got the reading books bound interleaved, and I had notes then of the points.

5073. The CHAIRMAN.—But I understand Mr. Henson's question to mean, not the noting of the instruction particularly required, but whether it is necessary that a teacher, who has been a long time teaching this lesson, should make preparation?—Preparation in such a case should not be necessary; but the teacher should have in mind a definite notion of what he should attempt to teach.

5074. Mr. HENSON.—I met one of our students the other day, who was a graduate of the London University, I think, a B.A., and who has since taken the degree B.Sc., and he told me that the inspector found serious fault with him because he had not prepared notes for teaching long division. Do you think that a man of his standing would need preparation of that kind?—I think not. That inspector was one of the cranks who wanted a good deal of looking after.

5075. And then I think you say the pupils ought to be tested by examination?—There is only one way, and that is by examination. I would not say that it is necessary to examine every class on every subject. I do not think it should be necessary, but certainly the senior class ought always to be examined.

5076. Now, in connection with that suggestion of examining the senior class, do you not think it is open to the danger that the teacher might give attention to the senior class to such an extent that the junior classes must of necessity be neglected—do you hold that opinion?—No; no man will succeed unless he prepares in the junior stages. He won't succeed in the senior stages unless he takes great care of the junior.

5077. In other words, to have that senior class in his school proficient, he must see that a proper foundation is laid in the junior classes, so that they will be prepared for higher class work when they come up to the senior class?—Yes, there are two things to consider. The pupils must have been properly grounded on the course preparatory to the instruction in the higher standard, and they must be efficiently disciplined so as to possess the necessary energy and application.

5078. He must concentrate a large amount of attention on the lower classes in order to have pupils fit to take the place of the higher when they naturally will leave the school; is not that so?—Yes, a whole lot of preparatory work must be gone through. If they have no preparatory work well done at the beginning, say, of the sixth grade, then, of course, he cannot teach them, and he must go back to the beginning again, half a year preparing them. Not only that, but the children will not have been trained to industry and to attention unless they are well managed in the junior standards.

5079. I found myself that when I was able to give that attention to the middle class of the school I could manage the seniors very easily?—I don't know if I am wasting time, but here is a point with regard to that final examination. It is my experience when I was teaching. I had experience of about nine inspectors and every one of these, except one, knew nothing whatever about his business. There was only one who did.

The CHAIRMAN.—That was in the olden days?—The olden days.

The BISHOP or BROS.—That was before the results system?—Yes. That one was an excellent inspector; but when I went to take charge of the Limerick Model School I thought it right to be on my guard, in order

that I might be able to defend myself against anything, and I put a paper before every boy that came to the school, and asked him to write his name and age, and where he lived and what school he had attended, and what he had been taught. I had them on a sheet of paper in consecutive order. I wrote the questions, and the boy's answers were under them. I examined him in everything that he had learned, and I got him to read a book, and I noted on the paper the book and page, and indicated phonetically the mispronounced words, and I got him to write a bit to dictation, and to do some composition and arithmetic, till I proved that I found how far that he had advanced in arithmetic and grammar and geography, and Latin or French, or anything at all that he had learned. I examined him on these, and I had a perfect description of the boy, and I had that for every boy in school who came subsequently to my taking charge of it. The head inspector reported adversely on my school, and my name was struck off the list of candidates for inspectorship. I appealed against that, and the chief of inspection was sent down, and he asked me "how it was that I could not get along with Mr. Patterson," and I explained to him his mode of examining, and I said, "He does not keep to the rules at all, and he has a plan of his own," and a very curious one it was, and very unsatisfactory. But I showed him these papers which I had. I produced them and I said, "I have that for every boy in the school, and I ask you, if you have time, to pick out at random any dozen boys, and I will tell them to come in here. I will produce the papers for those boys, giving their description, and, in the meantime, I will get prepared for you the number of days' attendance made by each of these boys every year." He was a judicious inspector, and he saw at once that there was no getting out of that, that it was the most perfect test of the school that could be given; and I believe it is. I think a hint could be taken from it as to devising a system of inspection.

5109. Mr. HENRY.—Now, you disapprove of these merit marks that we have?—Of the whole list.

5110. Supposing that a teacher is to get increment, whether annual or biennial, what conditions do you think that teacher should fulfil to be entitled to his increment, and what should be the nature of his report?—I think, unless there was actually bad work, he ought not to be prevented.

5111. In other words, it would come back to the words used in the document I was dealing with, which I suppose you would approve of, that where the school was being satisfactorily worked, he should get his increment?—Yes, that would be a fair way of describing it.

5112. You do not think it is possible to divide schools into "excellent," "very good," "good," and so on?—Oh, no.

5113. You were chief inspector when the new system was launched, were you not?—Yes.

5114. What instructions did the inspectors get at that time, as to how they were to classify a school as "excellent" or "good" (there was no "very good" then)?—I do not know. I do not remember seeing any instructions bearing on that point.

5115. You are aware that a conference of senior inspectors was held in 1908?—Yes.

5116. "In which they were asked to define what was meant by an "excellent" school, a "very good" school, and a "good" one, and so on?—I think I ought to have that. Probably I have.

5117. We have got a copy of the report of that conference, but so far as you are aware, the inspectors got no instructions antecedent to 1908, as to what was to constitute an "excellent" school or a "good" one?—I do not remember any instructions being given.

5118. Now, as you say, amongst the inspectors there always will be found cracks. Would it not be a desirable thing to have a definite programme, so that the teacher might be secured against them?—If the inspector is an intelligent and fair man, it does not matter what the programme is, for he will set fairly and rationally, and most of the inspectors do that.

5119. And then with regard to the working of the

system, and the reports which the inspectors prepare for publication in the Blue Books, do you think that the inspectors should be free to state facts as to whether the system that is in operation is working successfully or not?—Certainly; what are these reports for? They are not for the purpose of misleading the public. They are for the purpose of enlightening the Commissioners and enlightening the people of the country, and enlightening the members of the House of Commons.

5120. And what are the inspectors at liberty to discuss in these reports?—Formerly they were at liberty to discuss everything, and there was no limit.

5121. What are they at liberty to discuss now?—They are not at liberty to discuss anything, except to praise the new scheme.

5122. Now, you state here in your précis that on one occasion you were asked to include in your general report statements with reference to the neglect of their duties by managers, or of what are assumed to be their duties. Is not that so?—Yes.

5123. Were those the extracts that were subsequently or at the time published as a supplement to the address delivered by Mr. Sturges at Belfast?—Oh, yes, those were some of them. The inspectors were written to. I never saw the circular that was issued, but there was a circular issued evidently, for the inspectors sent in reports, speaking of the neglect of the managers, and a good many of those were adverse to the managers, saying that they took very little interest in their schools, or something like that, and I know that one of the senior inspectors, one of the old head inspectors, resigned prematurely rather than answer that, and write in whatever the terms of the circular were.

5124. Mr. CORRY.—That was Mr. Eardly?—Mr. Eardly.

5125. Mr. HENRY.—Can you say of your own knowledge whether some of these were printed long ago?—Yes, I can show you a whole lot of them.

5126. Can you give us an example now?—You see I tried to handle the subjects from my mind altogether.

5127. The CHAIRMAN.—There is one other point. You think it is not a wise regulation to have teachers in small schools prevented from rising beyond the third grade?—Certainly, I think there is no man that deserves promotion more than the teacher of a small school teaching alone, a man satisfied to stop in some wild place; and another thing I would also say, that in the places where these small schools are, the teacher has no chance of doing anything to increase his emoluments, whereas a man in a town or city can often supplement his school salary.

5128. Then do you think that it is in the rural districts where it is most desirable that a good and efficient teacher should be located?—I think that there is no place where a trustworthy man or woman is more required.

5129. For instance, in towns, those who wish for more advanced education have the intermediate schools that they can attend?—Yes.

5130. But if the children in a rural district cannot get education in the National School, they cannot get it at all?—Quite so. The National School has to serve the whole purpose.

5131. Is not that so?—Yes, and they are entirely dependent on the schools, and most of the pupils are poor, though there are some children of well-to-do people.

5132. Of course, as against that, the responsibility of managing seven or eight classes of boys, and organising a big staff, is greater, and the ability is greater, too, that is needed for that than for a small school?—Yes.

5133. Mr. HENRY.—I am not asking at all that the teacher in such a school should be appointed under the same conditions to the first division of first grade, but what I do think is, that it is a hardship that he should be limited to the third grade, or that a man cannot get into the second grade unless he has thirty pupils, and that he cannot get into the second division of first grade unless he has an average of fifty pupils. While I would not ask that he should be put into the first division of the first grade, I think that the limitation is drawn too close; in other words, that the

1st April, 1915.]

Mr. EOWEN DOWLING examined.

children of those rural schools ought to have an opportunity of having a good teacher, inasmuch as they have no other means of education available to them. Then you have been questioned very fully by the Chairman on some of the changes that you would suggest; but there is one point that I think has not been brought out. Would you think it desirable that each inspector should get a district like formerly?—Yes.

5125. And that he should be left there?—Yes.

5126. For a sufficient time to become acquainted with all the schools of the district, and also for a sufficient time to be held responsible for the state of the district?—Yes, I would leave him there permanently.

5127. For six or ten years; and if there is any fault in the district, or anything amiss, he can be held personally responsible?—I was twelve years in the Galway District, and then got my chance of going to Cork, or staying there for more time. I knew every school perfectly; I could tell you everything about them, and what was the character of every teacher, not alone as a school teacher, but in his private life.

5128. But under the present arrangement the inspector has practically no responsibility?—Exactly, and will take no interest. That was my district, and I wanted it to be equal to any other district in Ireland, as far as I could make it, and I gave every help to do that, and I was well seconded by the teachers. I found them most faithful and trustworthy men and women.

5129. You knew the teachers personally?—Yes.

5130. You knew their worth?—Yes.

5131. The CHAIRMAN.—And is it your deliberate conviction that under the present system the inspectors do not know the teachers well, and do not take an interest in the system?—They do not, and they cannot.

5132. Mr. KAVANAGH.—Now, with respect to that change in 1900 from results to inspection and grading, instead of classification, I did not quite make out from Mr. Henly's examination of you whether the teachers had suffered an actual loss of salary through that change?—No, they did not suffer any immediate loss.

5133. Actual loss I will call it?—But they lost the prospect of the comparative rapidity with which they could get promotion. Under the old scheme the teacher could get it in a few years. I was first of first class teacher when I was twenty-three years of age, and under the new system I would be fifty-four at least.

5134. The CHAIRMAN.—At what age did you reach the highest point?—I was first of first class at twenty-three.

5135. Mr. KAVANAGH.—Then the change was only a stoppage in advancement?—Yes. They started with whatever the salary might be. Supposing it was £54 8s. 6d., the teacher got an additional £1 to begin with; that is, he got £55, and then he was, of course, at no loss. He got a few shillings on the first year, and then if he got his increment, he would not be at any loss at all for a couple of years; but it was the prospective thing that all went overboard; that the rapid promotion that he was entitled to under the old system was all gone and swept away.

5136. I take it that you are not in favour of a return to the results system?—No, and I was not in favour of the results system. I combated it.

5137. The BISHOP OF ROS.—Was that at the end or at the beginning?—At the beginning, before it was started.

5138. Mr. HENLY.—And at the end, too, I think, before the Manual Commission?—I always fought against that mode of payment. I had no objection to the examination. The examinations were very effective in securing the attendance of the children, and getting the teachers to work with more energy. The system had certainly a great deal of advantage in that way, but the programme was overweighed, and the mode of payment was not a fair one; it was too uncertain.

5139. Mr. KAVANAGH.—But how can an inspector report on a school without examination—you did not like the results system, and yet, when the other system comes on, how can an inspector report on the school without examination? Remember, the results system

was a system of payment by examination?—The results system was a system of payment; but before the results system came on at all the schools were examined every year, and every boy in the class was examined. Under the results system the marks of every child in every subject were put down.

5140. The CHAIRMAN.—It was payment for every individual pupil?—Yes.

5141. In each subject?—Yes.

The child was worth so much in geography, so much in arithmetic, and so on?

Mr. HENLY.—Yes.

5142. Mr. KAVANAGH.—The results were merely examination, or merely so?—Oh, no; a report was also given on the tone and discipline and order of the school.

5143. The CHAIRMAN.—Did you report on the building and equipment in those days?—Yes.

5144. Mr. KAVANAGH.—Examination was the chief point?—Only for the payment.

5145. There is a sentence I do not quite understand in your statement, in which you say that under the present regime inspectors are subject to coercion of a very irregular and miscellaneous kind. What, exactly, do you mean by that?—I mean that they are dictated to as to the writing of reports, and I gave you a proof of my own there in letters that were dictated to me. I consider that a most mischievous thing, dictating to me as to topics that I was to write on, and the kind of opinion that I was to give upon them, because it was made plain enough there that I was on no account to say anything that would look like condemnation of the success of the present scheme.

5146. That was the scheme since 1900?—Yes.

5147. The present system. You were, you say, actually dictated to?—I consider that dictation. Of course, I could give you a great deal more about it.

5148. Who dictated to you?—Dr. Scallie.

5149. Now about the managers, you say that there was an alteration of their position brought about by the Commissioners?—There were new rules. Any rules that would apply to managers I think should never be changed except with the consent of the managers. The managers had to sign a document, saying they undertake the management of the school under these conditions, the conditions of the rules, and the rules are sent to them, and they bind themselves accordingly to them.

The CHAIRMAN.—Mr. Dowling has stated, in answer to me, that the rule stated that the managers were expected to organise periodic examinations of the schools under their charge, and that that was a quite recent thing.

5150. Mr. KAVANAGH.—I see. That is the alteration that you mean?—Yes, and the giving of prizes, and requiring the inspectors to come into collision with them. That was what I complained of most.

5151. But that was only the expression of a wish, for the Commissioners have no actual power over the manager?—It began by saying that it was desirable, and then they put it in the next issue of the rules as an order.

5152. But an order which could not be enforced?—But still an order. They wanted the inspectors to be involved in friction, and if the inspectors once got into friction in a general way with the managers, they might as well throw up the whole thing.

5153. You say in your statement that the recent outcry against examinations is the natural result of employment of examiners who are not educationalists. You mean that the examiners ought to be inspectors or teachers?—They ought to understand the circumstances of the whole school and of the children adapting the examinations to the circumstances of the whole children, and I found a number of inspectors that had a fancy for putting difficult, cranky questions.

5154. Now, Rule 106(d), you say, could be easily altered so as to oppress a teacher. That rule is—"Teachers whose schools have declined in efficiency, owing to their neglect of private study, may be examined as a test of fitness for continued recognition." Now, will you tell me how?—I think I have stated that already. You see one of these cracks may be

offended with a teacher. The teacher may fall into his displeasure in some way or other, and he will say, "Your school has deteriorated. You must come on to me next Saturday to be examined, to see if you are fit to be continued." That is what one of these cracks will do.

5155. But still you must have some sort of hold on the teacher?—That is stated to be for neglect of study, but how is the inspector to know that it is due to the want of study?

5156. Then there is another rule you take exception to, 124(c), with regard to the teacher not being at liberty to promote pupils?—The rule is, that no child can be promoted except at the beginning of the school year, and it is only at that time that a pupil can be promoted. Now, if I were teaching a school again, and I found a boy fit to work in a higher class, with more benefit to himself than he could in the lower class, why should I not put him up at once where he would get the benefit of the promotion?

5157. During the middle of the year?—Yes. It is only for exceptional boys. I did it in my own experience as school master, but it can be done very rarely.

The *Bosser or Ross*.—You have the present rule in all the University courses and Medical courses and Intermediate courses and Theological courses, and everywhere. I merely point out the custom, and when a boy enters the intermediate system in the Junior Grade, he will be examined in no other grade, and you have to keep him there for a year.

Mr. HENRY.—Could he not be promoted to the Senior Grade without passing through the Middle?

The *Bosser or Ross*.—But you cannot promote him in the middle of the year. If he starts his studies in the Junior Grade on the 1st of September, and by the 1st of December you consider him an exceedingly clever boy, it is impracticable to send him to the higher grade then.

5158. Mr. HENRY.—When I met good boys in my experience of teaching, I often promoted them at the end of the half-year to a new class?—There is no reason why this rule should be made except some very unlikely thing occurs.

5159. The *Bosser or Ross*.—But you must spend three years before taking your B.A., and in the Medical School five years in taking your first medical, second medical, and so on. You told us that you did not approve of the marks system, and you also told us, I think, that what you objected to in it was the mode of payment?—Yes.

5160. But I think you mentioned that one strong point of the system was that it made the teachers work well?—It put a lot of energy into the schools.

5161. But the great points were that it made the teachers and the children work?—Yes.

5162. And the principal weak point from your point of view was that it was a questionable mode of payment?—Yes, and that the programme was overloaded in a mechanical direction, or what I call a mechanical direction—that is, in the direction of what could be taught by rote. There was too much of that, and it did not leave time enough for teaching the school intelligently.

5163. What effect had it on the minds of the children and the intellect of the generation?—I do not see that it had any injurious effect at all events, but I consider that the system before it was better still.

5164. If the system became mechanical, as you seem to say, do you think you could have a mechanical system of teaching that would not be injurious to the intellect of the nation?—No, when it has too much of what is mechanical in it, because there is a great deal of rote work with the children. The minds of children of tender age are gifted with word-memory such as we have not in after age, and we take advantage of that, and we commit an immense deal of matter to rote, and by degrees the culture of the intelligence grows up, and there may be too much attention to mechanical teaching—for instance, in geography, where they had to commit names of places to memory, and there have also certain pieces of poetry to commit to memory, and in the grammar also there was a good deal of rote work, and that kind of teaching of the memory.

5165. The CHAIRMAN.—It was forced?—Oh, yes, and there was too much arithmetic.

5166. The *Bosser or Ross*.—Too much of mere positiveness at test cricket?—Yes, too much of that, and of difficult questions.

5167. And too little of what you have mentioned there, of the consecutive teaching of arithmetic?—Yes, and of intellectual teaching.

5168. Your idea of arithmetic is, that you should take up a particular rule, and teach that rule consecutively, and get the boys to understand the principles and practice of the rules, and then pass on to something else, and that a boy well trained in arithmetic in that way would be well fitted for any ordinary avocation, but in the results examinations system there were bundles of these cards spread before the children, and they spent their time in solving these test cards. And do you think that was a good system?—It was mischievous. On one occasion there a question was asked in arithmetic which was a very difficult one, and when I asked the boy how he arrived at the solution, he said the teacher had told him that that was the answer.

5169. Arithmetic taught in that way did not always remain in the minds of the boys after leaving school?—No.

5170. The foundation was not well laid?—I must say that in my district they did very well in mental arithmetic.

5171. During the results period?—During the results period. I had an Englishman going round with me one day, and he took a lot of interest in it, and knew a lot of English schools. We went into the school of Ballinacree in the very middle of Connemara, one of the very wildest spots in Ireland. I began to ask questions in mental arithmetic, and he said, "Would you mind my asking, for I am very fond of mental arithmetic?" So he began, and asked a little girl of twelve or thirteen, and very soon he had to ask me if her answer were correct.

5172. And that was very gratifying both to you and the Irish child?—It was, yes. He was from near Liverpool, and he said me that he never heard such pure English spoken in any of the rural schools in England as he heard there in Connemara.

5173. Under the results system was the teacher rewarded for that mental arithmetic?—No, there was no reward.

5174. Because it did not come under the formal examinations?—No. I got good work done, because wherever I could relieve them of what was not of much value, I took the reins into my own hands, and encouraged them to do what was good for the children, and they co-operated with me.

5175. But will not the examinations finally affect the teaching?—Oh, yes; and they did. They had to work for the marks that the money would be paid for.

5176. And if there was no money paid for mental arithmetic, would it be right in assuming that the tendency would be in the great bulk of the schools not to pay much attention to it?—It would not pay at all.

5177. And if it was taught in your district it was owing to your personal influence, it was not owing to the system?—No. I just told them that we ought to do the best we could.

5178. You referred to grammar more than once. Do you think that grammar, under the results system, became somewhat mechanical too?—Yes, the parsing. I never found that parsing led to anything. Grammar was all parsing, and it never helped anyone to write correctly. And this is what I did in Connemara in Irish-speaking places, in all the schools around there. I got them to have a half hour devoted to conversation, just chatting to the teacher, and getting all the children to talk about anything.

5179. I quite agree with you that parsing was very mechanical?—Yes.

5180. It was my experience to find a great number of boys who could parse with absolute accuracy, but when I came to try to get them to learn the rudiments of Latin and French, they had no conception of what the cases meant. They could not apply their knowledge to the new language they wanted to learn—for instance, as to what is set down in the grammar as cases?—Analysis is really what should be taught.

1st April, 1913.]

Mr. EDWARD DOWLING examined.

[Continued.]

5181. Have they not in the new system taken up and given a good deal of attention to analysis in 1906?—I cannot speak on that point. Of course, analysis is a difficult thing to teach.

5182. But analysis, too, in my opinion, might become mechanical—It might, but still it is better.

5183. The real thing aimed at is to try to get them to understand what they read, and to read intelligently?—Quite so.

5184. Did you notice that the reading was physical and somewhat mechanical also under the results system—I mean that a person read, pronouncing the words correctly, and making fairly intelligent pauses, and with a certain amount of intonation, but there was not a clear set of ideas running through his mind?—I was constantly reporting on that, and I came into collision with Sir Patrick Kenan over it.

5185. That was my experience?—The whole fault of that was that the books were entirely unsuitable. We had a sixth class book. I sent up one page of that with the amount of annotation that was necessary to explain it.

5186. The CHAIRMAN.—Were those books compiled by Archbishop Whately?—No.

5187. But he did compile books?—It was an address from Sir Robert Kane on some geological question, and there were then historical references and economical references and social references that these children would have no knowledge at all of, and I pointed out that, and then when I repeated it a second or a third time in the general report, Sir Patrick Kenan said to Dr. Newell, who knew me intimately, "Downing is nagging again of this thing, and is beginning to be troublesome." Dr. Newell said, "Downing would not do that unless he felt very strongly on the point, and there must be some very good reason for it, and I will put it to the test this evening, and will tell you to-morrow." And we went down from the office to the Head Master of the Central Model School, and he got a box of four or five or six books, which he brought home that night, and he had two of his own daughters fresh home after finishing their education in some of the best schools in England, and he sent over for the two daughters of Mr. Fitzgerald, the head inspector (and his two daughters were back also fresh from one of the highest class schools), and he examined these four young ladies on some of those lessons, and he told me a few days afterwards, "You are quite right; neither my daughters nor the Misses Fitzgerald could explain those books at all—they were quite hopeless."

5188. But do you think that the system of teaching had anything to do with it—that boys and girls, although the matter was simple, still had not a current of ideas running through their minds—I attribute it to the difficulty of the books. It was impossible to explain the lessons. They were far beyond them.

5189. But then did you find that when you came down to the small children in the first, second or third class where you had not these difficult books?—Oh, yes, the second was all right, and I think the third was all right, too.

5190. As far as I gather, all the teacher was bound to do was to have these children pronounce the words, and the inspector had no right to ask?—He had at all times the right of testing whether they understood what they were reading.

5191. I gather that he had the right of testing in as far as he could ask what was the meaning of the word, and that was all?—He had a right to test.

5192. Mr. BRYAN.—He had the right of testing whether they really understood the subject?—He had the right at all times of testing, of course. If he did not he was not doing his duty. I always sought from the beginning to pick out a suitable lesson, if it was in the book, and I would go quietly through it to see did they grasp the meaning, and get them to put the same thing in their own words.

5193. The BRYAN or ROSE.—If at the results examination children read all this mechanically well, but you saw that they did not understand the subject matter, would you pass them or reject them?—I would pass them if they read pretty fluently.

5194. Were you bound to pass them?—I think so.

5195. If you were bound to pass that child, was not that an invitation to the teacher merely to go through the mechanical work of teaching that child?—Yes, but I examined carefully, I know, in my own district, and they took much trouble to please me.

5196. But suppose there was an inspector that did not adopt your plan?—It would not be taught.

5197. Even if they were reading intelligently it was your personal influence, and not the influence of the system?—Certainly we did our best. We had to face enormous difficulties. It was an Irish-speaking place, and they had to be introduced to their reading of English.

5198. You will be prepared to admit that there were districts where the reading was not done intelligently?—Oh, I think there were. Even in my own district at first I complained in the general report several times of the want of intelligence.

5199. And the results system established no corrective for that kind of reading?—No, it rather led to it. Of course, it is a great matter for the child to be able to read, and to say the words in the small books, but the mere recognition of the words costs a lot of time also, and there is something gained in that. I had a curious experience in a new school that was opened in a very wild part of Galway. A very good woman was put in charge of it. There were about between thirty and forty children in the school, and three of them spoke some English. Their father kept a small shop or store, and his wife spoke English, and the children came to the school, and they were there at the first regular examination I held at that school. Every child could name the word in the primer as fast as I could point to it. I was amused at that, and then I wanted to see if they understood, and I found that they did not know one bit. What I did was to ask in Irish "What is the Irish of that?" while pointing to the word, but they did not know. They did not know "cat" or "dog."

5200. When they pronounced the word "cat," the idea of the animal never came into their minds?—No, but they pronounced it right enough. I said to the teacher that was of no value, and I put her to teach them by showing them the object in the school, first to show them the object, and then to join with that the translation, and to translate the words in the book.

5201. You think that in a great many ways the results system led to mechanical teaching?—It tended that way.

5202. We had two views of education put before us here by different witnesses, two distinct views, and in a general way one view was that education was storing up knowledge, and it was the stored-up knowledge that was to be tested by detailed examination, and the great object that the teacher had before his mind was the storing up of the knowledge. Of course, incidentally, there would be in most instances a certain amount of intellectual and mental development, and in some instances there might not be any mental development at all, in fact rather a tendency to lead to mental paralysis. The other view was that the object of education was to try to develop the faculties, and you had to use the acquisition of knowledge in this way—that a certain amount of knowledge was required, and you would use the knowledge as a means for developing the mind and the intellect. Which of the two views do you say is the right one?—I think either one or the other would be wrong. I think a proper mixture of the two and a blending of the two is the right system. If the Socratic method spoken of in that memorandum were adhered to largely, the child would have a very small acquisition of knowledge in seven years at school.

5203. It would mean waiting till the child would be able to discover all the things that were discovered by Newton and all the great thinkers of the day, waiting till the child's mind would develop?—Oh, course, there must be something of that, but very little of it.

5204. Take that method of teaching you described in the West of Ireland. No doubt these children had

1st April, 1913.]

Mr. KENNETH DOWNING examined.

[Continued.]

a considerable amount of trouble and labour, physical trouble and labour (I am applying the word "physical" to the mind as well as to the body) in learning off all these words. Now, do you think that that reading had a stupefying effect on their minds or a clarifying effect?—It had no injurious effect at all. That must be done all along. They must learn that. They recognised the words.

5205. So that you do not think that the forcing of a quantity of undigested knowledge into the mind could injure the mind?—I do not think so.

5206. Then you would not agree to analogy of forcing a quantity of food into the body which the body could not digest—you would not admit the analogy that the same thing could occur with regard to the development of the mind?—I do not think that there is any analogy in the case. There is a boy, say, learning to recognise each of these words by rote. That is one act. The recognition of the meaning and the right shades of the meaning are quite distinct things.

5207. And would you wish to keep the two things distinct, for instance, when you were teaching the child to take the three letters together, and to get the sound "cat" out of those three letters, would you keep that as a separate and distinct process?—No, certainly I would join the two together. I get this woman to do that, and she did it admirably afterwards by means of objects.

5208. Suppose the teacher did not join the two, but kept them distinct, and kept on squeezing knowledge into the mind of that child, would that child's mind be improved?—I do not think so. When they are very young the word-memory is very strong and very developed, and it is very easy to get a child to learn any number of words or rhymes then without any meaning. A child will commit any quantity of jingling words to memory, little ballads or memory rhymes, without any trouble, and they will remain in their memory all their lives.

5209. The memory develops much more easily than the intellect?—That is what I say.

5210. And therefore you use the memory of the child to some extent, and you might find that if you use the memory of the child too much you are using the memory to the detriment of the intellect?—I do not think so.

5211. So that you would not admit the possibility that if you go on teaching the memory without any appeal to the intellect their minds will get top-sided, and their intellect will never develop properly?—They have lost time.

5212. They have lost the faculty?—I do not say that. That would be the case of a child whose memory was over-developed, and who was taught to rely on his memory altogether.

5213. Now have you come across in your life people with memory so greatly developed that they never would use their intellect at all?—I never met any case of want of intellect attributable to the over-development of the memory. I have met cases such as you have referred to, but I have not been able to attribute it to that.

5214. I have met cases also, and I have attributed it to the fact that such a man in his boyhood was allowed to rely on his memory too much, and was not compelled to use his intellect, and therefore he got into the position that he was unable to use it. Suppose I hold that theory, what would you say to that?—What I think is, that every child uses instinctively and of his own accord every power of intelligence he has, and he discovers for himself and tries to get knowledge through his curiosity. If you give him a toy he wants to know what is in the inside of it, and he smashes it. Nearly every child shows that curiosity of inquiry, and I would therefore infer that though there are people that answer your description, they never had any brains.

5215. You have described the child and its curiosity. Now do you not think that in a system of education it would be a very good thing to work upon that natural tendency?—Yes, and every teacher has to do it. We have to work on that.

5216. So that it comes to this more or less, that you stick a book into the hands of the child, and told the child to learn the alphabet that had not the slightest interest for him, and that brought nothing into his mind?—They should be always taught in as reasonable a way as possible.

5217. Do you say that the natural bent of the child is the reasonable way, and that there should be something beyond reading, writing, and arithmetic that we could teach them reasonably?—I give myself as a test. Books were very costly articles in my young days, and we used to exchange books in the school, and in exchange for some books I got a little Scotch catechism of physical science, and I worked every experiment that was in it, and that led to the prosecution of that study all my life, just getting a little book for a trifle from a boy.

5218. So therefore you think that is the proper method?—I merely mean that I thought that of great advantage to me, and I was always an advocate for having something more of elementary science and putting boys in the way of being taught it.

5219. It is not in elementary science that a child shows curiosity—little girls show an interest in dolls' houses and boys in hobby horses?—I think most of them are disposed to break them up to see how the thing is worked, and in one of my general reports I suggested that one of the very best things would be the making of mechanical toys—that it would employ the hands and cultivate the intelligence at the same time.

5220. Therefore you were in favour of some hand-and-eye training?—Yes, but I certainly was not in favour of the kind of hand-and-eye training that was introduced.

5221. But you were in favour of the principle?—I was.

5222. And you would encourage the younger children in doing these mechanical things?—I wrote that a mechanical toy is the origin of a great machine. The steam engine was in the embryo stage only a toy, and the electric telegraph only a toy, and so on; and these, in simple ways, could be made in every school, and then I suggested that it might develop into the manufacture of toys in this country.

5223. So therefore I think it is pretty plain that in principle you thought the development of mind and powers of observation, and all that, was sound education?—Yes.

5224. And that in a popular system of elementary education affecting the whole country it was of more importance than storing the mind with a knowledge of geography?—Yes, and I also pointed out that the children were showing signs of that. I got every child to write one day in the school what business they would like to go to, and they always said they would like to be a clerk or something in that way. The reason they gave was that it was easy and clean, and I drew attention to that.

5225. And do you think that the system of education is in any way to blame for that?—It has no tendency to cause it, but under the old system we had a lot of mechanical science and natural science, and I taught it practically in Linerick Model School, and I can show you a very pleasing proof of it in the case of one of my old pupils who lives in Glasgow at present as a civil engineer. He was out in Chili (he was second engineer under the chief engineer), and the Government there wanted a workshop lighted up with electricity, and gave the order to the chief engineer. The chief engineer came to my old pupil, and he said, "We have got to put up an installation of electric lighting. Do you know anything about it?" He said, "I know a little, and we ought to be able to manage it," and he succeeded. And he said to me, "I knew nothing whatever but what I learned from you."

5226. I gather that it is your opinion that, so far as a system of education could effect it, it would be desirable that the minds of the youth of the country should not be set upon deadships and gentlemanly occupations of that kind?—No; of course, they should be directed in the rural schools to agriculture as much as possible, and I urged Mr. Heller, when I was chief inspector, to draw up a suitable course for the country



1st April, 1915.]

Mr. EDWARD DOWNS examined.

[Continued.]

schools on agricultural lives, and he said he did not know that he would be qualified to do it.

3227. I believe it is easy to teach some general agriculture in the schools of the country with the object of securing the minds of the boys in that direction?—What I would aim at in the school would be to make them competent to read intelligently treatises on the subject. There are a lot of papers and periodicals that give instruction on farming matters to one able to read them intelligently. Then a farmer needs to understand articles on the markets, and I would go in for giving school-boys that knowledge.

3228. I read with great interest an address delivered by Professor Culverwell to the Teachers' Congress here last week. He says that the people who devised the National system of education in the beginning were literary men whose learning was all from books; they were men who and things and thought things, but some of them were men who made things. They lived at a time when most thought that all knowledge was contained in books, and so it could all be learned from books, but everybody knew now that there was much that could not be learned from books?—I do not agree with that.

3229. And that there is much that must be learned by action. You do not agree to that?—Well, you can learn anything from books, and you can do the action yourself. That is what I had to do.

3230. But you want to train the children of the whole nation to be useful in life afterwards?—No doubt that is quite correct.

3231. Men know now that even in intellectual matters the knowledge which they have gained was by reaching things in action with a certainty and balance which book-learning could seldom attain?—That is right.

3232. They did not then realise that besides science real action was required to enable a person to perform well their every-day work, whether it is that of a rural labourer or a man-of-all-work?—That is right.

3233. Therefore your idea would be that that is what we should aim at?—Yes.

3234. And would you hold that it would be a national disaster if they wanted all to become clerks?—Of course it would.

3235. Would you agree with me that the results system of examinations where every boy and every girl in the country was able to say that he or she passed an examination was one that made the children proud, and made the parents think that they were very clever because they had passed the examination, and that they should be something more than rural labourers or farmers or fishermen—that that had something to do with helping on this idea?—I dare say, and the notion of passing examinations gave them a false view.

3236. And then the intermediate system came in, and they went on to pass higher examinations?—Yes.

3237. And all those who passed examinations wanted to be something more than manual workers, and that being so, do you think there might be some national disadvantages in the revival of a formal examination system (I am talking of a formal examination in every school in which every child would be examined), where the Inspector would go and hold a formal examination on a fixed date, when there would be a two-days' examination, and the Inspector would examine all the children in all the subjects, and where it would be known that these children have passed or failed—do you think that that might help to continue this evil that we are discussing?—I think if you were to make it an examination without having the marks at all the thing would continue.

3238. In your opinion there should be no idea that the children had passed or failed—you would not specify any particular child as having passed or failed?—Oh, no, but I certainly think it would be of very great importance to examine the highest pupils, those who would be going on.

3239. But you would not agree to a universal examination of the whole school?—I would leave it to the

Inspector himself, and let him spend a day in the school.

3240. And would you not agree with me that this might have that bad national effect?—If it was a case of every mark being given in the case of passing the examination, I do not intend that at all; I merely mean it as the strict test of the value of the school to take the boys, and see what they are, and what they were, and how long they were at the school.

3241. When the inspectors held the formal results examination, did it take two or three days to examine seventy or eighty children?—Seventy or eighty would be examined in a day.

3242. But a great deal of the Inspector's time was taken up with the formal examination?—Yes.

3243. And then he had to report on the other elements connected with the school, and he would have nearly three hundred schools in his district?—No, I had the biggest district, I think, in the country, and that was 154.

The CHAIRMAN.—It is 160 or 150 now.

3244. The BARNOR or ROSE.—If the Inspector had to spend a day in the school, and if you take 160 schools, it would pretty well exhaust the work of the year?—Yes.

3245. Mr. COTTEY.—Were there not 34 or 36 days available in every district for incidental inspections in the old times?—I would certainly have 154 schools, and some of those would take two or three days. Those were only a few, but I suppose I would have about 36 days or so. I know in my very first report in the Totnes district I mentioned the want of time for secondary inspection.

3246. The CHAIRMAN.—I don't know how you had time at all?—It was very severe.

3247. The BARNOR or ROSE.—And if you wanted to give them a friendly encouragement, and if the inspectors were to be of the formal kind, it would limit the time of the inspectors very much with regard to the ordinary class of work?—He should have time for inspecting well, and there is no need of examining a class in every subject. I would leave that to the inspector.

3248. You were very fortunate in being promoted first-of-first at 23, but if you were promoted first-of-first at 23 there were some corresponding men who remained third-of-third till 50, or remained at the lowest salary till the day of their death?—Oh, I suppose some did.

3249. And a considerable number?—I suppose so.

3250. But at present a young man could not suddenly jump to first of first. Is there more general promotion now than there was in the old time?—I dare say there is more. It is a complicated question.

3251. The amount of money spent on teacher's salaries now is immensely more. You are, of course, aware of that?—Yes.

3252. And somebody must be getting it while the number of teachers has increased slightly?—They are better paid.

3253. So it simply comes to this, that at present, as in all other services, no matter how clever a young man is, whether priest or parson, he has to remain a curate for a considerable time?—Yes.

3253a. He does not become an Archbishop straight away?—There is something in that.

3254. You began life, and at twenty-three you were an Archbishop in the service, but corresponding with that, there were plenty of unfortunate men who remained curates to the day of their death, and in not the same proved in all the services—take the Army, will you find any young man of twenty-three a Colonel, not to talk of a General or a Field Marshal? I don't want to traverse your opinion about the appointment of inspectors from the teaching body, but in the Army it is a very common thing for a man that begins in the line to get into high command?—I think it is a very common thing, and I believe they make the best soldiers or the best officers.

3255. But is it a usual thing?—It is only in the case of a small minority.

3256. You discussed the difficulty, and the great difficulties, of what to do with these one-teacher schools, and you mentioned that the number of schools, with an attendance under 25, was about 2,400, I think? Yes, about one-fourth of the whole lot.

3257. And between 25 and 50 there was another fourth?—Yes, more than a fourth; that brings it up to considerably over a half.

3258. What I want to call your attention to is this. Is it not the fact that stating that more than a fourth of the schools of the country are in this difficult or unfortunate position is hardly a fair way of putting it, and would it not be a fairer way of putting it to state the number of children that are in these conditions. Taking 2,400 schools, with an average attendance of under 25, and supposing the average is 25 all round, that would roughly come to 60,000, and that is only one-tenth of the school population, instead of a fourth, and is not the question at issue the number of children who have not proper facilities for education, not the number of schools in which they are?—No; I think it is very much plainer when you say that there are so many schools.

3259. But is it fair, because really what you want to get at is what proportion of the children of the country have proper facilities for education and what proportion of the children of the country have defective facilities for education. It is a question of children and not of the number of schools?—I look upon each of these places as a centre.

3260. But will you attach the same importance to a school of 15 children, a small Protestant school in a Catholic district in the South of Ireland with 15 children, as to a big Protestant school in Belfast with 500 children, if there is such a school, as I suppose there is?—Indeed, there is.

3261. If you come to discuss this question, can you fairly attach the same importance to the fifteen on the one hand as to the 500 on the other?—I see your point; but I think in order to make the thing plain, it was well to give the number of the schools.

3262. You put it in a way that does not convey a correct idea?—It is the aggregate.

3263. Would not the ordinary reader, or an ordinary person reading it, go away with the notion that one-fourth of the children of Ireland have defective facilities for education?—I made out the aggregate of the school.

3264. Supposing you said 100,000 children in Ireland had defective facilities and 900,000 had good facilities, that is quite intelligible. I heard you telling

Mr. Henty, and I quite agree with you, that these one-teacher schools require the very best teachers?—Yes.

3265. Now, you could not get the very best teachers without paying the very best salaries?—Quite so; and, therefore, I would allow them promotion.

3266. Can you find in any service in the world a case in which a man of small position, dealing with a small number of people, will be paid the same salary as a man dealing with a big number of people?—I do not at all say that we would get quite so much in any case. I consider it would be fair enough if the men in these very small schools were allowed to get up one grade, and then the next step to go up to second of first grade, and so on.

3267. Now, the children cost about £8 a head all over the country, and if we were to carry out the policy you suggest, you might have some of these children costing £10 or £15 a head in some of these small schools?—Yes; it might be so.

3268. Can you conceive that happening, that that could be sanctioned by any body of administrators responsible for public money?—I can very well conceive the National Board suggesting it, but I cannot conceive that any man having the purse strings of the nation would do that?—I think if a statesman understood the circumstances he should certainly allow some advancement.

3269. Are not at the present time the children in the small schools costing 50 per cent., and sometimes 100 per cent., more than the children in the big schools?—Perhaps so. I have not made the calculation.

3270. And to carry out your system they might cost 500 per cent. more. Do you think it possible?—I do not think that what I have suggested would be too much to give them.

3271. Then you leave yourself, so far as the question before us is concerned, in an illogical position?—Oh, I know that there would be a considerable sum of money required for it.

3272. Take a school of 30 children. You say at present they must remain under a teacher of third class, and we ought to give him a step, and let them have a second class teacher. Now, suppose that was done, does your logic still urge you on to say why should the children be deprived of the benefit of a first class teacher, and won't you be then driven on to give them a first-class teacher, and suppose you have a second of first will not the same argument apply; why should we deprive them of the benefit of a first of first?—Oh, yes; but the expense would not be so considerable, and the argument against it is only the expense.

## ELEVENTH DAY.—WEDNESDAY, APRIL 2ND, 1913.

At 25, Kildare-street, Dublin.

PRESENT:—SIR SAMUEL DILL, M.A., LL.D., LL.D. (Chairman); The Most Rev. DENIS KELLY, D.D., Bishop of Ross; SIR HERAM SHAW WILKINSON, LL.D.; Mr. JOHN COFFEY, Mr. HERACLES E. B. HARRISON, Mr. JEREMIAH HENLY, Mr. WALTER MCMURDOUGH KAVANAGH, D.L., and Mr. THOMAS MICHAEL KETTLER; and

Mr. ARTHUR J. DONNELLY, M.A., B.Sc., Secretary.

Mr. EDWARD DOWLING further examined.

5278. Sir HERAM WILKINSON.—You gave us yesterday, in reply to the Bishop of Ross, some of your views with regard to education generally, and the relative importance of training the memory and training the intelligence. Now I should like to know whether you would agree to this. Considering that the majority of the children that we have to deal with now leave school at fourteen years of age is a desirable, I take it, that on leaving school their intelligence should be developed as far as time will allow, and at the same time that their memory should be stored with such useful information as they can obtain in that time without impeding the development of their intelligence?—I agree to that, but I do not say that the majority leave at fourteen years of age.

5279. And it is important also that they should leave with the power of acquiring further knowledge cultivated and with a taste for acquiring further knowledge also cultivated?—I agree.

5280. You agree to each of those sentences of mine?—Yes, certainly.

5281. And, of course, we all feel impressed with the desirability that during their school time their character generally should be developed to the best advantage?—Of course, it is very desirable, but I do not know that the schoolmaster has much to do with that. He can do a little, and he ought to do a little.

5282. And that as far as the schoolmaster can do it, and subject to all the disadvantages which many of these schools are under, he should aim at the scholars leaving school with character as well formed as possible?—Yes, I certainly agree with that.

5283. Now having the two points for the teacher to obtain in the education of his pupils, the storing of the memory with useful facts, and the cultivation of intelligence, it is a most important matter, is it not, to consider at what period the memory can be stored with the least of what may be described as brain fog, and at what period the intelligence may also be cultivated with as little as possible brain fog (I do not say without effort, because nothing in this life is obtained without effort, but there is effort which may result in brain fatigue, and there is effort which, on the contrary, may leave the pupil at the end inspired), do you agree?—Yes.

5284. Now I suppose that it is desirable that we should take advantage of the experience of the world generally as far as regards the time at which the memory should be trained, and the time at which intelligence should be brought out. Now I think you will agree that there is an age up to which education should not be excessively called upon on the part of a pupil?—Yes, I agree to that, that at the early stage there should be comparatively little demand upon the reasoning power.

5285. I think you said yesterday that during that early stage the memory can be cultivated without any very great fatigue?—I think all educationalists agree about that point, that the memory is very well developed in youth—word-memory—which really means memory without intelligence, and then a child will consent to memory whole passages without having a bit of meaning.

5286. And you will agree that there is a certain advantage in that?—There is.

5287. You discussed with the Bishop of Ross the question of the recognition of words. Well, now I suppose that the example of Chinese, who were educationalists before other countries were civilized, ever dreamt of either education or civilization, might be of some service to us in this matter, and that it might be well to see what they did. We know that they begin with the pupil, and make him learn a book off without knowing the meaning of a single word of it?—I would not follow that example.

5288. You would interfere at an earlier stage. However, there is a reason for that in the case of the Chinese language which does not exist in the case of our language. The Chinese language consists of ideographs, that is to say, the signs they use represent neither symbols nor alphabets, but ideas, concrete or otherwise. They do not make a word with C.A.T., but they have a character which represents a cat. They may do as we do, in a small way, put a character down for "cat," and tell the boys what it means, but the main purpose of their education is this, and it falls in with the general theory which you put forward yesterday, that is, the theory of cultivating the memory at a time when the memory can be cultivated without brain fog. The boy can learn off some of the Chinese classics from beginning to end, so as to repeat them off, and to have them stored in his memory with very little fatigue, whereas if he wished to learn them as he learned his ideographs he never would know the Chinese classics at all. Now it is strange to say that there have been some recent experiments on the subject of children's education that have been in harmony with that, and there are certain things which can be required at that time of his without fatigue, which, if reserved till afterwards, will only be acquired by fatigue and brain fog; and one of the things which Madame De Montessori appears to have discovered in this—that writing can be required at the age of four years without any fatigue upon the child at all, and that it merely becomes a matter of play. Now you would agree that if that experience can be found to be general there would be more time in after years for the development of the intelligence, if the painful process of learning to write could have been got over at four or five years of age?—I do not think it could be got over, but a very good beginning could be made, and a good deal of it done by five years of age.

5289. Well, Madame Montessori has given specimens of the children's writing, and they certainly are most astonishing. The Montessori method is now in the experimental stage, and supposing that Madame Montessori is right in the conclusion which she has arrived at, that writing ought to be taught before reading, and can be taught before reading, it would leave the child with more time for the development of intelligence later on, than if later on he had to sit down and do as you and I, and I suppose all of us here have done, to learn writing with very great plodding and fatigue? Yes, I agree with that in the main. I made elaborate experiments myself on the same lines when I was only an assistant master here in Inchicore. I got a class of small boys who had never written, and I asked them to write nothing but by my directions. I began with a pencil, and got them to draw nicely sketched lines, and so on, and then to make loops, and in about

four months these were able to write a splendid hand—an artistic hand. I used to write a pretty good hand myself, and I took a lot of interest in their graceful writing, and I used to give them this rather ornate writing to imitate, and they did it in about four months.

3285. The CHAIRMAN.—What was the age of the children?—They were the lowest class that we had. There was a separate Infants' School; so we had no Infants. It would be what we would call the second class, the lowest class in the school.

3286. About ten or eleven years old?—They would be about nine, between eight and nine.

3287. Sir HENRY WATKINSON.—That is a most interesting and successful experiment, but you will even agree that suppose that they had learned to write as well before that, the time of their disposal for their training would be a very great advantage to them?—I consider that a very important idea and a very practical one. I quite agree with the general idea, and I think it very important.

3288. Now I gather from you, and it would seem to be a very generally entertained idea, that under the new system the memory has not, if I may put it thus, been stored sufficiently; that under the old system, with all its disadvantages, the man had a larger amount of accumulated knowledge than they have at the present time under the new system?—I agree with that. Of course, that idea runs through all the programme, that it directs attention very prominently to the cultivation of intelligence. Of course, if that were done without any loss to the storing of the memory, it ought to be done, and done as well as possible, but the absence of memory work would leave the children very helpless in their life afterwards.

3289. You agree that, take, for instance, the matter of history, the child when he grows up will, if he has a taste for reading history, benefit more from his history if, when he reads of something happening in Europe at a particular date, he knows at once that that happened in the reign of one of the Kings of England of whom he has read, and of the events of whose reign he has acquired some little general knowledge, instead of having to look up some book of reference to find what was going on in England at that time?—I agree to that, and that is a very good illustration. Of course, every student that has common sense will make out a tabulation of leading epochs, and will divide the whole time of the world into epochs, and have all these fixed on his memory, and it is a most important thing, for then he can refer any incident that he reads of in a newspaper or anywhere else to the time when it occurred approximately enough.

3290. In the matter of geography again we have heard a good deal said about the acquiring of the names of places. If geography were taught intelligently, and the pupil got to know about the influence upon a country of the physical features of the country, and the difference it made whether a country was mountainous or not, and the difference it made whether a country was in high latitudes or low latitudes, you agree that it would be a very great advantage to him afterwards in life in reading of what is taking place elsewhere to be able to know generally not only the general facts of physical geography, but the situation of many of the places of which he had read and the political geography of the country he was reading about, without having to look at books to recall these things to his memory on each occasion?—I quite follow, but I do not see how that can be done early.

3291. I have dealt with those writing experiments so far as they have been carried, and your experiments are in confirmation of them, that writing can be learned early, and you agree that the memory can be stored early. Now the question may arise whether the teaching of physical geography should come after the question of political geography, and whether the child should be able to know the countries of Ireland and the counties of Scotland, and the large towns in them, the leading countries in Europe and the capitals of them, before he is taught how each of these places is influenced by the physical geography of the country?—

That is quite right. I entirely agree that the child wants a lot of memory work. If I want to locate any place it is by the help of an old rhyme that I learned as a school boy that I can identify some of the towns. I can say the best of towns, and see if it is one of them, and I locate it by that, and I have still very frequently to call upon that old school boy memory.

3292. It is an advantage to a man when he reads of Staffordshire that he knows that Birmingham is on the west and Leicester is on the east of it, and that if he goes further east he gets to Rutland and Norfolk. If he could acquire that without any great difficulty, it would assist him?—Any boy before leaving the National School should have that kind of knowledge.

3293. And that kind of knowledge, you agree, can be learned at an early stage?—Oh, yes.

3294. When there is less fatigue on the memory in learning it. Now that boy is called upon to exercise his intelligence upon the lessons before him, and no one can doubt the great importance of what has been pointed out by the Bishop of Hereford, that in the later part of his education his intelligence would be constantly called upon, but he would have a better opportunity of exercising his intelligence, and the teacher a better opportunity of drawing it out if he has not at the same time to apply his memory to facts which he had stored up long before?—You cannot explain a difficult passage to a school boy without bringing forward a whole lot of information that he ought to have by rote if possible, so that he would be prepared for it. That was the fault that I always found with our lesson books, that to understand a page of our advanced lesson books it required a knowledge of a whole lot of things that the child had no previous acquaintance with at all, historical references, social references, and scientific references, and sometimes old linguistic difficulties, to understand the form of a strange word.

3295. Now with regard to infants, it is desirable in the interests of a school in which they are that there should be a certain amount of discipline, because if they are noisy the school generally will suffer, but you will agree also that it is of very great importance both mentally and physically for that child to acquire that sense of discipline with an little didactic work as possible?—Yes, that they should get a training.

3296. And the manual exercises of which we have heard a good deal would be useful for the purpose of teaching the child to occupy itself in an interesting manner, and also occupy itself in a way that will facilitate the use of the hands in anything that may be required thereafter?—That is right.

3297. As an illustration of that you have just now mentioned the fact of putting your young people to draw strokes. Madame Montessori, amongst the implements used by her in her method of training, had figures of squares, triangles, ovals, and so on; and the children amused themselves with a pencil drawing lines to fill these, and were taught to draw the lines in such a way as not to go beyond the outline, and when doing this they managed to acquire the power of using the pencil in such a way that when they came to write they had not to be taught anything about holding the pen, having already got that facility?—That is all right.

3298. But we all agree as to the high importance of the training of the intellect, and I suggest, and you agree with me, I am glad to say, that the storing of the memory is a most important matter for after life, and that that storing of the memory ought to be done at a time when the child can do it without brain fatigue, and that the development of the intellect will be facilitated in after life by the absence of any necessity on the part of the child to devote his time to the storing of his memory or to the doing of those manual exercises which may be a matter of play to him in the years of his infancy?—Oh, yes, and a very tedious matter afterwards.

3299. There is one point with regard to learning to read. Of course, a child's facilities in reading is increased very much if he has already learned to recognize the words?—Yes.

3300. In connection with the question of the time at which memory and intelligence are more easily

2nd April, 1915.]

Mr. EDWARD DOWDING, examined.

examined, it is rather interesting to be informed that Madame Montessori, having her pupils already beginning to write, and thereby learning to read, found that the reading in the first instance was without any great intelligence, and that even the intelligence with regard to matters of reading had to be cultivated gradually. That would be in accordance with your experience of the development of the child's mind?—Yes.

5301. Now, there is another point that you refer to, but a different one, and that is the question of class and grade, and I may say that I myself have not yet been able quite to grasp all the changes that were involved in the abolition of class and in the institution of grade. Do you remember what the different classes were, and what were the salaries assigned to each class?—Oh, yes, there was third class, then second, then second division of first, and then first division first, and there was a different salary for each, a fixed salary for each of these, and the teacher passed from one to another by examination. He had to pass an examination and apply for leave to attend it, and provided there were no black marks against him in the past, he was permitted to attend the examination, and if he passed it, he was then promoted and got an increase of salary.

5302. The HONORABLE MEMBER.—Was there any check on the Board as to the number of promotions?—No.

5303. And how did they arrange their affairs with the Treasury then, because if they promoted too large a number they could not get an increased estimate without the consent of the Treasury?—They had, of course, to get an increase whenever it was required.

5304. But suppose they took it into their minds to promote a very large number, they could not promote them without the consent of the Treasury?—They did not, of course, do that. It was only just according as opportunity offered, and it did not offer very often.

5305. It seems to me that, speaking roughly, they were confined within a certain limit, because if they came with a very large increase in the estimates they got into trouble?—Well, I suppose the Commissioners would give a hint to the inspectors. There was no limit.

5306. The CHAIRMAN.—There was no limit?—There was no limit to the number promoted.

5307. The HONORABLE MEMBER.—But there must have been in practice, though not down in the rules?—I never heard of it.

5308. Sir HERMAN WILKINSON.—The point, I suppose, is that, that the numbers that presented themselves for promotion were not so great as to call for any increased demand upon the Treasury?—I suppose that was it, but I can only tell you the fact, and I never knew of any departure from it, and I never knew of any pressure being put.

The HONORABLE MEMBER.—You must automatically just have kept within the limits of the grant, because nobody knows better than you that the Board would have immediately been pulled up, and in any service the same thing happens.

5309. Mr. HESLEY.—But as soon as the Training Colleges were established the classification of teachers went up by leaps and bounds without any restriction or limitation whatever, and that can be seen by looking at the reports?—Just so.

5310. Mr. COFFEY.—There are certain numbers, as we understand it, now fixed between the Treasury and the Board?—As I understood it, there was nothing like that at all. There was nothing like that ever before.

5311. The CHAIRMAN.—Do you happen to know whether we could ascertain the comparative numbers of men in the first class under the old system and in the first grade under the new?—Yes, that would be very easy to get from the reports.

The HONORABLE MEMBER.—That document which Mr. Hesley was examining from yesterday gave it.

5312. Sir HERMAN WILKINSON.—I take it that the numbers in the different classes in 1899 before the new scheme came into effect are those given in paragraph 35 of the Commissioners' Report for 1899, the 65th Report of the Commissioners; and that the

salaries assigned to each teacher, that is to say, the fixed salaries, not taking into account the results scheme, are those set out in paragraph 23 of the same report?—Yes.

5313. It was proposed that under the new scheme the numbers in the first grade and first section should be 200 men and 250 women; in the first grade, second section, 1,000 men and 750 women; that the second grade should consist of 2,450 men and 1,800 women; that is 450 altogether in the first section of first grade as against 1,195 in 1899?—That is right.

5314. That is the number in the first division of first class for the year 1899?—Yes.

5315. That there should be 1,800 in the second section of the first grade instead of 1,618 in the second division of the first class?—Yes.

5316. And that there should be 4,350 in the second grade instead of 5,491 in the second class?—Yes.

5317. And the numbers in the third grade were estimated at 5,330 instead of 3,814 in the third class?—Yes.

5318. Was it admitted that there would be a loss of £30,000, or at least that the cost of the new system would be £30,000 less than the amount that was then actually paid to the teachers?—Yes.

5319. Sir HERMAN WILKINSON.—Now by referring to the Appendix to the 65th Report of the Commissioners, that is, the report for 1900, I find the rules specially applicable to principal and assistant teachers appointed prior to the 1st of April, 1900. In paragraph 37 it appears that for principal teachers, who were in the service as principal teachers before the 1st April, 1900, the following special arrangements are made for joining the new grades. Now the first special arrangement (a) is, "Principal teachers of any class in schools with an average attendance of ten, but under twenty, having incomes, exclusive of residential allowance, less than the grade salary assigned in Rule 11 for Third Grade teachers, receive an initial salary from the 1st of April, 1900, the grade salary so assigned for Third Grade teachers." I wonder if you could assist us in telling us what effect upon teachers who were in the service as principal teachers before the 1st of April, 1900, this rule had. What would be the effect upon a teacher with an average attendance of under twenty and over ten under these conditions?—He gets the 25s.

5320. No matter what class he belongs to, although he may have been first-of-first, if he, at the end of 1899, was in a school with under twenty he would get that?

Mr. HESLEY.—He could not be first-of-first in a school of under twenty. In order to get first class salaries he required an attendance of 25 under the old system. Now previous to 1899 every student in training, on the completion of his course, and the passing of his examination successfully, was placed in second class—when the grade system was introduced, no matter what his qualifications, he was placed in the Third Grade?—That is correct.

5321. And the class of teachers that were then in training and that were summoned to training on the understanding that they could leave the Training College in a second class, complained bitterly that their prospects were taken away from them, that although they entered the Training College upon a course of training under one set of rules, a new set of rules applied to them when they were coming out?—Yes.

Mr. HAMILTON.—In fact it was made retrospective.

5322. Mr. HESLEY.—It was made retrospective. I think some of the teachers in the small schools fared better under the new system than under the old?—That is my own impression also, but I am not absolutely certain about it.

5323. Sir HERMAN WILKINSON.—We are on the subject of the operation of (a). Although it says "Principal teachers of any class," you say that there are practically some classes to which that could not apply?—No.

5324. It could not apply to the first class, although it says "any class"?—No.

5325. The point is, what is the highest class to which that applies?

2nd April, 1933.]

Mr. EDWARD DOWNING, examined.

[Continued.]

Mr. HENLEY.—I think the meaning of it is this, that any teacher, no matter what his classification was, could only get a certain limited salary if he were in a small school.

Sir HIRSH WHITBURN.—What I want to find out is the chance of teachers upon which that operated and might have operated detrimentally. Was there a possibility of its operating on a teacher of the first division of the first class?

Mr. HENLEY.—Yes, if you could get a teacher of the first division of the first class in such a school it would operate against him, and very properly too.

Sir HIRSH WHITBURN.—You say that that is so?—Yes, and I believe there were cases of that kind, of men who would have been receiving only a third class salary under the old system in a school under 20.

5326. In asking you, Mr. Downing, yesterday with regard to the salaries of men who got first-of-first, I understood that they got the salary whatever school they were in?—No. The payment of the full salary of first-of-first class was dependent upon the number of pupils in the school in which the teacher of first-of-first class was the principal teacher, and that number, so far as I can recollect, was 35, but I would prefer that that number should be checked.

5327. But I think you have said that there were a few cases of men who were first-of-first class who came under the operation of this arrangement (c), and were thereby put under the grade salary assigned to Third Grade teachers?—They would be first class teachers, but they would be *de facto* second of first. That would happen more likely in the case of second of first class. It was put generally that there were some first class teachers, and that would apply to both of these divisions. I am certain that there were some cases of first class teachers, without making a distinction between the first division and the second division of the first class.

5328. Then the special arrangement (b) is "Principal teachers of any class having incomes less than the maximum income (exclusive of residential capitation grant) assigned under Rule 11 for third class teachers are eligible for an increase of income by an increment or by increments, as continued good service salary or otherwise, to the maximum limit of the scale of income so assigned for Third Grade teachers, provided that the average attendance in the schools of such classed teachers is not less than 25."

The CHAIRMAN.—This is the report of 1926, 294c:—"First class salary will not be paid unless the school in which the teacher is employed maintains an annual average daily attendance of at least 85 pupils. Second class salaries will not be paid unless the school maintains an annual average daily attendance of at least 30. Third class salary will not be paid unless the school maintains an annual average daily attendance of at least 20 pupils over 5 and under 15 years of age."?—That is right.

5329. Sir HIRSH WHITBURN.—Those are the rules?—Yes.

5330. The CHAIRMAN.—Then it affected them injuriously to be placed in this way under the new system?—Yes, it was a degradation.

5331. Sir HIRSH WHITBURN.—Then under the special arrangement, under Rule 37, the grade of the teachers was, in many cases, made lower than what their class had been?—That is quite right.

5332. And that affected the teacher in the matter of his rise of salary afterwards under the new system?—Yes, it delayed the chance of increase.

5333. Then it was possible for a man who was in the first class to be put into the Third Grade by the operation of the new rule?—Yes.

5334. And under the old system, men of ability and men doing good work in their schools were able to rise more readily than they are able to do under the new rules?—Yes.

5335. And that the people who suffer most under the new rules are the men of ability who are doing good work in small schools?—Yes.

5336. Now with regard to the inference you drew

from the letter of suspension that you read to us. The inference you drew from that letter was that Dr. Sturges claims that the National Board service is a department in the Civil Service, and that he is the chief of that department, and that he therefore claims the supreme power which, according to the charters and according to all precedents, is vested not in him, but in the Board. Now where can we find the charters?—I think I have the whole of them here. I have no copy of the original letter. I had it, and could not find it now amongst my papers, that is the original letter that was written. The constitution of the Board was made out in the form of a letter to the Duke of Leinster, and that was the beginning of the National Board, and he was appointed in that letter, and named the Chairman of the Board.

The CHAIRMAN.—That is the letter of Mr. Stanley in 1831?—Yes. I think there were two letters. There was a letter and then the constitution. The letter constituting the Board was a distinct thing. There were two charters, and I have the supplementary charter. This is the later one, but in both it is the same. In each case the Resident Commissioner's name just occurs in the order of seniority without any distinction whatever. In the supplementary charters the name of the Right Honourable Sir Alexander Macdonnell appears in the order of seniority amongst the Commissioners without any distinction whatever. In the report of the Royal Commission on Primary Education, Volume 3, page 53, Query 911, Mr. Cowe says:—"I should like to ask you about the gradation of officers of the Board. You have a Resident Commissioner, secretaries, chiefs of inspection, head inspectors, and district inspectors. Is that the gradation of rank?" This was a question to Sir Patrick Keenan, and Sir Patrick's reply was, "I can hardly say that is the exact gradation of rank. I would say the Board, Sir Alexander Macdonnell being its resident member, the secretaries, the chiefs of inspection, the accountants, and the clerks, according to their respective classes." On page 1,048, Volume 4, Query 25, 31, Sir Alexander Macdonnell says:—"Whenever an officer is to be absent—any inspector is to be absent, or head inspector to be absent, or advance to take place among the officers of the Board—the Commissioners are always consulted, and often take an active part; and whenever an important question arises with respect to dismissal or punishment of any officer, they are consulted, and take an active part in the business." Query 33, 312:—"We may understand that that position the system, so far as the Commissioners are concerned, is administered by yourself, and secretaries, and chiefs of inspection?" Sir Alexander Macdonnell's answer was:—"The routine administration of the system is carried on in that way; but whenever, even in the routine administration, anything of importance or of a novel nature takes place, we are always bound to consult the Board, and do so." On page 1,051, Query, 33, 346, is "Who dismisses the clerks?" and Sir Alexander Macdonnell's answer is "The Board." "Would the sub-committee?"—No, we should never venture upon such a thing as the dismissal of a clerk or an inspector." In reply to 33, 352, Sir Alexander Macdonnell states that the sub-committee never ventured to recommend dismissal or non-dismissal in the case of officers like the clerks of the office or inspectors. They leave that entirely to the Board.

5337. Even subordinate clerks?—Yes.

5338. But it is clear that the Resident Commissioner, in that statement, did not claim any precedence as a member of the Board or any power of dismissal over the subordinate clerks of his office?—No, and I think that anyone who studies and goes into the spirit of the idea of the Government in constituting the National Board, would agree with me that the whole idea would be upset if the Resident Commissioner is head of the National Board system as a Government Department. I was suspended for submitting views or comments at the request of Dr. Sturges upon an anonymous document, a purely anonymous document.

5339. Mr. Cowe.—Would you not call it rather an official memorandum which was submitted to you for comment by him?—It had no marks of being official.

Mr. HENLEY.—The title on the top is "Memorandum on the re-organization of the system of payment of salary to the Teaching Staff of National Schools."

5340. Sir HIRSH WILKINSON.—That was the document?—That is the document. I cannot find a copy of the letter suspending me, but it ought to be available in the Education Office.

5341. Mr. CHURCH.—We have it in evidence that you were suspended for the criticism which you furnished of the proposed new scheme of education?—Yes.

5342. And payment of teachers?—Yes.

5343. Callison which you made at the request of the Resident Commissioner?—Yes.

5344. Mr. RAMSAY.—Was there any question of your answer being published, or was it merely made on an official document?—What happened was this. That paper was headed on the outside "Memorandum," and there was no other mark on it but the mark of the printers, "A. T. & Co." and the date, "11/10/06."

5345. But was there anything accompanying that asking for your criticism?—No, I think it was verbally said Mr. Stirling asked me to criticize it. I had no letter with it.

5346. You were asked by him verbally to criticize it?—Yes.

5347. Although you are not quite certain?—It is a good while ago, but I was asked to criticize that document.

5348. And you wrote a criticism?—Yes.

5349. And you sent it to whom?—To the secretary.

5350. It simply went through the ordinary official channels?—Yes, to the Secretary for the Board.

5351. And that was considered to be an act of insubordination, was it?—Yes.

5352. Sir HIRSH WILKINSON.—You have read to us your extracts from the charter. Do you consider that the following is in accordance with the rules then laid down? This is a postscript to a letter put in by one of the witnesses:—"As I am the final authority on details of administration no responsibility rests on any subordinate officer for my acts." The words there, "I am the final authority on details of administration." Do you think those words consistent with the tenor of the charter and of the answers that were given to the Royal Commission with regard to the position of the Resident Commissioner?—Certainly not; quite the reverse.

5353. "And the administration could not go on if my orders are not accepted?"—I never disputed any order no matter how absurd it was. I was asked to write that statement, and I wrote an honest expression of my opinion. My idea was to try to prevent the Commissioners from appearing foolish by adopting so absurd a document as that.

5354. Then the following is also in the letter:—"You know there is a Board Order that even the orders of the secretaries must be obeyed as coming from me or the Board." Were you aware of any Board Order of that sort?—Not a Board Order, I think. I have that letter:—

"ORDER OF NATIONAL EDUCATION, DUBLIN.

"13th January, 1908.

"Sir.—I am directed by the Commissioners of National Education to forward for your information and guidance the subjoined extract from the minutes of the proceedings at their meeting on the 7th inst.—

'All written orders and directions given by the secretaries to any official either of the indoor or of the outdoor departmental staff, or to other officers of the Board, shall be assumed by the officers to whom they shall have been given to have been made by the authority general or special of the Board, or the Resident Commissioner, but this rule shall not enlarge the authority of the secretaries as between them, and the Resident Commissioner and the Board.' Subject to the preceding rule, the secretary, financial assistant secretary and chief inspectors shall be independent of each other, and under the direct authority of the Board and the Resident Commissioner.—I am, sir, your obedient servant,

"E. Dowling, Secy.

"Chief Inspector."

"P. E. LEMARR.

5355. Sir HIRSH WILKINSON.—There is another question I should like to put to you. Under the old system, and up to a certain period, agriculture was taught in the National Schools?—Yes.

5356. And I believe that the experience was that the teaching of agriculture in the National Schools was on the whole, not advantageous?—No, it was badly managed, and was not a success of all. It was merely book knowledge, and there was no practical illustration.

5357. But there is one point connected with agriculture, and it seems to me ought to be considered, if not already considered, in the programme of the schools, that is to say elementary botany?—I quite agree that that would be a very suitable subject for any school, and particularly for country schools, and all girls' schools. In towns and cities they could get specimens.

5358. It is a subject that it occurs to me could be made very interesting?—Very interesting. You could only teach what is required for agriculture through it.

5359. And, of course, you would not propose to teach them long strings of the natural order, and so on?—Oh, no, but they might be taught to dissect a flower and a plant, and to watch the flowering of the sap.

5360. Mr. HENLEY.—That is being taught in National Schools at present. It comes under Nature study, and I am responsible for teaching it myself in the Training College?—The growth of plants in fertilized water is a very interesting subject, and very useful.

5361. Sir HIRSH WILKINSON.—And, of course, the different fertilizers could be taught in that way too?—Yes; of course, it should be a little advantage in the senior classes in the National Schools. It would not be at all beyond them.

5362. Mr. HENLEY has drawn my attention to the rules and regulations for 1912 on pages 113 and 151. This is new, within the last two or three years, and there is a note on page 112, "In schools where elementary science is not taught nature study and lessons on health and habits are considered sufficient in all standards to meet the requirements under this head." It seems there that nature study should take the place of elementary science?

Mr. HENLEY.—That is what is being in the schools. Sir HIRSH WILKINSON.—I see at page 151 in the regulations the course which the teachers have to study at present. Has nature study of this sort been taught in the schools?—Well, I do not think that there was any up to the time when I left the Board. Some history was taught under the old system; there certainly was some history.

The CHAIRMAN.—Are these new regulations?

Mr. HENLEY.—It is only three or four years since that was added on. A good many are working it. We try to avoid using the technical terms in the names of the orders, but at the same time we show the parts of the plants, and how we can discriminate one from the other.

5363. Sir HIRSH WILKINSON.—Do you think that that is a very appropriate subject?—It is a very suitable subject to be taken up, but in the same school in which you have that you cannot have any other kind of elementary science.

5364. You think that that is quite sufficient to fill the whole programme of elementary science?—I think there would not be time for the two subjects. There could be no time given for both. There are a great many subjects that it is desirable to have taught. There are a lot of subjects that it is very desirable to teach in the school, but they cannot be all taught. Every body will say they ought to be taught singing, and that the voice ought to be cultivated, and that by degrees they ought to be taught drawing to some extent.

5365. The CHAIRMAN.—That is universal now?—It is not.

5366. Singing is now universal?—Well, very nearly.

5367. Sir HIRSH WILKINSON.—You have said that you considered that that would be appropriate, especially in country schools, and that there would not be room for any other elementary sciences if that were taken up?—No time.

2nd April, 1913.]

Mr. HENRY DOWNING examined.

[Continued.]

5388. And is that, in your opinion, as much agriculture as could be taught in the Primary Schools?—I think so.

5389. Mr. HANMON.—I must confine myself, of course, to the poems, and I want to ask you one or two questions that would explain what is meant here. You state on the first page of your paper that you would confine the instruction mainly to reading, writing and arithmetic?—Yes.

5390. Would that not make teaching extremely warlike to everyone concerned?—I should say not.

5391. That is to say if you give children nothing but reading, writing and arithmetic, do you not think that both the teacher and the children would be very much bored?—I did not say that they were not to get any more. My view is, exactly, that within the obligatory hours the attention of the teacher in small schools should be given mainly to these subjects.

5392. I gather that you would do very little else?—Practically nothing within the ordinary hours, but the reading would include, of course, knowledge of the language, an intelligent knowledge of what was read, and writing would include composition.

5393. What is the amount of reading matter which the children would get through in the course of a year?—They would get through three or four readers in a year.

5394. That is not according to the evidence that we have had before. They would get through nothing like that?—I think that they could.

5395. Is it not, in addition, a matter of expense, the provision of books?—That is one of the difficulties, but I suppose that might be got over.

5396. It could?—I would vary the readers. I would certainly have an historical reader.

5397. You do not consider that confining the teaching mainly to these subjects would make it warlike?—Certainly not.

5398. Now it appears to me that you would propose to do a good deal of collective teaching in small schools. You would propose that the teacher should give collective lessons?—In certain subjects.

5399. You have limited the subjects to three practically?—I found fault with the suggestion (made in the document that I submitted) to take a school of 38 boys in one class to read all together round the teacher.

5400. But you are proposing that they should have a great many lessons, are you not?—I mean while the teacher is actually giving personal instruction to a class, and, in the case of reading, that should be only to those of the class year's standing.

5401. What would the other children be doing in a small school of 30 children?—Well the plan that was always adopted long ago in Ireland worked very well. Our schools are almost invariably half sitting and half standing. It was a very common thing to have a half hour lesson, and then change from floor to desk and vice versa, and then when the classes are standing round, the teacher would go to one and give a lesson. The other classes would practise their readings—one pupil acting as monitor.

5402. How many children would be given the lesson to?—Whatever number there was in one year's grade.

5403. In the year's grade only?—But they could be grouped as they always were in the olden time in Ireland for geography and some other subjects.

5404. You have not grouped for arithmetic, I presume?—I do not think they should be grouped for arithmetic. That should be taught to each grade separately.

5405. You go on to talk about the programme and the suggestions as to method, and these, I think, you regard as being made obligatory by some of the inspectors?—From my own experience, certainly not all the inspectors, but only the less worthy ones would seize upon that.

5406. But it is not expressly stated in the beginning of the circular or memorandum, whichever you call it, that these are only offered suggestions, and that

they are not in any way binding upon the teachers?—But as an essential place in it, it is quite the reverse, and to me it reads as practically obligatory.

5407. That was not the impression it made upon me at all, but that it was intended that the teachers should have a free hand if they chose to exercise it?—One case is that in teaching small children writing a line should be written up before them on a blackboard.

5408. Is that more than a suggestion which is open to any teacher to follow or not as he pleases?—The inspector would read it the other way. Some inspectors would read it the other way. That is all I mean to convey. According to my experience of old, some inspectors will read that as obligatory on the teacher, and no matter how great the success is, will condemn the teaching of the subject because it was not one according to order.

5409. Then your attack is not so much upon the issue of these instructions as upon the folly of the inspectors?—It is partly one and partly the other, and I would guard in a circular against that. I think these circulars are just the place to guard against the idiosyncrasies of the inspectors. There are always idiosyncrasies, and that is the kind of rule that they seem upon to humiliate a teacher. Things put in that are not meant to be obligatory are liable to be so interpreted.

5410. The CHAIRMAN.—To avoid that fault, would you leave out that suggestion altogether?—Yes, I would have no suggestion. I would put on the programme what is to be taught, and have nothing else mixed up with it, and I would make the programme more explicit to all parties concerned.

5411. Mr. HANMON.—Your objection is to my suggestions with regard to method?—To their being mixed up with the programme.

5412. They must be placed on the programme?—No.

5413. The CHAIRMAN.—If they were separate from the programme, would your objection lie?—I would object to that suggestion that I have referred to, that is setting up a model of writing before small children on a blackboard. I think every rational teacher should condemn that as being a wrong way.

5414. Mr. HANMON.—You say the new scheme was a failure. By the new scheme you mean the system that came in in 1907?—Yes.

5415. Have you read Mr. Dale's report?—Yes.

5416. You know that he came over, and you know perhaps that, on the whole, his reports on Irish education were favourable?—I don't know about that.

5417. As regards the attainments of the children it was distinctly favourable?—There were certain comments in it. I know I have some reference to Mr. Dale here in my notes, and he refers amongst other things to that about memorization.

5418. I am not talking about the memorandum, I am talking about the attainments of the children in the schools?—I do not remember his report.

5419. We have his report, and we also have the evidence of the present chief of inspection, which is very strong on the improvement that has been made since 1907. Now I think you gave up inspecting in 1904, did you not?—Yes.

5420. That your experience of the new system therefore is confined to those first three years?—Yes, those years.

5421. Can you give us any grounds on which you based this statement that the new scheme is a failure?—I cannot give you any evidence directly from myself, but I am, of course, in touch with a large number of managers, inspectors and teachers, and they all condemn it.

5422. It is not your own personal experience?—No.

5423. It is merely a matter of common hearsay?—Yes, and I hear it from the teachers of secondary schools also.

5424. I need not pursue that further if you cannot justify it from your own experience?—I have no personal knowledge.

5425. You quote, I think, from a document called the "Memorandum"?—Yes.

5426. Which apparently was issued early in 1900. Is that memorandum still in force?—No, and never was.



5406. Is it the one from which you quoted just now and which you called anonymous?—Yes.

5407. Has that never been issued?—No, it was never issued. I do not know whether there is a copy of it in existence except my own.

5408. Then this document from which you quote about the methods of taking the reading has never been in force in the school, and it has never been issued to the schools?—I put that forward to show the way in which this new scheme was ushered in. It was a non-sensical idea.

5409. But it never was issued?—No, that was because of my letter and Mr. Purser's. It was because we cut it up that it was never issued.

5410. Mr. CURRY.—You say that it was before you and Mr. Purser, and you criticised it adversely?—Yes.

5411. Mr. HARRISON.—I find this sentence in your paper, "Is the writer or responsible author of this farcical scheme the fit person to have automatic control over the National Schools system?" Is it fair to ask to whom you refer?—Oh, yes, Dr. Stuckle.

5412. Now you go on to make some recommendations. I think you want examination. In fact you practically put a very strong demand for examinations as absolutely essential to a proper report upon a school?—Yes.

5413. Do you mean by that individual examinations, with a record of the results with regard to each individual scholar?—No.

5414. Would you call this examination, if the inspector took several classes himself orally, and if he examined the exercise books of the children, and perhaps in one or two cases prepared even two or three sums or a written exercise to be done in his presence—would you call that examination?—I would not approve of that. I have sketched the kind of examination that I would approve of.

5415. Would you kindly define what you mean by examination?—I have stated that already. I said yesterday that I would examine the higher standards carefully to see if they were boys that would be likely to succeed on leaving school.

5416. You would examine them all individually?—No, but I would examine them, of course, in such a way as to know exactly. It would be practically an individual examination. I do not mean that I would take one boy by himself and examine him separately. I would take him in the class, and get him to go through the reading and writing and composition, and so on; and I certainly would take down those boys' names, and have some mark by which to know of their proficiency, and I would have prepared by the teacher the number of attendances they made each year since they came to the school tabulated for the inspector. That would then enable the inspector to see what time this teacher had that boy under tuition, and then considering the standard attained, the inspector would be in a position to judge whether the teacher has prepared those boys for the world. I think that that should be a principal feature of the annual examination.

5417. You would not regard the plan that I suggested to you as adequate for the purposes of a report?—No, I do not.

5418. Now you want the programme of instruction to be very definite. Would not that seriously curtail a good teacher?—I do not think so.

5419. Would you not allow him to propose any programme of his own as is allowed by the present system?—Certainly, I would allow him to teach any number of subjects outside of obligatory hours. He should get special pay for those.

5420. The programme of instruction, I suppose, means a syllabus in each subject?—Yes.

5421. Are you going to impose the same on every teacher or not?—I think that there ought to be some distinction between city schools and very remote schools. There ought to be a different programme.

5422. Would you propose one for town schools and another for country schools?—Well, if the country school were a large school, I would not see any difference except that you would have them trained there for agricultural pursuits rather than for mechanical. I would have the teaching directed in that way.

5423. In fact you would considerably limit the teachers?—I would not limit them at all. I would lay down a programme that should be expected of them, and if they attended to that that should be pronounced satisfactory, but they would be encouraged to do as every honest teacher will strive to do his best for the children, along with that.

5424. Now you say that the teacher of a very small school is, under the present system, debarr'd from promotion. Of course, we have had that, but what proposal would you make to remedy that admitted defect in the present system?—I would certainly give the man one step, at all events, from the third grade. I would give him something to work for to enable him to get up to the second grade.

5425. You have no further proposals to make?—No. He cannot get into the first class; he cannot get beyond the second. I would have them allowed according to their merit to get into the second division of the first.

5426. You think it a great hardship, of course, that a man should remain in the third grade till he changes his school?—Yes.

5427. But you do not propose anything more than that he should be able to emerge from that grade?—I mean that if a man is giving great satisfaction in one of those schools he should be encouraged. I am speaking of what I know and have had a long experience of. They are the hardest of all the schools to teach. As I said in my memorandum they require the most resourceful teaching, and they also require the most reliable teaching from very obvious reasons. They are away from very much supervision either of inspector or manager.

5428. Mr. KAVANAGH.—This is the single-teacher school?—Yes, the little rural schools out in the wilds of Connemara or Donegal, or elsewhere throughout Ireland. Those are the schools that require special sympathy.

5429. Mr. HARRISON.—You have no further proposal to make about that?—No.

5430. I am talking of these very small schools. You are, no doubt, aware of the fact that there is something in these very small schools very much in favour of the teacher. They have the same children, the children never change, and every child in the school comes into immediate contact with the head teacher, who is not depending upon subordinates of any sort, but is enabled to impose his own personality upon every individual. I do not say that that is an entire counterbalance, but it is a considerable set-off to the disadvantages?—I know that, but I know that it is a very difficult thing to teach one of these schools efficiently, and when there is a worthy man, satisfied to live in this place and contented, he ought to be encouraged to remain there, and not to be trying to run away from his manager and go elsewhere.

5431. The CHAIRMAN.—What do you mean by obligatory hours?—Four hours in a day, including half an hour for play.

5432. Is that what is called school hours?—Yes.

Mr. HENRY.—No, it is what is meant by attendance. Attendance is four hours for secular instruction after roll call. "School hours" means the whole time from the opening to the closing of the school.

5433. Mr. HARRISON.—Now I think you told us that you wish to examine the upper classes very fully, and you would make the promotion of the pupil depend largely on the results of that examination?—Very largely, but not entirely.

5434. I say very largely. Is there not in that case some danger lest promotion to the highest class may be retarded?—I do not think so. The teacher will try to promote his boys step by step every year.

5435. Are promotions made regularly every year?—They are, as a rule.

5436. That is the rule?—Not the rule, but it is a very common one.

5437. There will be very few who will be two years in the same standard?—Very few.

5438. There is one standard that is specially mentioned?—That is the fifth, and it is suggested that that is one in which boys or girls would

2nd April, 1913.]

Mr. EDWARD DOWNS, examined.

[Continued.]

perhaps have to remain two years, because these standards are now divided into five, and that is found not to be sufficient subdivision. The remedy in this new programme is that these boys or girls should remain two years in some one class, probably, it is suggested, in the fifth standard.

5449. There is a rule, I think, affecting promotion, 122c, and there apparently the Board discouraged any promotion except at the beginning of the school year. Is that so?—Yes.

5450. They do not absolutely forbid it?—The word is "should."

The CHAIRMAN.—Rule 122c is "Promotions of pupils should date from the beginning of the school year."

5451. Mr. HARRISON.—Are promotions ever made at any other time?—They used to be.

5452. Was that rule in existence when you were still an official?—No.

5453. Mr. COFFEY.—I think you stated last evening that in the time of payment by results reading was less intelligent perhaps than it is now?—I cannot say that.

5454. Well, then it was at the time you left service?—I do not think so.

5455. Do you think that reading was as good under the results system as it was when you left the service of the Board under the new system?—I think so.

5456. You do not think, then, that reading at the time you left the service of the Board was more intelligent than reading was under the results system?—We know that the teaching was being done with a very reasonable effort at intelligence under the results system. It all depended on the Inspector. I dwell upon that always at the inspections.

5457. I am talking generally of what came within your experience as chief inspector before you left?—I believe that there was always a reasonable effort at cultivating the intelligence, and the difficulty, as I always said and maintained, was that the real fault or want of intelligence was entirely due to the class or style of book that was put into the school which was wholly unfit, being far above the head of the children; and great efforts were made to teach, but it was impossible.

5458. That was particularly so in the sixth reader?—It was particularly so in the sixth, and it was so in the fifth.

5459. Did you consider that the standard in arithmetic had been very substantially lowered in 1904 when you left the service of the Board as compared to what it was in 1899?—Oh, yes; it was, undoubtedly; there is no question of the falling off of practical instruction in arithmetic. Well the word "practical" may be misleading, and I ought to say "useful" instruction, because there has been a little more of what might be described as practical arithmetic, measuring and weighing, and that kind of thing, which we had not, of course, in the older times. In every good school it was done, but it was not uniform, and it was not enforced.

5460. I was not an advocate then, and I am not an advocate now, of the system of payment by results, but I am by no means prepared to admit that the teaching of arithmetic was not intelligent. Do you not think that the teaching of arithmetic was intelligent under the results system?—Of course it was.

5461. Do you think, having in your recollection the style and class of problems that were set to the pupils in the higher classes, that any boy whose intelligence was not developed could grapple with them?—No, but, of course, there would be some misadventures with regard to the cards that they got hold of. They got hold of those cards that were issued to us. For that I always condemned the cards. I would never have approved of the issuing of the cards to the inspectors. It was a very bad system.

5462. But at all events the boys who could grapple successfully with the five or six problems that were set on the cards in the fifth and sixth standards gave a very fair indication of well-developed intelligence?—Yes, certainly, they knew arithmetic very

well, and arithmetic cannot be learned without intelligence, that is, such problems as these.

5463. The CHAIRMAN.—Were those cards issued to the inspectors?—They were.

5464. Every year?—Not every year, but every now and again. Whenever there was a suspicion that they had been got at there was a new set.

5465. Mr. COFFEY.—I did not think in your evidence last evening that you seemed to regret the elimination of passing from the programme of the National School. Do you not think that passing intelligently was the first subject where the children were really made to think?—When it was well taught it was a useful study, and certainly well adapted for cultivating intelligence. There is no doubt about that.

5466. I do not think it did much in the way of good letter-writing or more grammatical speaking?—That is the only fault I found with it, that the results programme limited the teaching too much to it, and did not encourage the other. They got their law for grammar if they went in for passing.

5467. Putting well taught was, in my mind, the first exercise in the National Schools where boys were brought really to think?—It was a useful exercise for developing the intelligence.

5468. As far as I can grasp the trend of one or two questions of his lordship last evening, they seemed to me to indicate a desire that the intelligence of the pupils should be directed towards fitting them for employment in agriculture and industrial pursuits. With that view I may say, taking Ireland as a whole, and taking the children as a whole, I am in entire accord, but seeing that the National Schools is at once the College and the University of the overwhelming majority of the children of our country, do you not think that it is the duty of those charged with the administration of National education to afford them the largest amount of educational training which can be got within the time of their short school lives?—That is in the memorandum I sent in.

5469. And do you think that with a well-directed programme drawn up with the help of experienced inspectors so much education could be put within the reach of the Irish child as I have suggested?—Certainly, particularly if the inspectors helped everything along nicely.

5470. While doing the best for all the children, can any good reason be suggested for limiting the chances of the farmer's son or the labourer's bright boy of getting an educational equipment that would take them to the threshold of the learned professions?—Oh, of course, the old scheme before the results system did that, and attained that equipment.

5471. And you think there is no reason why they should not do it now?—No.

5472. Do you think there is every reason why they should do it now?—Yes, and something like the old system is the best yet. It was carefully thought out by earnest men, and very carefully considered from time to time.

5473. The HUSBAND OF BOSS.—Are there as many of those National School boys reaching the threshold of the learned professions at present as there were?—No, I cannot answer that, you know, directly, but I have the information from several intermediate teachers.

5474. Are those schools less full now than they were then?—No, but the pupils come badly prepared, and the teachers cannot make them progress. They cannot fit them within a reasonable age. They vary much.

5475. But they do not get a smaller number of them?—I do not think so.

5476. And a smaller number would reach the threshold of the learned professions?—I am afraid there would be always too many on the threshold of the learned professions.

5477. Mr. COFFEY.—But under a reasonable system of primary education which should embrace good reading, spelling, writing, and arithmetic to the extent, we will say, to which these subjects were taught under the results system, would not the advantage even to the farmer and mechanic be very large?—Oh, yes, training in arithmetic is necessary for every man, with

[2nd April, 1913.]

Mr. FREDERICK DOWNING, examined.

[Continued.]

intelligent reading of English, and, of course, the writing of a decent letter. Every boy leaving a National School should be able to write a decent letter.

5466. What I desire your opinion on is whether you think that the National School, while affording a sound English education to men who are to devote their lives to farming or to field labour or to mechanical work, should, at the same time, afford an opportunity to continue their studies?—Any boy who would be well trained in the ordinary course in a National School is able to study for himself any subject afterwards.

5466. At present?—No; they are quite helpless now, but they were not so.

5470. The general drift of your evidence on another matter was that if a teacher is doing good work for his pupils, it is unjust that an inspector should be at liberty to force on him his fads and fancies as to how instruction should be given?—Certainly, that he should have very large liberty to adapt the instruction to the children that are entrusted to him.

5471. You have had a very large and successful career under the National Board, and I think you told us yesterday that in this experience you met a considerable number of inspectors that had fads and fancies?—Yes; of nine inspectors that I had to deal with when I was a teacher, there was only one that was able to examine a school at all with any degree of success.

The Broom or Boss.—And that was, of course, in the older time, before the results system was introduced.

5472. Mr. CONYER.—But to come down to a later time, you think it unjust that inspectors, who are otherwise honourable and conscientious men, should regard less favourably, or would be likely to regard less favourably, the teacher's work if he had not adopted their plans for carrying out the work of the school?—That is the point. He will be down on the teacher if he does not agree to his peculiar view, and it is not discrimination.

5473. But in other respects they are honourable and conscientious?—It is more crankiness. Men of cynical nature will find fault.

5474. The CHAIRMAN.—They are found under every system?—They are.

5475. Mr. CONYER.—Men of that class existed under the results system, I suppose?—Yes, and they had always to be guarded against.

5476. But while they existed at that time, the harm likely to arise at present would be much more serious when the impression of the inspector counts for more than any real question of the children's knowledge?—There is no doubt about that. That is a most mischievous principle. The impression of an inspector is not worth the least possible thing on his first inspection of a school, and I would place no reliance on it.

5477. Are you fully convinced, from your thorough acquaintance with every phase of primary school life, that the one and only true test of the work of the teacher lies in the examination of the children?—Yes, a fair examination of what ought to have been taught, not crooked questions or difficult problems, but just going on over the ground that a careful teacher should have gone over with his pupils, and should have taken his pupils over.

5478. It was suggested, I think, by one of his lordship's questions last evening that the matter of looking forward to the passing of examinations by children was likely to have an undesirable effect on the children as a whole. Do you not think it has great advantages on the other side?—A great advantage—it makes education very popular.

5479. But apart from its being popular, is it not a fine moral training, a fine training to yesterday, to have to fight the battle of examination?—It is. There is no doubt that there is no drawback in a proper system of examination, and it is the only way of testing the value of a school, and the merits of a school.

5480. And apart from testing the merits of these schools, is it not a privilege to the children to be examined, and ought not the children attending a school to have that privilege?—Yes. But the Commissioners will be expecting the managers to examine their schools, and to carry out these examinations, and it is an extraordinary thing that they are asking the managers to do that for them, as the managers are not supposed to be experts in the course of education.

5481. The boys and girls attending intermediate schools have intermediate examinations, is not that so?—Yes.

5482. And have not the children of poorer people attending the National Schools the same right to examination?—Yes.

5483. You suggested, I think, and in that I rather differ from you, that marks should be put down for each child by the inspector?—I would put it down, because my idea is that the inspector should form a very careful opinion of how these boys and girls have been prepared—not merely for the examination, but for their exit into the world.

5484. Would not a capable inspector, by putting three or four pounds of questions to a class, be able to determine in a very short time whether the class had been well and satisfactorily taught or not?—There is the other element of comparing the progress on the time that the pupil had been at school. You seem to overlook that. I would have the inspector to compare that boy now in sixth standard who has succeeded in so many subjects with what he was when he came to the school, say, five years ago, and I would have his attendance tabulated by the teacher for the inspector. He would then see how the boy had progressed, that he was in the third standard in such a year, and now he is into the sixth, and has really made respectable progress for the time and developed in every way.

5485. But would not that be tested from year to year previously?—I do not think so.

5486. Would he not have the history of the boy going on from class to class?—I do not think so. Of course, if there was a full examination of every standard that would be so, but I am assuming that there is not.

5487. But I would have a full examination of every standard in the essential subjects of all events?—I think that would be right.

5488. Now with regard to this impressionist system, without suggesting for a moment that any inspector of the National Board would wilfully do a wrong to a teacher, do you believe that injustice is inevitable under the present method of appraising the teacher's work?—I do.

5489. During your time, and you were a number of years chief inspector, were any appeals sent by teachers or their managers against the merit mark, referred to you?—I do not remember anything referred to me.

5490. Do you believe it, in any reasonable degree, likely that the large number of inspectors we have could reach a uniform judgment on what has been described as the tone of schools?—The "tone" of a school is an utterly meaningless word.

5491. Then you do not think that a large number of inspectors could agree on it?—Not in the least. If they could distinguish the schools into two or three classes according to what they understood of tone, no two inspectors would have the very same meaning for tone.

5492. The next question I had to ask you was this—was your large experience as a practical educationalist availed of in the drafting of this revised programme, but I need not ask you, however, because we have had it from you already, that in consequence of your offering an opinion not agreeable to the Resident Commissioner you were suspended?—Yes.

5493. You offered an opinion on the new system?—On the new scheme. He asked me to comment on it, and that I did honestly.

2nd April, 1913.]

Mr. HERMAN DOWNING, examined.

[Continued.]

5494. You do not, of course, claim more than any other Government official that you should be free to adversely criticize the policy of the Board?—No.

5495. You do not claim that?—I do not think so.

5496. But what I understood you to object to is, that you are not allowed to express your honest views as to the progress of education if your views do not suit the office?—Yes, I think that is made very clear from some letters I submitted.

5497. In those letters which you submitted and which you handed in?—Yes.

5498. The CHAIRMAN.—To put it plainly, if you thought that under the present system reading and arithmetic were suffering, could you claim to be able to say in your report that that was so?—Yes.

5499. And to make the remarks that you have just indicated in your answer to Mr. Coffey?—Oh, yes, that I should not be expected to say what I did not believe to be true, or to give a false impression.

5500. Mr. COFFEY.—But you were warned when asked for a general report to confine yourself to forming a judgment on the success of this new education policy?—Yes.

5501. But you were not at liberty to point out the faults?—No.

5502. You were to tell the public nothing of its shortcomings?—No; and in 1908 one of the Commissioners proposed to the Board, after three years' trial of the system, that the chiefs of inspection and the senior inspectors should come into a conference, and, by taking measures, ascertain whether this new scheme was proving a success or not, and should then report fully to the Board, and that was thrown out. I thought that was a reasonable and fair thing after three years' trial, and it was thrown out, and the two ex-inspectors were the only ones who voted in favour of it.

5503. The Resident Commissioner appears to have been dissatisfied with the report which you sent in 1902 in connection with the managers?—Yes.

5504. Will you quote for me how he expressed his dissatisfaction?—Dear Mr. Downing—I send you particulars of Appendix to my address, in which I quote passages which, so far as your part of Ireland is concerned, ought to be included among your extracts. —Yours very truly, W. J. M. STURKILL.

5505. Will you explain that further—have you the extracts that were sent to you?—I have (documents handed in); he seemed to have expected that I would make myself responsible for these expressions, without quoting the names of the inspectors at all. Of course, I would not give as my opinion what was not my opinion for anybody.

5506. As I understood it, at the same time there was a resignation of one of you old and experienced inspectors?—Yes, a man who refused to do what was asked of him on that occasion.

5507. You refer towards the end of your memorandum to an appeal of yours to the Board, and you say you are prepared to give a full account of it, and show how appeals are dealt with. Will you give us some information?—I can give you the whole thing.

5508. Has the teaching of mathematics practically disappeared from the schools?—Before I left?

5509. Yes.—Yes; anything beyond arithmetic.

5510. Euclid and algebra?—They had all disappeared practically.

5511. In writing on the Lonsdowny district in 1902 this is an extract from one of your reports:—"A pupil who has passed in the sixth class is fitted so far as school can fit him for any avocation in life short of the learned profession, and he is admirably prepared to enter upon the higher studies he requires for those professions." That was your view of the standing of pupils of the sixth class in National Schools at that time?—Yes.

5512. During the four years you were chief inspector under the new system, could you write the same?—No, not afterwards.

5513. Sir HERMAN WILKINSON.—You referred to an order, with regard to the preparation and furnishing of returns. Do you know the date of that?—That was in 1900.

5514. It is the 3rd of May, 1900?—Yes.

5515. And you say the order was as follows:—"No officer of this establishment is at liberty to prepare for or furnish to any person not a member of the official staff any return or statement relating to the affairs of the Board unless otherwise specially provided for in the official routine of the Department, without the express authority of the Resident Commissioner." Did you understand whether that precluded an inspector, say, or the chief of inspection, from furnishing to a member of the Board information with regard to the work of inspection or to other things?—That is the interpretation. It refers solely to giving information. It could not mean anything else in my case, giving information to a Commissioner, which I thought up to them I had the same right to do as before, and I can give you a case. Mr. Redington said:—"Every Commissioner has the same right to get information as I have." He said that when I questioned him on it.

5516. And you say that the meaning of this is, that no Commissioner should be supplied with information?—Yes; they were in the habit before Dr. Sturkille's time of coming into us. It was a usual thing. It was very exceptional on a Board day that we had not two or three of the Commissioners coming into our room. Our room in the office was called the library, and they would come in to get information from us as they required it for cases at the Board, and we gave them all the help we could.

5517. Then is this correct which you say in your memorandum:—"The meaning of this is that no Commissioner should be supplied with information; no other than a Commissioner ever asked for information. It was customary before Dr. Sturkille's time for several Commissioners to come into the library where the chiefs of inspections went before the meetings of the Board to obtain information respecting the business to be transacted at the meeting. On a certain occasion when a serious and contentious matter was under consideration, I was asked by one of the Commissioners to give him certain information. As I knew that this was to be used in opposition to the views of the Resident Commissioner, Mr. Redington, I did not like to be the medium through which this information should come, and I accordingly asked Mr. Redington if I should give it. His reply was—"Certainly, every Commissioner has the same right that I have to obtain all information available." That is correct?—Yes.

5518. The BRIDGE or ROSS.—In the letter which Sir Eileen has read the words occur—"Provided for in the official routine of the office;" well if I gathered it rightly from you that you regarded it as part of the official routine of the office to give information when a Commissioner asked you for it, why then did you consider yourself precluded from giving information to the Commissioner when you got this letter?—I knew what that meant well enough. It would only have one meaning. I maintain that that was the meaning intended, and the only meaning that it was capable of, and we saw no more Commissioners. They never came in afterwards.

5519. Is that from information you have received—you are satisfied about that?—Yes.

5520. But can you help to satisfy the Committee on the point, because you can quite see that we can hardly accept a mere impression which, in your mind, might have weight?—Here are some of the extracts which I was asked to include, there are two or three of them, and they are all the same (documents handed in).

5521. Sir HERMAN WILKINSON.—Now you have expressed your impression of what was meant by that letter of instructions issued by Dr. Sturkille. Would you consider the following extracts from a letter from Dr. Sturkille, of which a copy has been put in, dated May 12th, 1911, agreed with your impression or not? Dr. Sturkille says:—"Mr. Ward had told me that he discussed the matter with him" (that is with you), and I want to know whether you consider that statement as confirming the impression of that other letter that you put in or not?—Mr. Ward told me that he had discussed the matter with him, and that he showed him specimens of the work. Of course, I could not conduct the administration if Commissioners behind me back discuss questions with officials. Does that confirm your impression?—It does; it is the same principle.

## TWELFTH DAY.—THURSDAY, APRIL 3RD, 1913.

At 23, Kildare-street, Dublin.

Present:—SIR SAMUEL DILL, M.A., LL.D., LL.D. (Chairman); The Most Rev. DENIS KELLY, D.D., Bishop of Ross; SIR HIRAM SNOW WILKINSON, LL.D.; MR. JOHN COFFEY; MR. HENRAGE E. B. HARRISON, B.A.; MR. JEREMIAH HENLY; MR. WALTER MCMURDOUGH KAVANAGH, D.L.; and Mr. THOMAS MICHAEL KETTER, R.L.; and

Mr. ARTHUR J. DONNELLY, M.A., B.Sc., Secretary.

The Venerable LEWIS POOLE, D.D., Archbishop of Down, examined.

5232. The CHAIRMAN.—I have to ask you first about the document that you have been good enough to send us, the memorial of the Church of Ireland Managers of National Schools in the Counties of Antrim and Down, and in the County of the City of Belfast. That document purports to be a unanimous expression of opinion by your Society?—Yes, so far as we have been able to give it. Of course, every one of our managers belongs to our School Managers' Association. They have all been notified of this; we have had a number of meetings, and there have been large attendances, and this is the result of our deliberations.

5233. So that you may take this as fairly representing, on the whole, the general opinion of your Association?—The general trend of opinion. There has been no objection made of any sort at any of the meetings except verbal objections, many of which have been incorporated.

5234. You are the Chairman of this Association?—I have acted as Chairman. The Bishop is the Chairman, but he does not always come.

5235. And now I suppose I may assume that you yourself are or have been Manager of National Schools?—I have been a Manager of a National School for 24 years, and I have three large Parish Schools.

5236. You have three large schools under your management at this moment?—Yes.

5237. So that you have a very complete experience of systems of education for 24 years?—Yes.

5238. In fact you knew the old results system as well as the new system introduced in 1907?—I do.

5239. Would you mind giving us your opinion, just in general, as to the relative values of the two systems?—do you think the new system is an improvement on the old?—When the new system came out first, I think I was one of the first men in our diocese to support inspection from my previous experience as teacher in Armagh, in the Royal School there, as well as my knowledge of National School work. I think I was the very first to support inspection, and I have seen no reason to change my views, and I should be very sorry to have to go back to the old results scheme.

5240. You would object distinctly to going back to the old system of payment by results?—Absolutely. That does not in the least say that I am satisfied with the present system.

5241. But do you approve of the principle of the old results system?—I do not. I think it led to a great deal of harm to the children.

5242. We would like to hear you develop that?—In many cases it damaged the health of the children when it came up to the examination time. Managers were harassing the teachers, and the teachers said they were not furthering their interests if they did not allow them to keep the children an inordinate length of time in the school, and the knowledge acquired in the last month before the examination was valueless for all practical purposes, or nearly so. It was simply cram. I should be very sorry to go back to the results system.

5243. And under the old system you speak of, the inspectional work was confined chiefly to examining?—Practically.

5244. But we have been told here that it also took in other things besides the attainments of the children?—As far as I am aware, under the old system the Inspector had no right to take other things into consideration in judging of the results fees.

5245. But he reported on the other things we understand?—But then the teacher was paid by fees, and I do not think it mattered much.

5246. The other things did not affect the matter at all?—I do not think so.

5247. Did they not affect the teacher's promotion? Mr. HENLY.—Oh, yes, if the discipline and order were not good, he could not get promotion?—

Supposing a man came out under the old system, first class after his training, then the source that he would look to for any addition to his income was the results fee, was it not?

5248. Mr. HENLY.—You are assuming what would be hardly possible. I know that there were very, very exceptional cases, but teachers leave the Training College only in second class?—At any rate one of my teachers was first class.

5249. It happened in very few cases owing to the fact that they were not attending training, and some of the teachers who came up with second class to train (a very small proportion) were allowed to study for first class?—It was owing to very exceptional circumstances, and there was a very small number.

5250. The CHAIRMAN.—With reference to Rule 67, Inspector's visits, it requires the Inspector to notify his visits for formal examination and inspection to the Manager. Was that rule always complied with?—Does the rule say at what time?

5251. "They should give due notice of their intended visit when they proposed to make a formal inspection." Was it notified to you generally?—Yes, generally the morning of the day when the Inspector was coming. Sometimes I have got a note from the school when the Inspector was there, and being otherwise engaged could not arrange to be present.

5252. So the thing became a dead letter?—I should not like to say it became a dead letter.

5253. But it might become a dead letter?—It might be. I was glad to get notice, and I always went down when I possibly could; but I think we ought to get some days' notice.

5254. You have been present at those inspectors' visits?—Yes.

5255. You have been present even under the new regime?—Yes.

5256. What is your impression generally of the inspectors, and the management of their business at those visits?—Of course, there is a variety of inspectors. I have had a great variety.

5257. Some good and some not so good?—That is really what it is.

5258. Have you found that many of them neglected examining the children?—They are expected or required to do some examining; but it appears that you have hardly found any of them examining at all, as this document seems to say?—That is so, hardly examining at all; only examining one boy out of the class.

5259. Tell us what the inspector would do?—He would have a class round him, and he would take one subject, and he would take one boy or two boys; but there was no real systematic examination of the whole class. I specify that.

5549. And your idea is that there ought to be examination of the whole class?—I think if they take a class at all, they ought not to do what I saw done once. There was one case in my own knowledge in which there was a boy in the school that I knew was not very brilliant, and he made very silly answers. Well, that boy got all the questions for the rest of the examination.

5550. And that took place in your presence?—It did.

5551. Mr. HARRISON.—Was this a formal examination?—I think so, a formal examination. It was one that I got notice of at any rate.

5552. The CHAIRMAN.—I want to ask you, further, did the inspector listen to the teachers giving a lesson?—Yes, I have seen the inspector stand by when the teacher was giving a lesson.

5553. Did he make any remarks?—He did.

5554. Were any of those remarks unnecessarily severe?—I once or twice thought (and other gentlemen here will give the same testimony), that the teachers were spoken to in the presence of children in a way they ought not to be spoken to.

5555. It has been stated that some of the inspectors, perhaps only a very small number, do not treat the teachers with the proper respect that they should before their pupils?—I have known one or two cases of that; but I have not found it as a general thing. I have known it in the case of two teachers, where I do think the inspector spoke to the teacher and criticised the teachers before the children in a way that he ought not.

5556. But not in many cases?—Not in many cases.

5557. Mr. HARRISON.—They should not criticize them at all in the presence of the children?—Of course not, I suppose.

5558. The CHAIRMAN.—You have seen that?—I have seen that of my own knowledge.

5559. At the same time, it is not frequent?—It is not frequent.

5560. Would you say that the inspectors generally with whom you have come in contact, and whom you have seen in the schools, have been courteous to the teachers on the whole?—I think they have improved in the last year or two. I do not know whether it is evidence or not, but I think that when the inspector goes into the school, he ought to shake hands, and speak courteously.

5561. Have you ever seen a man going in, as we have heard it, without ever noticing the teacher?—Yes, I have.

5562. Walking up to the time-table and the books?—Yes, I have seen that.

5563. There is another point with regard to rule 65. Inspectors are required to inform you of all matters requiring your attention, is not that so?—Yes.

5564. Now, is that regularly done?—Well, of course, I cannot say that, because this should be done when matters require my attention. I have received letters, I may say courteous letters always, from the inspector, recommending that certain things should be done in the school, and many a time I have seen what I have considered was not a good report, and I got no letter; and I thought I should have got a letter if the report was a fair report.

5565. If there was anything to praise?—I never got a word of praise from an inspector in my life, and I never knew an inspector to give one.

5566. And when you tried to carry out instructions you never got recognition?—Never got recognition.

5567. It is all criticism?—It is all criticism.

5568. We have had a good deal of evidence about the building of the school and the equipment, and the cleaning particularly. You are responsible, of course, for the building and equipment?—I am not competent to give much evidence upon that, because we are in an exceptional position in Downpatrick. We have an endowment. We have a Board of Governors who meet every quarter, and any equipment that is required, and any improvements that are required in the school, we do, and we have never refused to do anything that they suggested, and we have done a great deal that they never suggested.

5569. And therefore I need not put any question with regard to the building or equipment, but a matter which has come before us personally is the question

of the cleaning of the school, and the keeping it in a state of cleanliness, as these affect the merit mark of the teacher. Now who is responsible for the cleaning of the school? whom do you regard as responsible?—In a country school I regard the teacher, because the manager could not go there every day to see that it is done.

5570. But would not the manager be expected to provide for the cleaning of the school?—I really think in country schools it is the children and the teachers who do it. I have a small country school, and I inspect it pretty regularly, and I do look to see that it is clean, and I provide myself for doing certain things that are required to be done in the way of cleaning, that is the heavy part; but I think in some country schools the children and the teachers clean the school.

5571. Here is Rule 65a in which the Commissioners impress on the managers that it is their duty to make provision for having the school properly lighted and ventilated and closed and adequately heated in cold weather?—We recognise that, and that is done, but the manager could not have the whole of the personal supervision of that. My country school is three miles from Downpatrick.

5572. Have you come across a case where on account of the state of the school and its not being properly cleaned the merit mark was affected?—No, I have not come across that.

5573. That is under Rule 54?—In regard to that last point the only thing that I think the inspectors might remember that there is a slightly different standard to keep up to in a town like Downpatrick, and in a small country school. I think they ought to remember that the opportunities are different in a town from what they are in a country school.

5574. Have you observed in your experience of various kinds of schools, rural and urban, that inspectors take into account the difference of locality and the difference of equipment in their reports?—I do not think they do so much as they might.

5575. They do not make sufficient allowance?—They do not make sufficient allowance.

5576. You know that particular clause of the general report, No. 11?—Yes, in country schools, in my experience I think that I have got reports which would have been very fair in the case of schools like Downpatrick with a good income behind them, but which were scarcely fair to a small country school.

5577. Poorly provided?—Poorly provided.

5578. Now there is one clause in Rule 54 to which I want to call your attention. You see in the fifth line that the manager should also make arrangements for holding periodic examinations. You have seen that?—Yes.

5579. Now I understand that is a recent rule?—Yes, a new rule.

5580. Have you had any experience of the working of that—does the manager actually arrange for periodical examinations?—We arrange with the teacher. I arrange with my teacher.

5581. Regularly?—I do, regularly.

5582. Is that for the annual examination?—The annual examination.

5583. That is held by teachers?—Yes, and anybody might go in.

5584. Were parents present?—I think not, except when children were getting prizes. Poor parents have got to work.

5585. Now I go to a subject which has been before us a great deal, that is the want of uniformity of inspection, to which this document calls attention. There is no uniform system of inspection, you say, and no two inspectors apparently act on the same principle?—I will give you an example of that. This is personal experience. I was in one of my schools and the inspector said:—"This school is doing very badly in Geography. You will never teach them Geography till you get black maps." I got three or four black maps, and about six months afterwards there was another inspector in that school, and he said:—"Why do you waste your money buying these things?" A

third Inspector came in comparatively recently, and he gave that school a bad mark in Geography because they had not got a black map of Ireland.

5396. That is there?—That is all.

5397. Do you think that enough?—I do. I am not deciding which of the Inspectors was right.

5398. Sir HEDAM WILKINSON.—They did not all agree?—They did not all agree.

5399. The CHAIRMAN.—Now in paragraph 2, following closely on that, I find you say that the inspector system of inspection is partly responsible for the want of uniformity?—I think it is.

5400. Do you adhere to that?—I do.

5401. Would you mind developing that?—I will give an example again. An Inspector came into the school, and took a walk round. He was a very conversational man indeed at all times, and he magnified his office, I think, a little, and he said:—"Of course, you know if I were just five minutes in the school I would be able to tell what mark it ought to get," and I said:—"Perhaps you could, up to a certain extent. If I go into a church I can tell you in five minutes whether the rector keeps the church clean, and whether he has the choir clean, but there are certain parts that I could not tell anything about, and you, for example, could not tell anything about the knowledge of the children." "Oh," he said, "it all goes together."

5402. Did he tell you what he meant by that—all going together?—No, he did not, but what I understood him to mean was that if the general tone and discipline, and so forth, did not come up to his particular standard, then the teaching or the knowledge must be on the same level with the unfavourable judgment that he had formed in his mind from the other points.

5403. Do I understand your Association to mean that too little stress is laid on book-knowledge?—I think you may, that there is too little stress laid on the teaching of a whole class.

5404. And under that head will you allow me to ask you this—do you think there is any deterioration in the result of the teaching of certain subjects like reading, arithmetic, and geography?—I am absolutely certain. I do not say that that is the Inspector's fault, but owing to the multiplication of subjects which the children have got to learn, I am absolutely convinced that they do not read as well as they did.

5405. Would this express your view, that under the new system three or four subjects that are regarded as elementary, and yet are essential, are not as well taught as before 1860?—I would say that.

5406. You say that deliberately?—I say that deliberately.

5407. That is your experience?—My experience, and the experience of teachers and parents.

5408. Is that the opinion of parents?—Yes, in my parish.

5409. That the children are not so well equipped for ordinary life as small farmers, and so on?—All these new subjects put such new ideas into the children that in the County Down they do not want to get into the old life at all. They want to be clerks. In my experience they all want to be clerks.

5410. Now we have already spoken of these six merit marks. What is your opinion about the possibility of, say, one man awarding one of these marks with anything approaching certainty to a school or to a teacher?—We managers think it is very difficult. We have discussed that for three or four days, and we are of opinion that were it possible to have a fair and exhaustive examination of the school (I do not mean by that an examination like the teacher examinations), we do not see that the teacher's objection to the marks as a general system is well founded. We would not object to the marks.

5411. Would you like six, or would you reduce them?—We did not enter into that.

5412. I thought you suggested reducing them to three?—We do not say anything about that; but I may say that the teachers in Belfast say they object to these marks altogether. We think (without defining how it ought to be done), that if the thing was properly done, it would be a help to the managers, and it is certainly a pull up to the teachers.

5413. Would you retain the present six marks if they were ordered on a different system?—Yes, that is our evidence.

5414. Do you not think that the shades of distinction are too many and too minute?—We were not entrusted on that.

5415. You do not wish to continue on that line?—I do not. Our teachers do not object to the marks on account of their number. They object to the system on which they are given.

5416. The point in this, it is not only a question of one inspector being able to award one of these marks with tolerable certainty, but it is a question of the possibility of anything like uniformity all over Ireland among 70 different inspectors?—I think that is a very real difficulty.

5417. Will "excellent" or "very good" represent the same thing in Clonsilla as it will in Belfast or in Donpatrick?—I do not think it could.

5418. And then there is a danger?—I think there is a danger. I know, for example, the Dean who comes in after me has very strong views on that subject and he will give you evidence on it, that the same mark could not mean the same thing in his school and in Mr. Brett's school—St. Peter's—which really is, or ought to be, a secondary school.

5419. The class of parents is totally different?—Totally different.

5420. And the home life is different?—And perhaps in regard to the examinations I might give another example that I have here, if I may.

5421. We should be glad to have it.—There was an inspector who came into one of my schools not very long ago. He is a crank about how you should hold your pen, and he gave a very bad account of a certain year, and he gave, in the book, saying that they did not know how to hold their pens. Well, it happened that a periodical called "Tit-Bits" offered 100 prizes for children's writing under 14 years of age. The teacher, without telling us anything, put the whole of this class that was condemned in for the writing examination conducted by "Tit-Bits," and there were many thousand competitors, I forget the exact number, but it was published afterwards. There were 100 prizes, and ten of these children who could not write were at the top of the list.

5422. Did you see the inspector after that?—I published it in the newspaper, a Donpatrick paper, and I thought that was the best way to bring it to the inspector's notice. I published the fact just as I tell you.

5423. I suppose he did not make any remark?—Oh, never.

5424. You think that confirms the remark here that "an many cases the methods adopted by inspectors do not conduce to sound education"?—I think it does.

5425. And you are absolutely certain of that?—I am.

5426. That is the present system of inspection, and you have illustrated that by telling us of an inspector who said he could award the mark in five minutes?—Yes.

5427. And is it your experience that it is generally a matter of fault-finding, rather than of judicious criticism?—We are absolutely united about that. That is a point on which there is no difference of opinion whatever amongst us, and all our managers will agree with me when I say that we never get a word of praise.

5428. Or advice?—Or advice. I will give you an example of that, in the case of an inspector. There was an inspector who was finding very much fault with a young teacher for the way in which he was teaching his class, and the principal teacher said to the inspector very respectfully: "Sir, would you mind taking the class for a little bit, and showing this man what you mean." "That is not my business, I am not a teacher"—that was the answer.

5429. The teacher asked that boss idiot?—He asked him boss idiot. He is a very earnest man.

5430. And he wanted his superior officer to give an example?—Yes, and he was told that he was not a teacher, that it was not his business.

5431. I must say I think he was violating some of the instructions of the Board, given in some of their

circumstances. Whether it is acted upon or not the inspectors are told to consider themselves advisers of the teachers. Is not that so?

Mr. HESTY.—That is so, but it is a rule more honoured in the breach than in the observance—I have never known them to act on that principle.

The CHAIRMAN.—But still am I not right in saying that the Board had suggested that?

Mr. HESTY.—That has been suggested, but it has not been acted on, with the exception of perhaps 4 or 5 inspectors in all Ireland.

5622. The CHAIRMAN.—Then your impression is that the inspector does not really consider it to be his business to be the adviser of the teacher, and the improver of education in the schools?—I would not say that, that he did not think that he might be an improver of education; but I think that his methods do not conduce to that.

5623. He simply confines himself to fault-finding?—Yes, we have all agreed about that. I had one particular teacher, a young and very nervous little man, and certainly he left my school because he was humiliated. He went away to another district, and I helped to get him another school.

5624. And that was to escape a particular inspector?—To escape a particular inspector.

5625. We have had it here that the changes of inspectors from one district to another are too frequent, and that the district inspectors are not allowed, as they were under the rewards system, to remain a sufficient number of years in a district to know the teachers and their characteristics and defects. Do you agree with that?—I do; but then sometimes we get an inspector we would be glad to get rid of.

5626. On the whole, if you have a fairly decent inspector, do you not think that he would be much more efficient if left for a considerable time?—Yes.

5627. And you do think they are moved about too frequently, and you get too many of them?—We have got too many changes recently. We got a change of inspectors some years ago, and he put every school in the whole district down two marks, from excellent down to good, two marks down all round. I had excellent in both my schools in Downpatrick, and they went down to good.

5628. And if they were good, they would go down to middling?—Yes, to middling. He practically marked down every school two. I do not know why he did it, but he did do it.

5629. That bears upon a question I was going to put, that in all these frequent changes of inspectors you have observed a very great difference in the standard of their examinations?—I have.

5630. You are clear about that?—I am clear about that.

5631. And that within a brief space of time?—Within a brief space of time. Of course, this whole system covers a brief space of time.

5632. Mr. HESTY.—Can you tell us, as far as you can judge, were the schools at the time he reduced them up to the standard of what they had been under the previous inspectors?—I would say so, at least. At least up to the standard.

5633. You told us in this document that there is no uniform system of inspection. Now, will you explain what you mean by that more fully?—Well, one side of it is illustrated by my experience as to maps, and on the other side I would say that the standard of excellence set up by different inspectors is not the same.

5634. I suppose you are aware that there was a memorial sent up from the Church Managers in Belfast in which they complained of 46 per cent. of school works being lowered?—That occurred about the same time that I am complaining of it in my district. Of course, I am not in Belfast.

5635. And I have here a document in which it is stated that Mr. Cole, a junior inspector in another district, reduced the marks of the schools in 78 per cent. of the schools which he inspected?—I think it was universal, but I do not know why. Was that about three years ago?

5636. Yes. Now, as you object to the impressionist system of inspection, what do you think the inspectors should do?—I think the inspectors should either see

the teacher teaching a class in every case, and judge from that not merely as to the teacher's ability, but as to the results of the teacher's teaching; or else, the inspector should examine the whole class himself if he has any doubts on any subject—either the teacher or the inspector. I do not say that the inspector ought to do it in every case; but if he is not satisfied, let him not pick the best boys out, and in particular let him not choose an idiot.

5637. Would you say the teacher should teach the class?—Yes.

5638. Is not the ultimate test of the teaching what the pupils learn, what they acquire from him?—It is.

5639. If they merely observe the work, how will that thoroughly test the real work of the teacher?—Well, I think if I was inspecting, I would judge by the intelligence and accuracy of the answers how far the children were learning.

5640. But how would you know, for instance, whether the lesson that was being then given was a more review lesson or whether it was breaking new ground?—You could not tell, you would have to trust to the honour of the teacher.

5641. For instance, Dr. Klemm made a report on schools in Germany, and he complains in that report he found great difficulty in getting the German teachers to give a lesson in a new subject. They were quite willing to review past work, and thus make a display of knowledge and skill on the part of the pupils which really did not represent the teacher's work at the time?—I can only judge in my own school. I have never seen so inspection of any class, whether taught by the principal or assistant, where I believe there was not a new lesson, and I know that the principal teachers would not have a show lesson. I do not believe it, but I think it might be done. It would be useless.

5642. Would it not be desirable then to apply the true test, and that is to examine the pupils themselves?—Certainly. I would like the pupils examined, not necessarily in every subject. I would like the inspector to examine them, but I thought that was a counsel of perfection.

5643. You stated that you objected to payment by results, that is I understand you to object to the payment of 6 fee for each individual subject?—Each individual child.

5644. Do you object to individual examination of pupils, that is an examination in an essential subject, say arithmetic?—I do not.

5645. Do you think it desirable?—I think it is very desirable. I like examination very much, but I object to a fixed date, on which everybody knows it is to take place, and to have the children examined up for a month or six weeks in order to pass the examination.

5646. Under the present system, is not the teacher required to hold an annual examination?—Yes.

5647. And are not the managers requested to hold examinations?—Yes, but that is not for pay.

5648. But I am not speaking of examinations for pay. Would it not be better than that those examinations should be conducted by an independent outside party, provided that they are properly conducted?—I would prefer it.

5649. And would it not be a truer test?—Yes.

5650. Supplemented if necessary by the examination of the teacher?—Yes.

5651. And you are not objecting to that when you object to payment by results of the individual examination of the children?—Oh, no, I am not.

5652. The CHAIRMAN.—You lay stress on examinations?—Yes, I have always done so.

5653. Mr. HESTY.—Now you have told us that in some schools there was examination by sample. You do not think that satisfactory?—I do not.

5654. Would it not be more satisfactory to the parents, and to the teacher of the child, to have a thorough examination of all the class instead of what we have at present?—I believe it would. I will tell you an example I know which struck me as very curious. I mentioned Mr. Bate's school of St. Peter's. Of course, that is a better class school, as regards the parentage of the boys, and at his recent inspection the



inspector said: "I think it would be much better for a school of this character to have an examination." He gave fully two days to the examination of the school, and I would prefer that to an inspector coming in and spending two hours or two-and-a-half hours with me in Dewopetrick, and going out and giving us "led" or something similar, as the result of his cursory examination.

5045. Now do you think it right that either the teacher's method or the state of the classes or other matters of that kind should be commented on at all by the inspector in presence of the children?—Certainly not; I think that should be a separate thing altogether; one for the teacher in the presence of the manager.

5046. In presence of the manager?—I think the manager should be present. I do not mean even in the case of finding fault with his teacher, but there are some things that the teacher could not put right without the help of the manager.

5047. You have given us an example of an inspector approving a teacher in presence of the people?—Yes.

5048. Have you noticed on any occasion that the manner of the inspector towards the teacher was not at all satisfactory?—I have. I thought on one or two occasions that the inspector was rough a little bit.

5049. Do you not think that that would tend to lessen the teacher's influence in the school and lessen his usefulness?—Yes; that is absolutely why I object to it.

5050. With regard to the building and equipment of the school, we have been trying to find how far the merit mark has been reduced, if it has been reduced, owing to the state of the school building. Can you give us any information on that?—I cannot. In some of my schools has the merit mark been reduced on account of the equipment of the school, because we had everything done that we were ever asked to do, and a great deal more.

5051. You are not totally opposed to merit marks?—Not totally opposed to merit marks.

5052. Do you think it is possible to sum up exactly the state of the school and the efficiency of the instruction in one word "excellent"?—I think it would be very difficult; I should not like to be asked to do it.

5053. Then, if it is so difficult, why should these merit marks be retained?—Simply that most of the managers were of opinion that they did afford a certain guide to the manager of a school in keeping things up to the mark. If things were going down, and if he got a mark like that, he would immediately go and find out the reason, and whether it was the teacher's fault or not.

5054. But you have told us that these merit marks are not given as anything approaching a uniform system?—Yes.

5055. When a man gets his mark reduced he does not know whether it is the state of the school that has fallen, or whether the mark has been reduced because the inspector may be a crank?—He does not know.

5056. It is no guide?—That is what we think. We say if the inspection mark were a reality, it would not be a bad thing.

5057. Would it not be better to have a detailed report on the state of the school, and the efficiency of the instruction in different subjects?—Certainly.

5058. Would not that obviate the necessity for these merit marks altogether?—But you are multiplying the work.

5059. For whom?—For the inspectors.

5060. I think they are paid for doing the work?—I suppose so.

5061. Are you aware that these merit marks were used in England and abandoned?—I am aware of it.

5062. And that the system of education has been carried on in Scotland and Germany without them?—Yes, and the teachers make that point too; but I may say this, that many of our managers are quite satisfied that the system of marks should continue if it could be worked properly, but we do not make its retention a strong point.

5063. You told us that under the present system the inspectors frequently harass the teacher, rather than test the knowledge of the children?—I have seen

a teacher cry. You will get more evidence as to that; it is certainly a thing that could never happen in England.

5064. You suggest that a uniform system of inspection should be provided?—Yes.

5065. And you could not make any particular suggestion with reference to that?—Our general idea is this. Take, for example, arithmetic, and suppose a senior class is being examined in fractions. My experience is that two inspectors would give a question not merely of the same style but of the same difficulty. You can probably give in an examination in fractions a question that any child could answer, and you could give another that no child could answer; yet the examination would be in the same subject. What we suggest is that the teacher should have a specimen card of questions, as they used to have. I suppose you know that under the reader system they were provided with cards or papers giving them some idea of the general difficulty of the questions that would be given, according to the different standards of the school; of course, allowing them a good deal of liberty and latitude.

5066. The CHAIRMAN.—A specimen examination paper?—A specimen examination paper. That is really what we ask for.

5067. Mr. HENLEY.—With regard to mathematics?—I may say mathematics is a subject where there is, perhaps, the greatest difference of opinion at present as regards the difficulty of the questions set.

5068. I see that in the Report from Belfast they complain that certain of the propositions in Euclid were set in a way in which it would be difficult or impossible for any pupil to be prepared to solve them?

—Yes, and the same applies to arithmetic, where there is a tricky question set. One was set the other day in my own school.

5069. Your suggestion is that sample cards or papers should be provided from the Education Office?—Yes.

5070. And that these should be taken as typical of what the inspector would set?—Of what he would expect each standard to know.

5071. Would you have these published in the code as specimens of what teachers might be expected to prepare their pupils in?—We did not think of that, and I would not like to answer you or no.

5072. Do you see any objection to it?—I do not.

5073. If that were done, I think it would do a good deal. You say in the next section that the promotion of children should, to some extent, depend on the result of the inspection?—Yes.

5074. Do you mean by that "inspection" or "examination"?—We call it inspection generally. What we mean by that is this. When an inspector comes to a school the children have no interest whatever in the inspection. They give nothing by it one way or the other. There is no moral completion on the child to answer. A child may stand in the class and hold his tongue the whole time. There is nothing depending on him. It is only the teacher who depends on the answering. His mark will depend on what takes place; but the children themselves have no interest really in the inspection. Now, they had a great interest in the examination in the old days. We have a difficulty in this way. It is not fair to throw the whole responsibility on the teacher for the promotion of the children.

I know a case, and you will hear of other cases afterwards, where the teacher deliberately was of opinion that a certain child should not be promoted, as it had not learned sufficient, and the whole case of that was thrown on the teacher, and the consequence was that five children were taken from that school on account of that child not being promoted, and were sent to another school. I think the inspection, however it is managed, should go back to the system by which promotion of a child to a higher grade would depend on the result of the inspection.

5075. Then is there not another danger, that supposing a teacher is not efficient, and not working properly, pupils may be retained too long in the class or standard that they are in at that particular time?

—There would be that danger, with the exception that they might pass to other schools.

5076. Then is there not another danger, that supposing a teacher is not efficient, and not working properly, pupils may be retained too long in the class or standard that they are in at that particular time?

—There would be that danger, with the exception that they might pass to other schools.

5077. Then is there not another danger, that supposing a teacher is not efficient, and not working properly, pupils may be retained too long in the class or standard that they are in at that particular time?

—There would be that danger, with the exception that they might pass to other schools.

5078. Then is there not another danger, that supposing a teacher is not efficient, and not working properly, pupils may be retained too long in the class or standard that they are in at that particular time?

—There would be that danger, with the exception that they might pass to other schools.

5685. And in the other case you think that there would be a danger of pupils not being promoted with sufficient rapidity?—I think there is a responsibility thrown on the teacher that is rather more (considering that this is a State system) than the teacher should be asked to bear.

5687. Now, it has been suggested here that if there were a formal examination of the children, a regular field day, such as we had in the old results time, there would be a tendency on the part of the pupils to become contented and unfitted for ordinary work by merely passing these examinations?—Those who are concerned need find their proper level.

5688. You are not afraid of that?—Not in the least.

5689. The CHAIRMAN.—Do you think every contented person gets the content knocked out of him?—Unless they are so contented that they do not mind the knocks.

5690. Mr. HENRY.—Then you think that some examinations held partly by teacher or inspector should take place before the pupils would get their promotion?—I do, distinctly.

5691. And that should be sufficiently formal to give the parents an interest in attending that examination, and endeavouring to get their children to pass it?—Yes.

5692. The CHAIRMAN.—If promotions are to be made, you propose I think that they should be made by the inspector?—Yes.

5693. But suppose that were so, would not the inspector have to give an individual examination in the school?—I do not think it would be necessary to do that in every subject.

5694. Not in every subject, but he must test every pupil?—I think that is what he is there for.

5695. That is the necessary consequence?—That is the necessary consequence.

5696. Mr. HENRY.—Promotions under the results system depended on passing three subjects, reading, writing, and arithmetic?—Yes.

5697. And the individual examination would be sufficient for those three subjects?—Yes.

5698. And a close examination for the remaining subjects?—Yes.

5699. And, of course, the individual examination is at present in cases subjects?—Yes.

5700. As a result of your experience, do you think that the adoption of a uniform school year has been beneficial in Ireland—the school year at present commences on the 1st of July, and all schools then commence their school year?—Yes.

5701. In the results days each individual school had its own school year, so that when the inspector came to hold his formal examination he was testing the year's work. I think the inspection of the year's work was better; but the question is whether he would like to go back to the old system of having a special year for every school, to date from the date of the inspection?—That is a matter on which we have not given our opinion. If we thought that the new school year in July was a failure, we might; but we do not object to the actual working of the present rule very much. There was a case in my own experience in which an inspector came at the end of five months of school teaching, and insisted on examining the school in the entire work for which a year was provided. That is absolutely wrong.

5702. The CHAIRMAN.—Was he exasperated with?—He was exasperated with both by the manager and the teacher, and that is why we suggest that if the school year remains as at present, commencing in July, the inspectors should be instructed as to how much of the course they should expect to be ready for examination, say, in October, January, and April, for it is a great injustice to the teacher to mark down a school because it has been only five months at work. Of course, the simplest plan would be to go back to the old system and let every school start from the date of its examination, and let promotion take place at that time, too.

5703. Mr. HENRY.—At present the inspectors are expected to confine their examination to work gone over, as indicated in the progress book?—Yes.

5704. And that has not been observed?—That has not been observed.

5705. The CHAIRMAN.—Where is that instruction given? Is it in one of the circulars?

Mr. HENRY.—It is in one of the circulars?—It is not in the Rules and Regulations.

The CHAIRMAN.—No.

5706. Mr. HENRY.—You think it would be better on the whole that each school had its own school year?—I do not like to say that; but I might say that it would get over a certain difficulty. I do not like to say that on the whole it would be better, because I have not thought it out. The point is that if you have a separate school year for every school, and a child passes from one school to another, that child may be put at a disadvantage, coming in at a different school year, and it may lose a year thereby.

5707. That is possible to happen at the present time when schools are not worked at the same rate. My impression is that I do not see anything has been gained by the change?—I do not think anything has been gained.

5708. What do you mean by the suggestion in your minds that the spirit of inspection ought to be changed?—We consider that the most important point in the whole thing. At the present time the teachers dread the inspectors. That is certain. I was in a school in England, and the teacher knew the inspector was coming, and the teacher said in my hearing: "I am so glad he is coming, because we will be certain to get a few good hints, and we will get help." No teacher in Ireland would ever dream of looking for help from an inspector under the present system. Now, we really want, whatever change is made, to be of such a character that the inspector will have to understand that he is to be the friend and encourager and helper of the teachers, and not merely an outside critic, who is inclined to be hypercritical.

5709. Would you wish to see him a co-worker?—I do not mean an assistant.

5710. And would it not be better if he recommends a plan for any particular school, that he should show how that plan could be worked out in that school?—So far as possible, yes.

5711. And should he not be prepared to assist the teacher as to the mode of teaching the different subjects?—I think so, and that is not done at present.

5712. Instead of that, you indicate here, that they approach the teachers with a feeling of distrust and hostility?—The teacher regards the inspectors with a feeling more or less of dread. They know they are not going to be pleased.

5713. No matter what they do?—As a general rule, they are not going to be pleased. I got a "very good" report the other day, to my great surprise, having got the very opposite three months previously; but, as a general rule, the inspectors do not encourage or cheer up the teachers and the inspections are not looked forward to with pleasure.

5714. One other question. Where you find a teacher doing good work, satisfying his manager, and satisfying parents, that the progress of the pupils is satisfactory, do you think it is right to allow that inspector to interfere with his methods of work and impose methods of his own on him?—Not unless the inspector is deliberately of opinion (I think the head inspector's opinion should be asked also) that better work might be done by a slight change in the system, because it would be just possible that the system, while satisfying parents and satisfying the manager, might be a little inadequate for the requirements of modern times. Improvements might be suggested, and they should be based, not on the opinion of the inspector alone, but on the opinion of the head inspector.

5715. I will take a concrete case. If a teacher takes the number 27 and teaches the children that that number is made up of two tens and seven units, he may be condemned by an inspector for not knowing his arithmetic. That is the sort of thing that I am speaking of?—That sort of thing is ridiculous.

5716. The CHAIRMAN.—You are agreed about that?—Yes.

5717. The BARROR or BARR.—The Chairman was asking you about the effect of the condition of the school and the equipment?—Yes.

8718. And you told us that you got a report in connection with a school that you considered would be a fair report if it were made on a town school, but was not fair on a country school?—I did not quite catch whether you meant merely the general description of the school. I think in a country district you must have something less in the way of lavatories and arrangements than you could have in a town with a water supply. I think the inspectors ought to take that into consideration, and they do not.

8719. I thought what the question was aimed at was the effect of the condition of the school on the merit marks?—I think I answered that afterwards, because I said that in my own experience every one of my own schools, as far as I know, was marked down.

8720. And that your schools were in excellent condition?—Yes, and they could not be marked down on that account.

8721. You had an endowment for it?—Yes.

8722. And I think you mentioned that a number of children at present wanted to be clerks?—Yes.

8723. We are agreed about that. That is my view and I think it is yours?—That is my view.

8724. You seemed to connect that mentality, if I may use the word, with the present system. I do not quite see how that particular frame of mind could grow up with the new system since 1900. It seems to me that the new system was intended to have the very opposite effect, and that this desire to get clerkships and positions of that kind would come from the former system of the child having to pass his examination in the National Schools. They might naturally slip into the idea that they ought to pass Civil Service examinations and other examinations?—You see, the vital part of the examinations in the old time was as regards reading, writing and arithmetic, and a man who was a good reader and writer, and had a fair knowledge of elementary arithmetic, would be willing to go and be a manual worker. Now they are occupied with a great many subjects and they learn a great many things that they did not learn then. I am not supposing that they teach all of them together, but they learn a great many subjects that they did not learn, and even amongst the farming class in my district, there is a growing discontent for manual labour and I can only attribute it to the general tendency of the teaching that is at present given in the schools. Of course, in one of my schools, the boys' schools in Davigelick, we try to obviate it by paying as much attention as possible to chemistry and practical science, so as to try to turn the boys' attention to technical work and technical schools.

8725. To try to counteract that tendency?—To try to counteract it; but there is that tendency which we cannot overlook, in our district—a growing discontent and a despising even of farming operations. I am afraid it is general over the country.

8726. The CHAIRMAN.—Is it not due to more causes than education?—I do not think that you could attribute it to anything except the education.

8727. The BRUNER or ROSE.—I quite agree that the teaching of chemical facts could help a farmer; but has there not been an effort to try to train their hands and eyes, and giving them a little mechanical sense, and is there not less attention devoted to this book knowledge that would fit them for passing examinations; for it has been complained of more than once that under the new system the boys do not get sufficient knowledge of reading and handwriting and spelling and arithmetic and long sets, which, as a foundation, really fit them for passing examinations. When the children had this knowledge, do you not think that they found themselves better equipped to pass examinations than they do under the present system?—I do not think that in our schools in the North there is any very great development of hand and eye training. Our teachers were taught to make paper boats by a teacher sent down from Dublin, and fold paper into little cubes. That was a lot of tomfoolery.

8728. Was not the main object of the bookkeeping to turn attention rather to industry?—I do not think it has done it.

8729. I quite agree with you that it has not achieved the results; but I cannot see how you can connect this

growing dislike of manual work with the new system since 1900?—You see, a great deal of attention is paid in our schools to most literary subjects—more so than there used to be—history and so forth, which is very useful and very good, but it does seem as if we wanted some development of our National system that would turn attention to the fact that the men who really do things in the world are carpenters, not clerks and men who do other people's work, and that the man who makes a wheelbarrow is a far better man than the man who copies a deed. That is my opinion.

8730. You have expressed my views better than I could do it myself. Did I gather that you were originally connected with an Intermediate School?—Yes. I was Senior Master of the Royal School, Armagh, for four or five years.

8731. I do not think you were quite enamoured of the Intermediate system of examination?—No; certainly not. The result was very pleasant, that is all.

8732. And I think you are arguing now that you do not want the Results system?—I do not want the Results system brought back again under the National Board.

8733. And your great objection was that when it was known that this examination was coming on, great pressure was brought to bear on the children, which was not good for them either physically or intellectually?—Yes, that is my view.

8734. If you are to go back to a fixed school year, and if you are to have examination at the end of the school year, would you not reproduce those difficulties?—You would, and I believe it would be better not to have a fixed date for the examinations, but to let the inspector inspect towards the end of the year.

8735. To drop in?—To drop in and do it.

8736. And that could be done without any fixing of the date?—Without any fixing of the date.

8737. And your own proposal was that the teacher should know exactly how the work of the year should be spread over the periods, and that would meet your difficulty?—Yes.

8738. And would you prefer that to going back to the fixed school year, with the danger of pressure and cramming, and all that?—I would.

8739. Mr. HANNA.—I understood you to say that the inspector should come in towards the end of the year? Yes; I would not like to have put down that any school should be examined every year on the 25th of June, because that would revert towards the old pressure system.

8740. I would like to know what year is meant?—The inspector should come in and have a formal examination towards the close of the year, whatever school year might be adopted.

8741. For that school?—For that school. I am not saying whether you are to keep to a universal one or not. Our point is that we want to have the promotion partly done on the authority of the inspector and not solely on the authority of the teacher.

8742. The BRUNER or ROSE.—And therefore if we are to go back to each school having its own year, and having an examination towards the close, you then have an interval of a couple of months?—I do not think that danger is so great when result less do not depend on it, because it is merely a matter of promotion of the pupils, not of putting money into the pockets of the teachers.

8743. So you think the money was the difficulty?—I think the money was the difficulty, and very materially.

8744. And then you would run the risk, whatever risk there may be in it?—I would.

8745. Bringing in a buffer between the parents and the teacher?—Yes, and also you would get the opinion of two men in place of the opinion of one man.

8746. I entirely agree with what you say on the point that the inspector should be courteous and gentlemanly towards the teachers; but the question I want to ask you is this. I do not know if of my own knowledge, but are the inspectors in later years more courteous than in the earlier years?—About three or four years ago they were certainly more courteous. I think they have been improved in the last year or so. My teacher was quite pleased when an inspector came

and shook hands with her the other day. She was quite pleased and said she did not know what was going to happen.

5747. Mr. COOPER.—How long ago was that?—It is about seven or eight months ago.

5748. Mr. HARRISON.—I think you said that the teachers dread the Inspector's visit. Is it not that really it is the menace of this merit grant that hangs heavily on the inspector and the teacher, when one has to assign a merit grant knowing what an enormous difference it may make to the teacher, and the other has to await that decision with a certain amount of fear and trembling?—We did not mention anything about this merit grant, because we thought that this was a case where it would be better for the teachers to give their own evidence; but I do think, in answer to your question, that that is partly what was the case, but not altogether, because I object to the whole tone of the inspection and the attitude of the inspector towards the teacher, which you seem a little surprised to know has existed.

5749. But I do think that this merit grant is the difficulty?—The teachers feel it very, very much.

5750. You do recommend less that the system of marks should continue, and the purpose of my question is whether a good deal of the feeling between the inspector and the teachers is not due to the system of these merit marks?—I think it has a good deal to do with it, but please do not say that we recommend the system of marks; we only say we won't condemn it.

5751. Now, you say that the reading, writing, and arithmetic have deteriorated since the year 1900, owing to the multiplication of subjects. Can you tell me what subjects you object to?—What strikes me is that we are really trying to make the schools—it may be right or it may be wrong—but we are trying to make the schools more or less verge on secondary schools.

5752. I want to know what subjects exactly have been brought into the curriculum which produced this effect?—The curriculum has been extended by the addition of history.

5753. Was not history taught before?—Not at all, it was absolutely forbidden in Ireland.

5754. Or geography?—Geography was, to a limited extent; but, of course, it is enlarged under the present system.

5755. What other subjects?—Physical drill, which takes up a good deal of time in the schools, is a good thing, and if you have an old list of thirty years ago, take the programme of any school, and compare it with the programme or the school time table of the same school to-day, and you will find that the time is far more split up, that there are more subjects being taught and a shorter time given to each.

5756. Is not that rather an advantage to the teachers and the children, that there should be a variety, and that the changes should not be only ring, as I understand they were, on reading, writing, and arithmetic?—Yes, but I think we have gone to the other extreme, and the time for reading is too short.

5757. At the same time, you do not think the other system was perfect?—Oh, no; not at all; but my evidence is that in our present system the foundations are not sufficient. There is not sufficient time for laying the foundations, just in the same way as in the Secondary or Royal or Grammar Schools we have. If I was a senior master, and I was in Armagh, and I went round a school and found that the second class Latin grammar and third class Latin grammar were not properly taught, but that they were attending to other matters, I would say that Latin grammar should be taught before anything else as the foundation of a knowledge of Latin.

5758. You think that there has been a distinct deterioration in what are known as the three elementary subjects?—Yes.

5759. Can you give me any reason for that beyond your impression?—I was in a house in town the other day, and the father said to me: "I wonder why it is that none of my children can read or write anything." Well, the children were fairly intelligent and had done well in the school, and I try, as far as I can, to have as much time given to reading, writing, and arithmetic, as we possibly can give under the present system, but I do not think that these elementary subjects are as well taught.

5760. Probably reading aloud has deteriorated; but so the other hand, there has been a great deal gained in the intelligent appreciation by the child of the book it reads?—I think if a man is intelligent, and if he understands the words on a page, he ought to be able to read it to another man, so that the other man should understand it.

5761. That is not quite true of children of 10 or 12; they want practice, and I do not think that it is even true in, we will say, the middle forms of a secondary school; where the reading aloud, which is not practised, is sometimes extremely bad?—Extremely bad.

5762. And we might even go further, and say that one hears lessons read in Church sometimes, which are not perfect examples of reading?—Certainly.

The GRAMMAR.—Under the Intermediate system there is no time now for the reading of classics. I find students who can translate Homer splendidly, and they cannot read a line of Homer easily?—The answer to that in the case of a secondary school is that they have no time to read Homer or Virgil. It is the same in the other schools.

5763. Mr. HARRISON.—I do not say there is not sufficient time to read; but there is less than there was?—In my own school I give prizes for reading at Christmas.

5764. The Bishop of Ross has asked you whether it is your experience that the education given since 1900 has made children more inclined to follow what we will call clerical occupations than before?—It certainly has in my school. Perhaps I am blaming something that I should not, and there may be some unknown cause, some temper of the mind in the general public, which is leading the boys to do that. The one idea now is to get into a shop or into a lawyer's office as a clerk.

5765. Has that distinctly increased since 1900?—It has distinctly increased.

5766. I do not think that experience would coincide with the experience in England?—I suppose it would not.

5767. Because in the late 'seventies and 'eighties we had very many complaints that the education was tending to make boys take up clerical?—But don't you think you are twenty years ahead of us?

The BISHOP OF ROSS.—I think it is the reverse. Our system began in 1881.

5768. Mr. HARRISON.—You say there is no word of praise ever comes from an Inspector, but you rather contradicted that just now by saying that you had received a very nice report?—I did, written in the school report book.

5769. Then I think you go on to say you want the extracts from the report sent to the managers. Is not that what you want?—No, only part of it. It is headed "Extract from the Report," or something like that, and it always relates to what is found fault with.

5770. Do you not get the report on the subjects in which they have done well?—We do not. We never get that. That is the difficulty. What I want is to be able to go to my teacher and say: "Now, I am very pleased to see you did so well in history, or geography," or whatever it might be; but in place of that, I find nothing down but "arithmetic deficient in standard," and so on—not a word for anything that is good.

5771. I have seen the forms, and the inspectors do give marks in every subject?—I never got them.

5772. So you do not know how good the subjects are which have escaped blame?—I only know that certain subjects as a rule have escaped blame.

5773. That is really rather a revelation to me, and therefore you are entirely dependent on anything the inspector may say to you as manager or to the teacher?—Or may write in the book.

5774-5. Would he write praise in the book?—I have never seen it, except in that case.

5776. Mr. HENRY.—Does not that bring us to this, that a general report giving a proper estimate of all the subjects would be the proper thing to send?—Yes.

5777. Mr. HARRISON.—Now, in your evidence, you propose that specimen questions should be sent from the central authorities. I am speaking to you as an old educationalist. Do you think it is possible to draw a satisfactory list of specimen questions?—I do not

think it should be anything beyond the ability of the National Board or the Inspectors to do it roughly.

5778. It must be done very roughly, otherwise will you not stamp both the teacher and the inspector?—You might; but sometimes an inspector comes and gives an examination in fractions, and a reference to the regulations shows that the examination is absolutely beyond the children who are being examined.

5779. When you criticise the inspector's questions, you ought to know also with what object he asked them. You say he should not put a trick question?—Yes.

5780. A trick question may be asked by an examiner with the best possible intentions?—He'll be paved with good intentions.

5781. That is perfectly true, but I want to point out that the question may be just to try if there is a particularly sharp boy. It all depends on what impression he attaches to the question. Of course, if he is a wise man, he will not make the reason for asking it clear, if it is a doubtful question. But in limiting the instruction is there not a danger of cramping everybody concerned, if you issue these specimen questions?—In the Intermediate examinations a man has to write a history paper, we will say. He writes it, but it is not necessarily the paper that is set to the pupils. That paper has to pass a Court of Examiners. That Court sees that there is nothing in that history paper which ought to be beyond the intelligence or understanding, as regards the subject matter of the question, of a child of, say, the middle grade, or whatever it is. There is no such check on the ingenuity of inspectors, of any sort whatever. They may put any sort of questions they like, however unkind you may think them, to the children that are to be examined on them. We hold (not necessarily in some down to a system of cards or specimen questions) that somehow or other there should be some check, just as in other examinations.

5782. I quite agree that the inspectors ought to try to be reasonable, but remember this, that you are taking the case of an examination paper. There is no doubt that questions should always be submitted by the man who drew them up to somebody else, but some of your examinations in the Intermediate are oral examinations, are they not?—No. We still examine orally in Trinity College, and some of us suffered.

5783. In fact, you feel yourself in the position of the poor inspectors, subject to a good deal of criticism in your questions, if you examine orally?—I was the corpse wife. If you go in for classical scholarship in Trinity College a heap of the work is done viva voce, and a great deal of it is very nearly worth.

5784. I have suffered. The inspector's position is one that subjects him to a great deal of criticism, and sometimes possibly unfair criticism?—Yes, and there should be something by which they would have some uniform idea, that one man would not come and examine a class altogether and dismiss it by giving questions it cannot understand.

5785. I think one of the reasons for urging examinations is that you say it is a necessary stimulus to the children. Do you think that really the children require that, and are you not really rather ignoring the natural desire of all children to show what they can do?—I don't know that it is quite a universal feeling among children. There are lots of children who will never open their mouths if you don't force them. You are rather turning into the positive what we are working at from the negative side, that is, that in the present system there is no obligation on a child to do anything at an inspection, because there is no examination and there are no marks.

5786. Well, the penalty was not very severe on them in the other case, if they chose to be idle and said: "I do not care if I pass or fail?"—But if you examine a class against one another, you arouse a spirit of rivalry that does not exist in the ordinary inspection of a class, and that is what we are saying takes place. If you were examining a class at work on a certain subject they would all try to do their best to answer. One wants to beat another; but under the present system of inspection there is no encouragement to the child at all.

5787. And do you mean to say that if an inspector takes a class and examines them, he won't find them all eager to answer?—He very seldom examines a class.

5788. The Chairman.—The point of the objection is according to this document, that there is hardly any examination?—The inspector may sit down and see the teacher examine a class.

5789. Mr. HARRISON.—But after he has listened for some time, does he not then ask them questions himself?—Oh, no; but he will pick out one or two children.

5790. And ask questions of the class?—Very few questions. That is not my experience.

5791. Does he examine the books?—The children's books?

5792. Yes, the existing books?—Oh, yes.

5793. And occasionally he sets a sum for them on the blackboard?—Yes.

5794. And hears them read?—Sometimes.

5795. So he comes into the reading class and talks to the children, does he not?—Yes; but there is nothing in all that to arouse the children's interest to do as well as possible.

5796. Won't they do it for the teacher's sake?—If they are in the habit of answering the teacher, won't they answer the inspector?—You cannot explain to the children that the teacher will, perhaps, get 27 of a rise.

5797. But the children understand that very well.

—I do not think the children know anything about it.

5798. I thought they were sharp children in Ireland?

—The teachers do not explain to the parents.

5799. Mr. KAVANAGH.—You say that if inspection was a reality you would not object to the marks system. Do you think that would meet the view of the teachers also?—I do not think it would.

5800. They object altogether to the marking?—They absolutely object to the marking system in the North of Ireland and Belfast and Down and Antrim, for which we speak.

5801. Do you think they would like to go back to the results system?—I do not think they would, and I do not think it would be a good thing. No teacher ever told me that he wants the results system back.

5802. Have you any idea whether they have formulated any scheme—if they did not like the results system and do not like the present system, what is their particular grievance in that way?—I do not think I am bound to speak for the teachers.

5803. Previous witnesses have differed as to the merits of the present system. Can you tell us whether you think the education of the children is better or worse now than it was before 1900?—I think the children, as a whole, are more intelligent now, but I do not think they know certain things as accurately as they did before. That is really what it comes to.

5804. You think they are not as well educated now as they were?—That depends on what you mean by "educated."

5805. Well, to meet the battle of life, such education as is required for ordinary life. Are they educated as usefully now for themselves as they were before 1900?—It is hard to say, except in Belfast. You see, I still think that the education has a great deal to do with the tendency of the present system to turn them from what I consider very valuable and more important things—agriculture and farming and all that sort of thing. It has that tendency. They are not so well grounded certainly.

5806. They are not as usefully educated as they were before?—Well, you see, you have brought in so many other outside things.

5807. But in considering any change in the system, ought not we to think first and foremost of the children?—Certainly.

5808. Of the children's interests?—Yes.

5809. And then does it not come back to the question whether they are better educated now than they were before 1900 under the two different systems?—It seems to me that it is going a little bit beyond what I anticipated. It seems to me that the question is a little beyond what I thought was the scope of the inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN.—As my note, that question has been gone into to a very great extent.

5806. Mr. KAVANAGH.—I try to keep the children always before my mind in considering this question?—I do not think that within certain limits it will be very hard to draw a conclusion, if you take the elementary and absolutely essential subjects of education, the children are not as well taught now in those subjects as they were before 1900.

5807. The Bishop of Ross.—But at the same time you think the children are more intelligent?—Yes.

5808. That when leaving school under the present system they are more intelligent?—Yes, but they do not know so much.

5809. They are more intelligent, but they have acquired less knowledge?—Yes.

5810. Mr. KAVANAGH.—You could not say whether it was more useful than the previous knowledge?—I do not think the subjects are more useful.

5811. Are you aware of the existence of grievances amongst the teachers in your district?—Oh yes, there are nothing but grievances.

5812. Would you consider that it was against the system or against the individual inspectors?—I would rather put it differently, because I think the inspectors must have been acting on instructions they got from headquarters. I do not think the inspectors came down of their own accord, and began to work havoc in our schools, and to mark them all down. I really cannot think that a businessman attacked all the inspectors.

5813. Is it a grievance against the system, and not against individual inspectors?—Yes, it is the present system that we object to.

5814. You have said that you have seen a good many of the inspectors changed. Do you think that there is more grievance under one inspector than under another?—That is the point. The inspectors vary, and they have different grievances; each man is allowed to have his own little lads, and there is no organized system.

5815. And you have told us that you do not believe in a man being able to award a merit mark in ten minutes?—In five; but to say ten is equally true.

5816. One of the inspectors told us that any intelligent inspector ought to be able in ten minutes to award a merit mark. Do you disagree with him?—Absolutely.

5817. Sir Samuel Dill has asked you as to how the equipment and appearance of the school affect the merit mark of the school?—It has not affected any of the schools with which I am personally acquainted, but the schools were marked down. They were moved from "excellent" down a couple of points, and that could not have been caused by the state of the buildings.

5818. Did you ever know of a teacher having to pay out of his own pocket for the cleaning of the school, or for having to do anything to the school?—No.

5819. That has not come under your experience?—Certainly not.

5820. Are there any inspectors at present who have been teachers?—I do not know.

The CHAIRMAN.—Twenty out of seventy.

5821. Mr. KAVANAGH.—You could not tell me whether an ex-teacher is a better inspector than one who has not been an ex-teacher?—I think there is a great deal to be said for and against, and it depends on the personality of the man.

5822. Sir HERMAN WILKINSON.—Touching the question of expense entailed upon a teacher for the cleaning of a school, we are all delighted to hear that you know of no such case; but it has come to our knowledge that there are such cases, and this is the rule with respect to it.—The Commissioners desire to impress on the managers that it is their duty to provide funds for the proper furnishing, lighting, and ventilating, and the adequate heating of the schools in cold weather, and they cannot approve of any expenditure for this purpose or monetary responsibility in connection with it being imposed on the teachers of the school. That is the rule, but we have had evidence that if the teachers do not clean the schools, or have them cleaned, they may get their marks reduced in

consequence. That is one of the points on which there is really no dispute. It is satisfactory to hear of cases in which there is an endowment or other provision for all these purposes. I may say that the Lord Bishop of Ross has informed us that in his own diocese he sees that there is money provided for such purposes, but, unfortunately, there are cases in which this is not done. It is not our business to say whether the managers are right or wrong; but we would desire to see some system by which the schools would be cleaned, but neither monetary responsibility nor physical responsibility would be imposed upon the teacher?—I think the Government ought to do these things. I think it is very hard on poor clergymen of any denomination to have a big school and no endowment for it. They may have to get it cleaned out of their own pockets. I do not think the State ought to allow that.

5823. I understand that when the children go home from the schools, where there is no arrangement for a charwomen or anybody to look after the work, it falls upon the assistant mistress or head mistress or teacher to sweep out the school. You see he thereby does not commit a breach of the rules; but now, the point I wish to ask your advice and opinion upon is this, how far, considering it from the social point of view, and the notion that parents would have as to the uses their children are turned to (for I should say many parents would be very touchy if they got an idea that their children were turned to manual service), and considering that amongst the young children at any rate, it might be a means of teaching them order and cleanliness, you, as an independent witness, who have had great experience with regard to the ideas and opinions of parents of pupils, think it would be possible in the training of infants and younger children to include some cleaning of the school among the things that should be taught without bringing down on the teacher the condemnation of the parents?—There are a great many country schools where you could not get a charwomen for love or money, and at the present time in the County Down, in the little country schools, the sweeping of the school afterwards and the general tidying up is done by the senior class of girls, and it is a very good lesson to them in domestic economy.

5824. That is the point, and you think that that could be carried out?—It has been carried out to my knowledge for 24 years in a National School, and no parents have ever objected to the children having to learn how to sweep a room.

5825. I am very glad to hear that, and you quite approve of that?—I quite approve of that.

5826. Have you had much occasion to communicate with the Board?—No, sir; I occasionally go and speak to them.

5827. Do you find your representations are attended to?—I may get a letter by return of post to say that my letter has been duly received; but the answer may not come for a long time, so I generally go round and see the secretary.

5828. And have you been successful in getting remedies for grievances?—Well, in anything that I have had to bring before them, I have found the secretaries very courteous, and if they would not do the thing they refused me very nicely, and I believe more in going to see the secretary rather than in writing, because it seems to me a relaxation of the red tape system.

5829. One of the points we had before us was appeals to the Board—the hearing of those appeals and the result of them?—Up in the North, when we have an appeal to the Board about anything, we get someone that we know on the Board to bring forward the appeal, and we believe in the spoken word more than the written letter.

5830. With reference to examinations, Mr. Harrison put a point to you regarding what you have said as to the interests of the children, and I think it was brought out before us that under the results system each child knew what the result of his examination was, and had to tell his parents how he got on. What I understood from you is that you were speaking of the present system, under which only a few passed, and that the examination, when the inspection resolves

itself into an examination, is not of the same nature as under the old results system, so far as regards calling upon the pupil to do his best in each case?—Yes; I do not think that the present inspection system makes much demand on the child or encourage the child even to be intelligent. Do not take it, however, that I want to go back to the results.

3834. You have emphasised that, and I think we all understand it. I was rather wanting to get an illustration of the different points of view with regard to the child taking an interest?—The children can stand round an inspector in the class under the present system and some of the children will be asked a question at all. There may be 14 or 20 children in the class, and ten or a dozen may never be asked a question the whole time.

3835. The CHAIRMAN.—The whole point is that the inspector's examination does not take in a sufficient number?—It is necessary to take in the class.

3836. Sir HIRSH WILKINSON.—And no child can go home to his parents and say, "The inspector was there to-day, and I did well"?—A few might, but the whole class could not. The inspection would not necessarily include that.

3837. And there is no record under the present system of examination of each child's progress in the particular subjects?—Oh, no.

3838. With regard to infants, what is your experience as to the inspection of infants—the tone and discipline of infants has come up occasionally, and some inspectors are rather impatient at the want of that perfect stillness which is required?—There is not one man in fifty fit to inspect infants.

3839. Do you mean that you would have a woman inspector?—I would far rather have a woman inspector for the infants. I have known a man teacher as good and having just as writing a way with the infants as a woman, but I would rather inspect the sixth standard than inspect the infants.

3840. The CHAIRMAN.—A person accustomed to a nursery should inspect them?—I think so.

3841. Sir HIRSH WILKINSON.—Is it in consequence of the question that is required?—I heard one inspector say that the teacher did not keep the infants of my boys' school sufficiently in order, because they did not fold their arms nicely and simultaneously on the desk.

3842. Mr. COOPER.—You say that in reading, writing, arithmetic, grammar and geography, the instruction has deteriorated in comparison with what it used to be?—I think it has.

3843. You said you thought that intelligence had improved. I would be glad to know, if reading, writing, grammar, and geography have deteriorated, where is the improvement in intelligence likely to come from?—The children are more pliable, and they can talk to you better and about more things; but whether that is more desirable when looking for situations is a very different matter. I would rather not have it.

3844. Under the present system has not memory cultivation been sadly neglected?—Yes; but I think there is very little time for memory cultivation. Of course, I hold a very strong opinion about memory cultivation, and I would only keep the Committee for too long if I were to enter upon that; but I do think that with this perpetual system of writing in vogue in all our schools nowadays, both secondary and primary, and which everyone makes a note of everything, and depends on his note book, our memories have deteriorated.

3845. But do you not think it would be well if memory was cultivated in the schools at an early stage, and not left over to an age when it becomes a torture to get off a list of places?—I do.

3846. I am entirely with you in your dislike of the results system; but if I understand you rightly, you would like a full examination by the inspector, if you could hope that it was attainable?—Yes. I would not necessarily ask the inspector to inspect each class in every subject, but I would like to get examination in some subjects and to let everything be thorough.

3847. Do you not think that examination is a privilege of the child's, and do you not think it would be a healthy stimulus and a training in industry for a child to pass an examination?—That is what I said. I

think examination draws out the spirit of the child, and that the present system does not.

3848. Do you not think that in view of the child it would be well to have a set day on which he could have to face this discipline?—Yes, provided that did not encourage the old system of cramming.

3849. This is my idea. I do not say that the inspector should examine every child on every subject, but that a set day should be provided for the examination, and that the inspector should thoroughly examine the class, and by had a dozen rounds of questions on any subject he ought to be able to satisfy himself whether that class was well taught?—Yes.

3850. You say that that is right?—Yes, I do.

3851. Of course, in the results system, the whole principle was vicious, where all depended on a money payment. The bright boys had an advantage, and the dull boys were found at a price that was cruel to bring him up to the same standard. In regard to the merit marks you do not appear to have any very strong view as to the necessity for them?—We do not want them particularly, but if the Board think they are necessary, and if they are fairly allotted, we are not going to say that we object. That is our position.

3852. We have had evidence of officials of the Board who pointed out that one of the advantages of these merit marks was that it made it easier for those who had to deal with them in the office to see how the school stood at the time. Is not that the view of some of the managers?—That it makes it easier?

3853. Yes; that is given information in a tabulated shape to the manager, enabling him to see how his school is doing?—Yes, that is what some of the managers felt; but they do not think that these marks as at present given are of any value whatever.

3854. The only advantage you can see, if I understand your position rightly, is that it would enable the manager to see at a glance how the school stood?—A number of the managers in our society said that they thought that if the marking was done fairly and as a result of proper inspection and examination, it would be a help to the managers to know exactly how a school was doing. I have spoken as their mouthpiece, but to be quite honest I personally would have none of these merit marks.

3855. How could it ever be fairly done if you take an impressionist view of the school?—It cannot.

3856. So that the merit marks are unreliable under the present system?—Under the present system they are perfectly useless.

3857. Mr. HARRIS.—Can you tell us whether the percentage of pupils in the higher classes has increased under the present system?—I think the percentage of pupils in my own boys' school has increased.

3858. In the higher classes?—In the higher classes; because we have no secondary school in the district, and I have got an exceptional master. He is a B.A. of London, with honours.

3859. I was asking with reference to the schools as a whole?—I could not say.

3860. Mr. HARRISON.—Are there no statistics on that point published by the National Board?

Mr. HARRIS.—I would like to get them for an important centre like Belfast.

Mr. HARRISON.—They are published for the whole of Ireland?—You could get them for Belfast, I suppose. The teachers would give them to you; but it is not a matter that an individual manager would consider.

3861. Mr. HARRIS.—Unfortunately the teachers will give us nothing?—There was one question Mr. Harrison asked, about the increments depending on the inspection. Though I hold no brief on behalf of the teachers, I may say that they are very strongly of opinion that if they had no bad marks and that the school is going on fairly well, they should have a fixed gradual rise, as would be the case in any other profession.

Mr. HARRISON.—We have already had some rather strong evidence on that point?—I wish to make it quite clear that in all I have said it is the system I blame rather than the individual inspectors.

Very Rev. CHARLES GIBBSON, B.D., Dean of Belfast.

5861. The CHAIRMAN.—We have before us the Memorials\* of the Church of Ireland Managers of the National Schools in the Counties of Antrim and Down, and we have had ample evidence from the Archbishop, and you concur generally in the statements and recommendations of this Memorial?—Yes.

5862. You have been now a manager of National Schools for how many years?—I was a manager of two schools in Banbridge, Co. Down, for about 24 years, and then I have been a year and a half manager of two schools in Belfast. One is Donegall Road, a very large school, with eight teachers.

5863. And you have had experience for 24 years in Banbridge?—Yes.

5864. As Rector of the Parish. I will just touch first on your experience of inspectors' visits. I think as manager you have been present at a good many of those visits?—A good many. It is not always easy to be present, because of late we only get notice on the morning of the inspection, and that is a difficult thing. 5865. That might interfere with your arrangements?—Is might.

5866. And by rule 67 you have to receive notice?—We receive notice practically always in the morning. The morning's post would bring me word that an inspection would be held in an hour or two hours.

5867. You have seen inspectors conduct these inspections?—Yes.

5868. Under both the new and the old system?—Yes.

5869. Would you mind giving us your general impression of the inspectors under the new system with reference to criticism?—I think there is a dictatorial spirit about it. There would seem to be a want of sympathy with the teachers. The teachers complain of it, and I think really they have a right to complain in some cases.

5870. Now, as an observer, when you have been present there, have you noticed a want of courtesy on the part of the inspector to the teacher?—In some cases. In one case, I found a female teacher in tears in the class room.

5871. Was that due to the conduct of the inspector?—Yes.

5872. Was it his conduct generally or his words?—She told me that he had examined her as to her duty to the mistress, and then examined the mistress before her, and she broke down.

5873. Have you observed any want of respect on the part of the inspector to the teacher in the presence of his pupils?—I have.

5874. Distinctly?—Distinctly. I do not mean on the part of every inspector. An inspector came in unexpectedly, and I came in very shortly afterwards, and found him at the desk with four or five boys beside him. He was examining the boys as to the truth of what the teacher said about their absence, testing the truth of the teacher in front of the teacher, and in presence of the teacher.

5875. By means of the pupils?—Yes. What happened was this. The boys had finished some writing lessons and had been sent out before the half hour was up for the subject. The inspector went into the school then, and the school boys came in when the half hour was up and saw the inspector, and the inspector then asked them why they were absent, and the Principal told him what I tell you. He seemed to doubt it and called the boys in, and had the boys here upon the platform in the schoolroom, questioning them before the teacher.

5876. As any rule, you have seen inspectors behave in a way that they ought not to do towards the teachers?—With want of courtesy; but not frequently.

5877. Now, with regard to the matters that managers are supposed to attend to, the inspectors are not allowed to dictate in the school, but they may inform you of anything they saw wanting?—Yes; they do generally.

5878. What was their manner of doing that?—They were generally courteous to me. I have no complaint to make on that head.

5879. And had you much difficulty with regard to the building equipment, and lighting and heating of the school?—At Banbridge, both schools were built during the time I was manager.

5880. Had you much local aid?—In one case we

spent £1,300 or £1,350 of absolutely local money. We had no help from the Board of Works. As it was sent to the Church, we wanted to have a free hand to use it as we liked, so we asked for no money. We had to use that money from our Church funds.

5881. You had a sufficient amount of funds for these purposes?—A parish finds it difficult to make an exchange balance when all matters are considered.

5882. Who was responsible for the obtaining of the school?—The Select Vestry, of whom I am Chairman, appointed a caretaker, who might be sexton in one case, and in the other case he might not be sexton.

5883. In your schools in Banbridge the duty of keeping the schools clean was not thrown on the teacher?—Never.

5884. Now, in a recent rule of the Board, the managers are expected to have periodical examinations. You are aware of that rule?—I am not.

5885. That is rule 54, and under it managers are expected to have periodical examinations made through the teachers or other competent persons?—I am not aware of it. I know nothing of it.

5886. And apart from that rule, have you ever arranged to have those examinations conducted by the teachers?—Oh, no; I knew the teachers did it, and they have shown me the results of the examination.

5887. They bring you the results?—Certainly; they bring me certain things regularly—exercises books and copy books, and design drawings, and these are all kept for me.

5888. And have you ever gone into the subject of promotions in the school?—Never. I leave that entirely to the teacher.

5889. Now, in all that long period, you became perfectly acquainted with the work of the results system?—Yes; fairly so, I think.

5890. And what was your general impression of that, of its effects on education?—We did not like it.

5891. For what reason?—Well, examining would be one reason, and when it came near examination time the teachers were at fever heat the last six weeks. Their promotion depended on it, and high pressure was put on, so there was examining for some weeks before the examination.

5892. I dare say you know it is alleged that it had one great advantage, namely, interest of the pupil in the examination, and interest in the parents in the progress of the pupils?—Yes, and we think that if there could be a system intermediate between our present one and the past one it might be well. It is not for me, not being an educationalist, to suggest, but I think it would be well to have a little of the results, if it could be worked in.

5893. Would you still have payment on examinations if it could be worked?—Not altogether.

5894. But as some of the payments might depend on the result, you would not exclude that possibility?—No, I would like the results to be a factor in determining the state of the school.

5895. Would you desire to have all the children of a school examined by the inspector individually?—No; I am not prepared to say that as schools differ so much. I would not be prepared to say that.

5896. Just another question under that head. We have had some discordant opinion given to us here on the subject, and I should like to hear your opinion. Do you think, with regard to one subject that we have to report upon, that the new system has been beneficial to education? Has it raised or depressed education as to efficiency?—I would say that on the whole it has improved.

5897. You think it has improved?—Yes, on the whole, I would prefer the present to the past, if it could only be managed by the Education Office to have some examination.

5898. You would like the salary of teachers, or, at least, a portion of it to depend on the examination?—Yes; but I believe the present system is certainly better than the last.

5899. In what particulars do you think education has improved?—I think the absence of examining, and the absence of a period in which pressure is put on very great gains.

5900. Is it a positive gain?—It is a positive gain if a bad thing is removed.



3rd April, 1913.]

Very Rev. CHARLES GIBSON, B.D., examined.

[Continued.]

5900. The CHAIRMAN.—Do you think the general intelligence of the children apart from book-knowledge, has improved—if you can separate these things?—I don't think I could separate these.

5901. I do not know whether you consider yourself able to answer the question, but in the three elementary subjects it has been stated that there has been a decline under the new system?—I am not in a position to answer that.

5902. I suppose you have been confronted with a question that has been circulating everybody now, and certainly has been circulating our minds, and that is the want of uniformity of inspection?—Yes.

5903. Have you been face to face with that?—The other day a case that was an illustration came under my notice. It was on the occasion of an inspector's visit to St. Ann's School, Belfast. Although that school is connected with the Cathedral, it is one of the schools to which the poorest children go, and the inspector examined in advance on the elementary science course there, and he did not seem satisfied. A few weeks later the science organizer came and he said it was very satisfactory as regarded the education of the young children, and he went on then without any question of depreciation to praise it.

5904. What was the interval?—Between November and February.

5905. And the latter examiner gave praise?—Yes, and the other said it was mediocre.

5906. Mr. LAMONT.—The latter examiner was an expert in the subject?—Yes; that is the point. The teacher told me this.

5907. There was a very short interval?—Very. The inspector came in November and the science organizer on the 4th of December.

5908. That would be only two or three weeks?—Yes.

5909. The CHAIRMAN.—Have you any other instance with regard to that subject of discordance?—No, I do not think I have any other instance I could mention.

5910. You know these six merit marks that we have had so much before us, beginning with "excellent" and going on down to "bad." There are six distinct marks given to the teacher of a school for the purpose of his increment or promotion?—The only remark I would make about that is that there is a necessity for uniformity among the inspectors, which seems to be a very difficult thing to maintain.

5911. When you have so many of these marks, is it easy for one man to assign a mark correctly, and is it easy for two men in different parts to attach the same value to the mark?—I think uniformity is a most desirable thing to attain; but I see great difficulty in attaining it.

5912. Do you mean that the multiplication of these shades of difference in the awarding of merit marks makes uniformity more difficult than it might be?—That is self-evident.

5913. But you have not considered the question of the policy of the merit mark?—Oh, no; I have not.

5914. Now, it is stated in this memorial that the present system of inspection is impressionist, that it deals rather with the tone of a school and things of that kind, and that it does not conduce to the knowledge and proficiency of the pupils?—I agree with that generally.

5915. Have you observed instances of an inspector entering a school and giving judgment on it after a very cursory glance at it?—Certainly. I have had examples of inspectors coming in, taking a cursory view of it, and going out again; but I do not know that he based his judgment on that brief visit.

5916. You could not correct his judgment with that?—No.

5917. Now, there is a very strong statement here, that under the present system the inspectors frequently harass the teachers rather than test the knowledge of the children?—I have had the example that I have mentioned of my female teacher, who was a very nice young woman, and good teacher, of finding her in tears. That is one example. And there was also another case in my other school in Benbridge where the teacher was winner of the Carville and Blake memorial prize, and the only dealing the inspector had with me was to hand me six pages that he tore out of the exercise books, which were the six worst papers of the whole school. He showed me nothing of the good

work, and the teacher was present and said: "That is not fair."

5918. What did the inspector say to that?—Nothing. He passed on to other matters.

5919. So that the inspector deliberately chose the worst work?—He showed me only the worst work and nothing else.

5920. We have had it stated here that the inspector deals far too much in trenchant condemnation and never gives praise?—I would endorse that fully. I never heard a word of praise.

5921. Is a school in doing well, you never heard it praised?—I have never heard it praised. There was an inspector a great many years ago, when I first went to Benbridge. I think everybody liked him. I don't know that he was an easy inspector, but everybody liked him, and with that one exception I never heard a word of praise of a school.

5922. Or do you remember an inspector going to a teacher and saying: "Such and such subjects are very well done, but there is one subject that needs more attention"?—I am able to find that from written reports; but I am talking of face to face intercourse.

5923. I think the Archbishop or somebody went further and said the reports generally dwelt on the faults and not on the merits. That may be so, and the Archbishop has told us that he never saw anything praised in a report, and never knew of an inspector going to a teacher and saying: "These subjects are very good; but why is not this so good"?—My evidence is that at a personal meeting with the inspector I never heard a word of praise from the inspector.

5924. In personal communications you never heard praise?—Never. With regard to the written reports, they could be turned up, and then you could see exactly what they stated.

5925. Now, I go on to this point, which is very startling; that the visits of inspectors are awaited with dread?—I endorse that. "Dread" is a strong word, and yet I do not know any word.

5926. You do not find among the inspectors that their conception of their office is that it is a great part of their business to advise the teacher in improving the education in the school?—I think that helpful advice is absent.

5927. The idea of improving the education is not present to their minds?—I believe it is generally absent.

5928. And that is one reason why their visits are dreaded?—Yes, and that to me is the centre of the whole thing.

5929. The real centre of the evil?—Yes, between the teacher and inspector.

5930. That the relation of teacher to inspector is not of the proper kind?—Yes, there should be a position of sympathy and not of antagonism. They look upon the inspector as antagonistic.

5931. Then I proceed to the last clause of this page, in which you say we desire a change in the spirit of inspection?—Yes.

5932. Do you mean that the inspector ought to have the intention of advising and helping the teacher first of all?—Quite so, and finding out what was wrong and setting it right and advising him; and sometimes it struck me that some of the inspectors find it hard to get rid of the school attitude, if I may say so—of considering that he is rather the schoolmaster and the teacher is the child, or that the teacher is a senior scholar and the inspector is the teacher.

5933. Speaking from a higher platform?—Yes, I think so. There is a want of sympathy.

5934. There is one point of considerable difficulty on the last page; that is, a suggestion for procuring a more uniform system of inspection, that there should be a series of uniform tests in various subjects or specimen examination papers sent out from the Central Office to show teachers the scale of difficulty in the examination that they might expect?—It seems to me that that would be desirable, but I think it should not be too rigid, because of the different qualities of school and the different qualities of pupils. Take St. Ann's School in Belfast, where we have a large number of little boys without shoes and stockings. I do not think that it would be expected that the teacher could possibly get these children to the level of high class children.

5935. The inspector should make allowance for social circumstances?—Yes; that would be fair to the teacher.

5900. Do you think that is done at present?—I do not know; I could not tell you.

5901. It is recommended by the Board apparently in a note?—Of course, I am not speaking of what they do in another school. I can only speak of my own schools.

5902. Sir HERMAN WILKINSON.—In the matter of the cleaning of your schools and your providing of funds, there is no obligation thrown on the teacher, you say, with regard to the cleaning?—There never has been.

5903. Are you acquainted with any of the schools in which that obligation is imposed?—No, I am not.

5904. Mr. COFFEY.—Do you think that the teaching of the subjects of reading, writing, arithmetic, and spelling, is as good in the schools as it was under the result system?—I have no reason to think the contrary.

5905. Mr. HARRISON.—We had it in evidence this morning that since the new system came in in 1900 more children were coming at being clocks or getting into positions where they could wear a black coat. Is that your experience?—Not in my schools. Of course, my schools in Banbridge were in a large commercial centre where the boys gravitated to town factories and came to the railway, and in Belfast at present the children would not necessarily think about it. It is not in my experience.

5906. Then you expressed yourself strongly as to the relations between the inspectors and the teachers. Have you ever considered it from the point of view that on the inspectors is laid the burden of awarding these merit marks on which so much depends, while the teacher will always naturally await that with a feeling of anxiety?—I think that is likely one of the causes.

5907. That would affect the relationship considerably?—It does; but that does not alter the fact that the relation is there.

5908. But that may affect the relation?—I believe it would.

5909. And supposing that that were removed there would be a much better chance of pleasant relations existing?—Yes.

5910. And have you had any experience of the observation book that has been referred to?—No; I cannot say that I have.

5911. Did you use it yourself?—No; I remember that we had some difficulty about the observation book, but I cannot say anything about it.

5912. You have had no complaints?—No.

5913. Mr. HARRISON.—You spoke of the attitude of the inspectors. Does that hold good of every inspector?—Certainly not; but in some cases it is much more marked than in others.

5914. It is the general temper of the system, I suppose?—I might say, with one exception, I really never heard praise given by a single inspector; that is, taking them all. I have, however, found some more brusque than others.

5915. But the general attitude of the inspectors is what you say?—It is.

5916. You are speaking for Antrim and Down. Would you be able to tell us whether that is the experience of your Church in the West of Ireland or not?—I could not tell you that.

5917. But you have an organisation, I presume, representing all Ireland?—I believe so; but I know nothing about that. The organisation would give very little information of that nature.

5918. It is no part of your proposals that a negligent teacher should escape censure?—Absolutely not.

5919. I am going to ask you a question which I think is altogether unobjectionable. Do you find that a difference of religion between inspectors makes any difference in the mode of inspection?—No.

5920. Mr. HARRISON.—You have told us that there is no uniform system of inspection. Now, does that statement apply to the subjects to which the inspectors attach importance, or to the amount of knowledge that they would require in the different subjects? For instance, to give a concrete case, there is one inspector who would attach importance to elementary science and another to geography and another to history or something else—does that statement of yours apply to one inspector requiring a larger amount of history

or elementary science than another?—My example was that in the same subject, elementary science, one inspector marks it as mediocre, and a month afterwards another marks it as satisfactory in the same subject.

5921. May not that arise from having in the school what is known as a maximum programme, which only represents what may be attained under the most favourable circumstances, but which is not to be required in all schools?—That only shows that the inspectors should agree amongst themselves as to the standard that they are going to work upon.

5922. Then you do not approve of the maximum programme that we have at present?—I do not say that.

5923. But if you ask the inspectors to agree amongst themselves as to what should be put down in the programme, would that satisfy you?—So long as they examine by a definite standard.

5924. You do not approve of the impressionist system of inspection, going into a school and waiting about the school for a few minutes?—That is not sufficient.

5925. You still think that some of the teacher's income should depend on the results of the school?—Yes.

5926. But does not a large amount of it depend on the school results?—Of course, the whole promotion depends on it.

5927. Is not that a very large portion?—Very large.

5928. Would it be desirable to have the money stimulus, if I may call it so, increased? Have you not a sufficient stimulus provided by the annual or triennial increments?—You see, the question of the teacher's financial position depending on the nature of the report he gets, brings in an awkward situation between the inspector and the teacher.

5929. Would it not be the same if you provided that the teacher was to be paid by results?—It would; but my point with regard to the teacher being paid by results is that that would help the education of the children.

5930. I thought I understood you to say that you did not approve of the results system?—Not as it was; but of a wedding of the two.

5931. Have you nothing of examination in the schools at present?—Hardly.

5932. Would you be in favour of an annual examination, in which the pupils would be promoted as the result of the examination by the inspector or teacher, or both?—You see, this is an educational problem that I do not see that I can speak upon. I am not an educational expert, and I am not prepared to say. I believe that examination should be one of the factors in it. A child should not go up till he is able to pass it.

5933. I suppose you have a system of religious examination?—Yes.

5934. Would you be satisfied there to test the children by the mere impression of the diocesan inspector going in?—Certainly not.

5935. Would you think that it was desirable in a case of that kind that there should be an examination of the pupils?—Yes.

5936. And if so in a subject in which pre-eminently the formation of character is a prime factor, why not in secular knowledge?—I said I would like more examination than there is, but I do not like the old system, as there was too much examination in it.

5937. I think we have got it from you that the inspectors do not give any help to the teachers with regard to the mode of conducting their classes?—That is so.

5938. Have any suggestions been made that they should give that help?—Not to my knowledge.

5939. Do you think that the majority of inspectors would be capable of giving that help—have you formed an opinion on that?—I presume when they are appointed to the post they are fit for it.

5940. Now, in order to secure uniformity, you have suggested, I think, that a system of tests should be drawn up as specimens?—When that was mentioned, I said that I thought that ought not to be done too rigidly.

5941. Simply as specimens?—Yes.

5942. And you are in favour of promotion of pupils depending to some extent on the work of the inspectors?—Yes, to some extent.

3rd April, 1915.]

Very Rev. CHARLES GERRISON, D.D., examined.

[Continued.]

3979. That being so, are you in favour of the uniform school year we have at present, or do you think that each school should have its own school year?—Do you mean when the year begins or ends?

3980. At the present time all school years begin in July. Then if the inspector visits the school in August he tests that school on a very short portion of the year's work, and the teachers complain that sometimes they do not get the benefit of the inspection of the whole year's work. Under the results system, each school had its own school year, so that when the inspector visited a school for examination he was testing a whole year's work. Now, which of these two years would you be in favour of?—That is an educational problem that I would want to be an educationalist to answer. All I can say is this, that if the school is examined three months after the new year's work began, then it should be examined on that work, and the inspector should take into account in his examination how much of the new year has been passed; and I think they complain rightly when that is not done.

3981. Then you think inspectors are not courteous towards teachers in some cases. Have you seen them shake hands with them on entering the school?—No, I

do not think I ever have, and there is an absence of that feeling that I should very much like to see.

3982. On his leaving the school in the evening?—To my mind that is not sufficient. I do not say that they never shake hands, but there is an absence of that proper feeling.

3983. An absence of help?—There is an absence of the spirit that should help very much between them.

3984. Mr. KERR.—The attitude is that of enemies rather than of friends?—In the case of the boys that were brought up and examined by the inspector, as I have told you, with reference to the teacher's statement, that inspector thought it a matter to report. I then got a question from the Board pointing out the irregularity of the boys, and I wrote back and I said I thought the inspector had acted towards the school-master as a prosecuting attorney. That exactly describes what took place—the little boys on a platform at one side and the schoolmaster on the other, and the inspector questioning the boys.

3985. The CHAIRMAN.—Was that letter acknowledged in any way?—No. The inspector was more civil the next time he came round.

The Rev. T. M. HENSON, M.A., Chancellor of Connor, examined.

3986. The CHAIRMAN.—Are you in complete agreement with this memorandum of the managers of the Church of Ireland, which has been laid before us?—I do not know that I am so completely in agreement with it.

3987. Is there any point in which you differ from them?—No; but I do not want the Committee to suppose that I am making any real objection against any of the inspectors because some of them were found unsatisfactory.

3988. You have had a long experience of the management of schools—an experience of 35 years?—Thirty-five as patron and manager.

3989. Has that been in different districts in Ireland, or in your present parish?—In two different districts, one in the diocese of Down, and one in the diocese of Connor.

3990. And how long have you been in your present parish?—Thirty-two years.

3991. Now, you have been manager of various schools in different localities (that expresses it generally). Were they schools of various kinds, or were they all rural schools?—In my first parish it was a rural school, and I put it under the National Board and started it. It was a purely rural parish.

3992. Where was that?—In Down, Co. Down. My present school is in a town parish—practically three schools in the parish. I have one, and the other ones I am not manager of; but I have some voice in the choice of teachers through the kindness of the manager. In the town school I have entire control. The town school is in Ballymoney.

3993. That is entirely a Church of Ireland school?—Practically.

3994. The children all belong to one denomination?—Practically. I have a few Presbyterians.

3995. Now, with regard to building and equipment and the cleaning of the schools, have you, in your long experience, had any trouble connected with these matters?—I have had nothing but trouble.

3996. In collecting money?—Collecting money. The Board would do nothing for us except to find fault. They would give us no money.

3997. And have you had great difficulty in keeping up the schools that you are connected with?—Very great.

3998. Has that been done by local subscriptions?—We have no endowment.

3999. You have never had any endowment in connection with any school?—No.

4000. And you have had either to do it out of your own pocket or to raise the money?—Yes; I started the school in Ballymoney. There was no school there. There had been an Erasmus Smith School, and when I started the school I put it under the National Board.

4001. Have the inspectors dealt with you severely about the state of the buildings or the equipment or

the cleaning of the school?—I cannot say that they have.

4002. Have they had anything to complain of?—They could not possibly find fault.

4003. I am speaking of the various schools you have been connected with in 35 years?—Well, as regards the small school I have for several years in my present parish I was harassed greatly.

4004. By the inspectors?—By the inspector.

4005. In what way?—Well, he wanted me first of all to build a porch, and then to raise the building, and it was an old building that had been handed over to me. I raised 420 or 430 and put it into order, and it was no sooner done than he wanted me to raise it and I had at last to put my back to the wall and to say that I would not do it.

4006. Then had you a succession of communications from the Board in Dublin, asking you to do these things?—No; it was from the inspector in personal communication with me, and he reported that the school was badly lit, and so on.

4007. With regard to the cleaning of your schools, have you been in the habit of providing for the cleaning of your schools?—Yes.

4008. In every case?—In every case.

4009. And the teacher is not responsible?—Not for the payment, but I have made him responsible to see that it is done.

4010. When an inspector has visited your schools, have you generally received notice of the visit as is required in the case of a formal inspection?—I think I might mention a distinction between the old system and the new. Formerly we used to get notice. Now I get notice perhaps by the morning's post.

4011. The notice generally comes on the morning of the day that you are expected to be present?—Yes, and I find that most inconvenient.

4012. Your arrangements are already made?—Yes.

4013. And still some of you have been present at these visits of inspectors?—I always do so when I can.

4014. Can you confirm some of the complaints made in this document as to the tone and manner of the inspectors towards teachers?—The language here is very strong—"The inspectors are mainly critical. They find faults, but will not encourage, and their visits, in place of being helpful to the teacher, are availed with dead." Would that express your general experience, of late years, as any rate?—Yes, but not formerly.

4015. Would you accept this statement that has been made here, that almost universally the inspectors confine themselves to damaging criticisms and that they never give helpful advice?—I think that would be going rather far.

4016. You would not go so far as that?—I would not go so far as that. One inspector came in and he was not satisfied with something or another before he came in, and he asked for the progress record

6017. Now, you were going to give us an instance of the manner of the inspectors?—The inspector came in and he asked for the progress record, and it was when the new system had come into force a very short time. It was shown to the inspector, and he was very saggy, and spoke very sharply to the teacher.

6018. In your presence?—No. He told me about it afterwards; and it was in a case in which short notice had been given. And he said: "I am sorry the book has not been kept in the way you wish it to be kept, and I will take care that it is kept in accordance with your wishes in the future." "Yes," the inspector said, "if you are still in the service." I asked him: "What did you do when he spoke to you so sharply?" and he said: "I was afraid of losing my temper, and I went right away."

6019. Mr. KERRIE.—Do you know anything of the facts that he found with the keeping of the record?—No; he told me that it was not kept in the way the inspector wanted.

6020. Was there any model?—No, there was no model. It was just at the beginning.

6021. The CHAIRMAN.—You confirm to some extent the criticism we have heard here that the inspectors are always finding fault, but that they never do what they are instructed to do in one of the circulars, advise the teachers and help and encourage the teachers?—Well, I would be very sorry to say that; but I think I might say that the standard of those who are doing the work of inspection certainly has not gone up.

6022. Mr. KERRIE.—What exactly do you mean?—The class of men.

6023. The CHAIRMAN.—May we take it that under the old system the number of the inspectors and their tone towards the teachers was much better than it is now?—That is exactly what I mean.

6024. Mr. KERRIE.—Might the charge be explained possibly in another way, by a difference in the instructions issued to the inspectors from the Education Office?—I do not quite catch your question.

6025. You said that of late years the standard of those engaged in the work of inspection has not gone up?—Yes. I said that, because I do not want to convey anything offensive.

6026. But assuming that you had the same standard, the same intellectual quality of the inspector, would the change be explained by the fact that the new inspectors may be acting under different instructions from those issued to the old?

The CHAIRMAN.—What the change is in fact due to the office and not to the inspectors?—Well, I do not think that is what I meant. I meant a difference in the men.

6027. Now, your criticism refers to the persons who entered the service in later years?—Yes.

6028. Not to those who had been in the service many years, but to those who had recently entered?—Exactly.

6029. The CHAIRMAN.—I want to ask you a question in connection with that. Of course, the mode of appointing inspectors now is different from what it was under the old system. They are now appointed without competitive examination. There is a certain qualifying examination, but they are selected out of a number of candidates. Do you think that the old system was better?—Well, judging from the men I came across, I would prefer it. That is not a question that I feel qualified to say much upon.

6030. Mr. KERRIE.—How many inspectors have you had an opportunity of meeting?—I am afraid I could not answer that question.

6031. It would be a considerable number?—It would be a considerable number.

6032. The CHAIRMAN.—I think I may ask you about your experience of the manner of inspectors, because it is said here that under the present system the inspectors frequently harass the teachers rather than test the knowledge of the children. Do you agree with that?—Very largely. I do not understand what the instructions given to the inspectors are, but they do not seem to be of the same class as they were under the old system, and they examine very little.

6033. What do they do when they go into a school if they do not examine?—They find fault. You won't understand me. I do not want to bring a sweeping accusation against inspectors. Some of them do their work to the best of their ability, but the old system seemed to turn out men who entered more into the feelings of the teachers.

6034. Now, coming to the children and their education, do you think that the new system is an improvement on the old as regards efficiency of education, or is it a falling off—would your experience enable you to pronounce any opinion on that? Do the children go on better fitted for life than they did under the old system?—I do not know what to say to that. The old system certainly gave them an amount of information.

6035. That they do not get under the new system—do you mean that?—The present system seems more scrappy. They do not put boys and girls in the lowest class and work them up to do their best in each class as they go on.

6036. Do you think that the old teaching was more thorough?—More systematic.

6037. It is claimed for the new system that it produces superior mental habits and greater intelligence?—That depends very largely on the teacher. If you get a Madame Montessori you are all right, but there are very few of them going.

6038. But still you do say that the amount of knowledge with which a lad was equipped when he left school was greater under the old system than under the new?—I think that the amount of information that the child got under the old system was greater.

6039. Do you mean acquired in an ordered way—your spoke of the new as scrappy?—Yes, scrappy.

6040. By which I understand that there is an absence of order or system in the acquiring of the knowledge—was that what you meant?—No; what I tried to convey was that there was a system under the old arrangement and that there is not a system in the new.

6041. As regards the acquisition of knowledge?—Yes. That is what the teachers complain of.

6042. Are you aware of any subjects where the teaching has fallen off in the new system—could you say that from your own observation?—I could not.

6043. Now, there is one expression used here on which I must ask you a question to see whether you have a strong opinion on the point. They say that inspection now seems in many cases to be impressionist rather than exhaustive. Do you agree with that statement?—I told some of my co-managers that though I am in accord with their statement generally, I did not quite understand what they meant by that.

6044. I think it has been explained to us how as meaning that a man can walk into a school, and in ten minutes, without asking a question, tell you what the school is worth?—I think no one could suppose that anybody could form that opinion.

6045. Yet the claim has been made?—May I give you an instance that occurred, not in my own ward Denbury, but in the rural Denbury of Carey. An inspector came in on his first visit to the school. It was the first visit of an inspector to a country school, and he looked over the school. "Oh," he said, "I need not examine here. We are going to put up your slaters."

6046. Is that recently?—Within the last three years, and the manager was very indignant. It was a small church school. I do not want to introduce the religious question. It was a small church school, where there were very few Roman Catholic schools and a large Roman Catholic population. To my mind, that was certainly an impressionist examination.

6047. Have you any opinion as to the connection of the impressionist method with the system of mark books of an extremely minute kind, six of them, going from "excellent" to "bad"?—Yes.

6048. Have you formed a deliberate opinion as to the possibility of awarding those marks with any certainty?—I look upon it as very dangerous to put into the hands of inspectors what is decidedly a possible engine of tyranny.

6049. Do you mean his being called upon to award one of these marks to a teacher and to a school?—Yes, it is a very difficult thing. I do not think it is fair to the inspector.

3rd April, 1913.]

Rev. T. M. Dawson, M.A., examined.

[Continued.]

6060. Would you go so far as to say that it would be possible to do it with moderate accuracy?—I think it is possible.

6061. Is it possible to have uniformity in different districts with regard to the meaning of these terms, that "very good" would mean the same thing in Belfast as it does in Cork under different inspectors?—I do not think it could. In my town school, for instance, I have the very poorest of the children, ill-fed and ill-clothed. You could not possibly expect the same results from these children as you would from a class of children in a school, say, in one of the best and most prosperous districts in Belfast.

6062. In your experience is due allowance ever made for adverse circumstances such as you have referred to?—I do not think so.

6063. You think due allowance is not made?—Not on all occasions. You know there are inspectors and inspectors.

6064. One of the forms of the report requires the inspector to make allowance for adverse circumstances in reporting on a school. You think that has not been done always?—I do not. I know I have had great difficulty on that very point. With my own town school, where we have a very mixed population, a great many of them very poor, I thought the inspector on two occasions did not show consideration for that point. He was inclined to judge of the school hardly.

6065. Take that one school as a concrete case. Has there been great variation in the marking of that school, would you say, in the last ten years?—Well, the system has been in force only for 12 years.

6066. Well, within the last seven or eight years?—Well, I had rather a controversy with the inspector about that, on that very point. I had to appeal to him on that point and say: "I really think you do not make enough allowance for the class of children."

6067. And what did he say?—He came to my point of view and he treated me fairly.

6068. And he took it into consideration afterwards?—He did; but I do not think the manager should be driven to that. My idea is that the inspector should have taken it into account himself. He saw little children there, bare-footed little ragged children, and it was only when I made a strong appeal to him that I got this done.

6069. These are very important things, being actual concrete cases. Have you any more evidence to offer on this point, I mean with regard to the award of merit marks—have you ever been startled by an enormous change, or at least a considerable change in the standard of marking in your district, or have you heard anything about it?—I cannot say that it has been very great about the Ballymoney district.

6070. Have you had very frequent changes of inspectors?—Very frequent.

6071. More frequent than under the old system?—Much more.

6072. Do you regard those frequent changes as injurious to education?—Very.

6073. In what respect?—Because a good teacher is constantly anxious to please the inspector, and the education suffers.

6074. With the inspectors continually coming and going the standard varies?—It varies. I have not any personal experience in the matter, but I know that the feeling of the teachers is most nervous and apprehensive, and that is injurious to education. I do not know whether it would come under that head, but there is a feeling—it may be right or it may be wrong (I do not say)—but there is a feeling amongst the teachers that the inspectors wish or are instructed to keep back the awarding of increments.

6075. Is that a general impression amongst the teachers of your district, apart from whether it is well founded or not—is it a general impression?—I cannot say generally, but it is amongst some.

6076. Amongst some teachers that you have met?—Yes; they seem to have that feeling, and they say that the awarding of these merit marks should be in such a way that it should be properly done, and that the increment should be earned and automatic.

6077. Well, what do you think of that yourself?—I do think that when a man gives fair service, he ought not to be deprived of his increment.

6078. You think that there ought to be a stated increment on reports that are not unsatisfactory. Would that be your view?—Yes.

6079. If the reports are fairly satisfactory?—I think so. My teachers as a rule have been conscientious and diligent and very moral, and when teachers, both male and female, give good service, I think they are entitled to their increment.

6080. Would a system such as you have just sketched, with the award of increments on fair reports, satisfy the teachers that you are acquainted with?—They would simply not to be harassed and checked and interfered with.

6081. Mr. HARRISON.—You have mentioned the case of a small school, where the inspector suggested that they were going to put up the shutters. What was done in that case?—The manager was indignant and asked for an explanation, and the school is still open.

6082. And nothing happened?—Nothing happened.

6083. It was broken jokers?—It was.

6084. Mr. KERR.—How many pupils were in that school?—It was a small school; just sufficient to keep going under the rule.

6085. The CHAIRMAN.—About 20?—About 30.

6086. Mr. HARRISON.—You mentioned that in one of the schools with which you are connected the building was a bad one, and the inspector made certain demands upon you, with which you did not comply. Were those demands really reasonable, having regard to the fact that the teacher had to teach and the children to be taught in the schools?—I do not think they were, because the inspectors or the National Board, I don't know which, had a system of emigration that they are still worrying at. They have not accomplished it, but they are worrying at it still, and it seemed to me unnecessary to go and spend money on an old building when they distinctly announced that they were ready to amalgamate with another school besides it.

6087. The school was not imminent in any way?—No.

6088. Was it decently lighted?—It was sufficiently lighted.

6089. There might be a difference of opinion about that?—There might.

6090. And ventilated?—The ventilation could not be better.

6091. The ventilation was excellent?—It was.

6092. Not too much?—Well, I would say rather too much.

6093. And with regard to the porch, was the idea of enlarging the porch to keep out draughts or to provide for the children's cloak?—It was to provide for the children, to hold their hats and coats.

6094. They had been hung round the room?—Yes.

6095. That was necessary?—This school I was manager of for the landlord, and the whole expense came on my shoulders. The hanging of the hats and coats round the room is done in numbers of places, and had always been done there.

6096. But the demands of the inspector were not altogether unreasonable?—No; but three months afterwards another inspector would come in with some other demands.

6097. And did that actually happen?—Well, might I tell you what happened to my own town school—a fine large school, better than the model school. One inspector came in and warmly recommended with me about not splitting this fine large room up into three divisions. Each division would cost me £15. That is to say, two divisions would break it up into three.

6098. By means of sliding partitions?—Yes. I asked him: "Will you give me a guarantee that I will not be asked to remove that within six months by your successor?" And he would not do it.

6099. The Honor or Room.—What do you mean by saying that the country school belonged to the landlord—did he build this as a school?—It was on the landlord's property. It had been built in former times under the old Church Education Society as a school.

It was not an ideal building by any manner of means, and it would not be built at the present day. The landlord was resident chiefly in England and it had been

6th April, 1916.]

Rev. T. M. BUNSON, M.A., continued.

[Continued.]

managed by his agent, who had never set foot in it for fourteen years. The Commissioners said they would not have him as manager any longer, and the landlord asked me as rector of the parish, would I take charge of the school. I said: "If I can be of any help to you I will." And the first thing I had to do was to raise £25.

6080. Did he ask any rent for the building?—No.

6081. But the property was his?—Yes.

6082. Mr. BUNSON.—You said there was a strong impression among teachers that instructions had been issued to inspectors to keep back increments. Have you, in your experience, noticed that when the time came in which the increment scored the report was unfavourable?—No; I think I give that as the feeling of the teachers.

6083. But you have nothing to add to that from your own experience?—I have not.

6084. And I think I understood you to condemn unhesitatingly this system of grading the teachers?—I do not understand the question.

6085. You know that these increments depend upon the teachers getting from one grade to another?—Yes.

6086. You condemn that system, or, if you like it, you condemn the merit grant?—What I condemn is power being, for some insufficient reason, left in the hands of the Inspector to prevent a teacher entitled to it getting that increment, and it can be done. He can keep back the increment by arbitrarily reducing the mark.

6087. And to that would you attribute a good deal of the unpleasant relations between inspectors and teachers?—I am afraid so; but I cannot give personal instances. It is from conversation.

6088. At any rate, from your experience, the present system is working badly in that respect?—It has created an atmosphere of suspicion and distrust and that is very bad for education.

6089. But you have no instances to give?—I have not.

6090. The BURNER or ROSS.—You suggested that increment should be annual and automatic, and then there was something said about fair and satisfactory reports. How are we to get over the promotions, if there are to be reports at all? Will you not have the difficulty arising that one class of reports will not be fair?—At present it seems to be that the teacher has to juggle himself in some way with the Inspector, and my view of the matter, and as I understand the feeling of people generally, is that increment ought to be automatic, unless there is some grave reason against it.

6100. So that increment would go on unless there may be some positive reason against it?—Yes, I do not mean to say that the teachers are infallible. They are not.

6101. Sir HIRSH WILKINSON.—I will read Rule 55 (a). (Reads Rule.) You will observe that "responsibility" is qualified by the word "monetary." However, we have it that if the school is not cleaned the teacher suffers in the mark that he receives. I think you have told us that you have in every case provided money, or obtained the money, so that there is no necessity either to expend money for that purpose or to clean the school himself?—That is so.

6102. Have you been acquainted with any schools where the money was not provided and where the teacher had the alternative of paying somebody to clean the school or cleaning it himself?—I know one school in my own parish where the teacher is responsible for it, and the way he does it is to make the pupils clean out the school—or he did so a few years ago; I don't know what the present arrangement is.

6103. Well, the Archbishop told us to-day of a case in his recollection where it seemed a very good arrangement that the senior girls' class undertook that, and as a matter of domestic economy; we know the advantage of children being brought up to put things in their proper places and to make things clean. Do you think in places where it is inconvenient to obtain money the system could be extended, having regard to the ideas of parents with respect to what their children ought to be called upon to do?—Well, I do not think the parents would like it. In fact, it is a

matter of experience in the town. I know where parents have been very angry when I have asked the teacher to send some of the boys where they checked up the down-pipe, to clear this out, as they checked it up, and the parents did not like it.

6104. You think that there is a sentiment that would have to be consulted if that were to be done?—Yes.

6105. But taking the case of infants, for instance, you have mentioned the name of Madame Montessori, and you know that she gets her pupils to put things in order and trains them up in the way they should go, and do you think that beginning with the infants' class in that way, something could be done, as much for the purpose of training the child in orderly habits as in getting this particular work done?—I am afraid that would conflict with another rule of the National Commissioners, that the fire should be ready for the children when they come.

6106. It could not be arranged to be done before the school closed?—Then if you have an evening meeting for other purposes, as we often have in the town, the place would require to be cleaned up again.

6107. You could not expect the children to clean up after an evening meeting?—No.

6108. That is out of the question. All that you could do would be to arrange that the schoolhouse should be left again in order and ready for the pupils next morning. What are the school hours in your schools?—It is 9.30 to 3.30 for infants?—We begin at half-past nine with religious instruction, and then they close at three o'clock. I am not quite sure what time the infants go.

6109. Half-past nine for religious instruction?—Yes.

6110. Is the ordinary secular instruction taken at 10 o'clock in that case?—Yes.

6111. And they work from 10 to 3?—Yes.

6112. And they have an interval for lunch?—Yes.

6113. Is that a general thing here?—That is a general thing here.

6114. Five hours?—Five hours.

6115. And ten is the obligatory time?

Mr. HENRY.—Four constitutes an attendance.

6116. Sir HIRSH WILKINSON.—Is it a general rule, as a matter of domestic economy, either for the children generally, or for particular classes, to clean the school?—I am afraid that that would be a very unpopular thing to do. The poorer the people the more loathly they are.

6117. And then there would be a difficulty. The Archbishop was able to tell us of a school in his knowledge where the senior class of girls undertake it as a matter of domestic economy, and I was thinking of the possibility of its being extended?—I have never asked them to do it, and I always raised the funds from my parishioners, so that I have no experience.

6118. The BURNER or ROSS.—You have cookery classes in your schools?—No; I have refused.

6119. Mr. KAVANAGH.—You are in favour of having the increments to go on if the school escapes censure, and not to depend on the mark. Is that what you suggest?—I don't know about the increment being given if the school escaped censure, but that it should be given unless there was sufficient reason to the contrary.

6120. What effect would that have on education, do you think?—Well, it would encourage the teacher as much that the education would be better.

6121. Would it?—Oh, I think so. You cannot do good work if you have the sword of Damocles hanging over your head.

6122. But if the teacher knew he would get his increment, no matter what the report of the Inspector was, do you not think that the incentive to work well would be taken away?—I do not think I have gone so far as that.

6123. I understood you were in favour of giving the increment if the school did not actually get a bad mark. Is not that so?—Well, generally.

6124. Then, practically, you may say the increment would be a certainty?—Yes.

6125. I put the question to you now: Does not that take away the incentive to improve the working of the school?—It would, if you assume that the teacher is just doing it for his bread and butter.

2nd April, 1913.]

Rev. T. M. BARNES, M.A., continued.

6125. That is a certain consideration with the teacher, is it not?—It is.

6126. And if in the third year he gets a good mark he will get the increment of £7, whereas if that increment is taken away there is no reason pressing him to do good work?—I do not think it should be taken away.

6127. Mr. CORNLEY.—Do you know teachers who have no hope of increment doing excellent work in their schools?—Yes.

6128. Men who have reached the highest grade?—Yes; my principal in the town school has got all that he could possibly get, and he is an enthusiast—a regular enthusiast.

6129. Mr. RIVINGTON.—Do you, as manager, ever see the Inspector's reports?—They send us down extracts from the reports.

6130. What parts?—Well, if there is anything to be found fault with, I get that.

6131. You do not see the good part?—Oh, no; that is too sacred.

6132. There is a stigma in inspectors' writing: "Such report should rather deal with the good points of the school and any striking merits noticed, than with the defects."—Well, we are anxious to know exactly the Inspector's opinion, not only as to one side of it; we are anxious to have a fuller report.

6133. But this would apparently mean that good reports should go out!—"Such report should rather deal with the good points of the school and any striking merits noticed, than with defects." You never see that?—I won't say that they only send us the fault finding, but they do not send us the full report. They send us an extract.

6134. Would you be allowed to see that report, if you called up at the office?—I do not know.

6135. Now, does the Inspector put his notes in the observation book at all?—He does.

6136. Does he ever put a good report in that?—I am afraid I have not looked into it lately. I go in as often as I can, and the canteen goes in every day.

6137. And as a rule would he flatter the teacher?—No.

6138. Or would he only write down the defects that he found in the school?—I would not say that he would do that only. Sometimes if he is satisfied he says so, but the difficulty is that he is an old man satisfied.

6139. Mr. HENLEY.—You told us about a school in which the Inspector was wanting you to make some structural changes. Was the building in fairly good repair at the time?—It was just a small country school. It was, I had just spent £25 or £26 on it.

6140. When a school is taken into connection with the National Board Rule 178 (c), is that a schoolhouse to be taken into connection must be suitable, in good repair, adequately furnished, and provided with proper out-features, and therefore I take it that that building fulfilled the requirements of the Commissioners when taken into connection?—Yes.

6141. And then was it in a fairly satisfactory state as far as the structure of the building was concerned at the time when the Inspector wanted you to make those alterations?—It was. It was a good deal better than it had been for fourteen years before.

6142. And therefore you are under the impression that these recommendations were made to you in order to force you to amalgamate?—But I told the Inspector that I was quite willing to amalgamate, and I thought it was unreasonable that he should push this when they had the amalgamation scheme in view.

6143. And you say it was for the purpose of carrying out the amalgamation scheme?—Well, that was the impression that it gave my mind.

6144. Then you have told us that education under the present system is more snappy than under the old?—That is the result to my mind.

6145. In rule 115 (a) we are told that the ordinary school subjects are English (including reading, spelling, writing, composition, and grammar), geography, history, arithmetic, singing, drawing, needlework for girls, physical drill, manual instruction, object lessons, elementary science, cookery for girls, laundry work for girls, kindergarten for infants, hygiene and temperance. Now, if these have all to be taught in a

four hours' course of instruction, can the instruction be otherwise than snappy?—I was going to anticipate your question, and to say that it was absolutely impossible to get them all taught in the time.

6146. You think the programme is overloaded?—Overloaded.

6147. And therefore, no matter what the teacher is doing the instruction must be snappy?—That was the impression on my mind.

6148. These three cannot be a systematic instruction given in these subjects?—I think the programme is overloaded and I have refused to take on anything more.

6149. Would you think it desirable that the essential subjects of reading, writing, and arithmetic were made compulsory in all schools, and that the managers and teachers should be left a choice to add on such other subjects, a limited number, as they might think suitable to the requirements of the pupils attending the schools and to the qualifications of the teachers of the schools to teach them properly?—That would be a big order. Your question suggests a solution.

6150. Would you have the three essentials compulsory in all schools, with liberty to the teachers and managers to select a limited number of other subjects?—I am afraid that would make inspection more difficult.

6151. I do not want to relieve the inspectors from trouble?—I mean that there would be such a variety that inspection would be rendered more difficult than it is.

6152. Mr. CORNLEY.—But he only suggests that you should have reading, writing, and arithmetic, with such other subjects as the managers and teachers should think desirable in certain localities?—In the town in my parish there are two or three schools. One would take a certain number of optional subjects, and another a certain number of optional subjects, and it would be extremely difficult.

6153. Mr. HENLEY.—You have that difficulty at present—you have not these subjects compulsory all round. I am asking your opinion, as far as your opinion as manager is concerned, whether it would be to the interest of the pupils or not, apart from the inspectors?—My own feeling would be to take off a lot of these optional subjects and to go in for more literary education.

6154. Would you take a small number of subjects and teach them more exhaustively and thoroughly than at present?—I think so; but this question is new to me.

6155. Do you think that you have sufficient examination in the schools, sufficient testing of the actual knowledge that the pupils have acquired?—No.

6156. Would you be in favour of an annual examination at which the pupils would gain promotion?—I would. I think that since the annual examinations ceased the children have not taken the same pride in their school or the same pride in their examination. Of course, it is the instinct of competition and emulation amongst the children. It is a fighting instinct, but still it is there.

6157. Do you think it is desirable to revert to the old practice of each school having its own school year, instead of all the schools having the same school year as at present?—That would be a matter of arrangement; if it were to have a school year. At present they hardly know what it is.

6158. Under the present arrangement, if the inspectors are employed all the year round, they must inspect some schools early in the school year, when there is perhaps only one or two or three months' work done. They cannot inspect all the schools at the close of the school year, and therefore they never have an opportunity of testing the pupils except in a small number of schools over the whole course of instruction. Would you be in favour of a reversion to the system of having a school year for every school, instead of the present arrangement?—I think I would; because when the inspectors come to inspect three months' instruction and examine on the twelve months' course, it is very, very rough on the children.

6159. Do you suggest that at that time the pupils should be promoted?—I think it would be better. At

Wed. April, 1913.]

Rev. T. M. Benson, M.A., examined.

[Continued.]

present promotion seems to be very largely left to the teacher, and it is very difficult for the teachers. When the examination was under the old system you knew what each child did, and promotion went accordingly. But I honestly say that these are not questions that I want into recently.

6186. Now, in your observation, have inspectors shaken hands with the teachers when they have gone into a school, and do they shake hands with them when they leave?—Sometimes they do, sometimes they do not.

6187. That is as a rule?—I think as a rule they do.

6188. Have you noticed inspectors giving help to the teachers in this way, that an inspector will observe a teacher teaching a class, and, if he does not approve perhaps of the mode in which the lesson is being taught, will step in and take the class himself and teach the lesson and show the teacher?—Yes; and I have objected to that, because it is practically sacking the teacher before the pupils, and I do not think the teacher should be removed before the pupils.

6189. But would you object to the inspector doing any teaching duty?—No.

6190. Under what circumstances would you approve of it then?—Well, in the old system, the inspector came and said: "I am going to take this class and examine it."

6191. But I am talking of teaching, not of examination; I am talking of the inspector taking a class and teaching a lesson?—Well, I have seen him doing that.

6192. Many of them?—I am afraid I cannot answer that question, but I have seen them do it. I know for the last twelve months or so, I have never had an opportunity of going in, because the notice was so short; so I cannot speak from recent visits.

6193. As far as you have had an opportunity of judging, have the suggestions in the observation book been helpful?—As far as my knowledge goes, they take something like this shape—"arithmetic weak" or "arithmetic might be improved," and so on. Well, I do not want to be disrespectful to the National Board, but it gave me the impression that the inspectors wanted to do something for their money, and they just wrote something down.

6194. Mr. Benson.—You mentioned a case in which you had to appeal to an inspector under the "adverse circumstances" clause to make allowance for the class of children attending the school?—Yes.

6195. What did you mean by "the class of children attending the school"?—They were the very poorest class, and their food was bad and their clothing was bad, and they were not physically fit to assimilate education in the way that better fed and clothed children would be.

6196. And but for your remembrance, I gather that the social test might have been applied there, the test of the tone condition of the children might have been applied in the report?—I said I thought it was hard upon the children of that school to give a bad report of the school when the best had been done under the circumstances.

6197. At any rate, you were afraid that the barefooted school might not get as good a report as a school with well-dressed children in it?—Not because of the dress, but because of the physical condition of the children.

6198. Because they were poor children?—Well, a poor child, a badly fed child, in my experience, has not as good a chance to take in education—as a class, they are not as well fitted to take in education as well-fed and well-clothed children.

6199. I altogether agree with you. But your experience of the system of inspection was such that you feared that the same test might have been applied to a

school of very poor children as to a school of well-fed and well-clothed children, and that was why you remonstrated with the inspector?—I remonstrated with the inspector because I feared upon those children as not being as well able to stand the test as their more fortunate brothers, and so they might be, and therefore that the test might not be so severe.

6200. You made your remonstrance with the inspector because you thought that if you did not remonstrate he would not take that circumstance into account until I drew his attention to it. He had not absolutely marked it down, but he told me that he was only going to give "fair."

6201. And as a result of your remonstrance what did he give?—He gave "good," and treated me very fairly.

6202. You have mentioned that owing to the shortness of the notice that you have received of inspections, you have not been able to be present at inspections for twelve months?—Yes.

6203. Previously you had been present?—Oh, yes; I always made it a point to go.

6204. And the shortness of notice, of course, is due to the fact that the present inspection is founded on a system of surprise visits?—Yes; the notice was sent on the morning of the visit, and I object to that because I may have engagements at the time that might take me from home, and frequently I have.

6205. My feeling about these surprise visits is that there is an element of spying in them, and it would be well to get rid of them. Do you not think that you should have adequate notice of the inspection?—Not if they do not want me to be present. I have no objection to a surprise visit, if they do not want me. A man that is going on doing his work honestly every day has no objection to a surprise visit.

6206. It is not the knowledge of the teacher when he gets up in the morning that this may be the day when the inspector may pay his visit, but the feeling that it is done with the object of finding if he is at fault?—Well, it would be better to let him know.

6207. If the teacher has been teaching properly, and you test that by examination, you get rid of the surprise visit altogether?—I believe that the instructions of the National Board are that these surprise visits should be paid.

6208. I want to know if you approve of the surprise visits?—Well, if I had anything to conceal I would object to them; but if I have nothing to conceal about the school, and if they wish to do it, I say nothing.

6209. The only other question I wanted to ask you was this. You have told us that the intellectual standard of the inspectors has been going down in your experience?—I did not say that. Not the intellectual standard, but that there is a different class of men.

6210. Now, about the school in which the slummers were to be put up, in the schools in Antrim and Down do you get in many cases pupils of different denominations in the same school?—Very seldom. In fact, the basis of the National Board system is not carried out. It has degenerated into a denominational system, but knowing that it is a denominational system, I think we ought to get fair play.

6211. It has been transformed into a denominational system?—It has.

6212. Mr. Benson.—The point that Sir Henry was elaborating was about getting the children to clean the schools. What authority has the teacher to order the children to clean the schools?—I do not know of any.

6213. And, therefore, if it were made compulsory, you would have a large number of parents objecting?—I might put up the slates myself then, but it would be a very desirable thing, if it were workable.



## THIRTEENTH DAY.—FRIDAY, APRIL 4TH, 1913.

At 23, Kildare-street, Dublin.

Present:—**Sir SAMUEL DILL, M.A., LL.D., LL.D. (Chairman);** The Most Rev. **DENIS KELLY, D.D., Bishop of Ross;** **Sir HERMAN SHAW WILKINSON, LL.D.;** **Mr. JOHN COFFEY;** **Mr. HENSTAGE E. B. HARRISON, B.A.;** **Mr. JEREMIAH HEKLY;** **Mr. WALTER MCMURROUGH KAVANAUGH, D.L.;** and **Mr. THOMAS MICHAEL KITTLE, B.L.;** and

**Mr. ARTHUR J. DONNELLY, M.A., B.Sc., Secretary.**

Rev. MATTHEW H. F. COLLIS, *Vicar of Antrim, excused.*

6188. **THE CHAIRMAN.**—You are Rector of a parish in Belfast?—No, in the town of Antrim.

6189. Are you Rector of Antrim?—Yes, Vicar of Antrim. It was always a vicarage, and the old title is preserved.

6190. And you are a member of the Association of the Church of Ireland Managers of National Schools in the Counties of Antrim and Down, and in the County of the City of Belfast, that has forwarded this document?—Yes.

6191. Were you present at the meeting at which this was adopted?—I was. I was a member of the Committee of the Association.

6192. Of which the Archbishop is the acting Chairman?—Yes.

6193. And Mr. Woodward is Secretary?—Yes.

6194. You say you were present at the meeting at which it was adopted, and I suppose we may take it that it was adopted with fair unanimity?—I think so.

6195. It represents, at any rate, the general feeling of the Association as far as it was possible to test it?—Yes, I think so.

6196. I know there was not absolute unanimity?—There might be a variety of expression. Some might not use the same expression as others.

6197. What was your previous experience in the Church before you became Vicar of Antrim?—I was Curate of Trillick, in Waterford, and I was Curate of St. Mary's Church, Newry.

6198. And from that you became Vicar of Antrim?—Yes, about 23 years ago.

6199. So you have been in three parishes? In three parishes.

6200. How many years does that cover?—That covers 23 years.

6201. So you were curate in those two places for 7 years, and 16 years in Antrim as vicar?—Yes.

6202. As curate were you manager of any schools?—No, I was not. I taught in the National Schools in Newry, and in the Model School.

6203. But since you came to Antrim you have been manager?—Yes.

6204. Of how many schools?—One school.

6205. Is that in the town of Antrim?—Yes. It is on the border of the town. It is called Manserere.

6206. Is that a very important school?—It is a school attended by 150 children.

6207. How many teachers are in it?—Three teachers.

6208. One head and two assistants?—Yes. We built a new school.

6209. Is it a new building?—Yes.

6210. And well equipped?—I think so.

6211. You never have any complaint about the building or equipment?—One of the Inspectors asked us to divide it into two. I agreed to do so, and then the Board wrote and said they had not any money at present.

6212. And that is the only question that has arisen about your building?—I think that is so, except that the classrooms are considered very small. That was mentioned three years ago, and I wrote back to say that they might have considered it four years previously when the plans were passed.

6213. And what provision is there for keeping up the school?—Well there is an endowment that the late Lord Manserere left us, about £200. That is the interest of £2000.

6214. Does that cover the necessary expenses?—I think it does.

6215. The lighting, cleaning, and heating?—We get a grant for the heating now, a half grant.

6216. From the Government?—From the Government.

6217. It is only half the cost?—I believe it is supposed to be about half the cost. It is a good new building. We have had some plumbing repairs, and we have modern sanitary arrangements.

6218. Have you raised any subscriptions?—No, I have not. I have never been able to do it. Of course, everything is now at present.

6219. But the cleaning is done at the expense of the manager?—Yes.

6220. So that the teacher in the case of that school is not responsible for any expenditure for that object?—No, he is not.

6221. Now as manager you receive a notification of the visits of an Inspector for formal inspection?—Yes, I do. I have a note down to say that I get very short notice.

6222. But it appears that there is some reason for that?—Well, of course, if it is a surprise visit. The last time a child was sent out to tell me when the Inspector was there.

6223. Have you been present often?—Not very often.

6224. Have you been present often enough to give us an idea, or an impression, of these visits?—Well, my personal experience is not very wide. Of course, I had a great deal of experience on our Committee.

6225. But you have not any similar experience of your own?—Not many. I must say not many. There is not a regular examination, and I know they are not long in the school.

6226. You have heard and you know that there is not a regular examination in the schools?—No, I do not think they have ever held a regular examination on the lines of the old routine examinations.

6227. What, then, is the nature of the inspection?—I think it is not very definite. It will vary. He will call out a boy and question him, or look round when the teacher is teaching a class, and another time he will look at the copy-books (which I do myself as manager), or hear a boy read, or see what they are doing in arithmetic. I call in occasionally, but I do not hold any examination.

6228. I suppose the teacher takes a note of the inspection as to the result of it?—He does; he generally mentions that the Inspector has been in.

6229. Does he tell you about the Inspector's judgment?—Well, he will get an extract from the Inspector's report.

6230. Are you satisfied with only getting an extract?—No; I think in the memorial we say we ought to get a full report.

6231. With regard to that report it has been given in evidence here that it is nearly all fault-finding?—I think that is not the case with the written report. I think the written report is not always unfavourable by any means. I think it is more in the remarks of the Inspector to the teacher.

6232. Now the teachers complain that the judgment is all fault-finding, and that no praise is ever given?—That is very sweeping, but it is generally in the direction of criticism. I suppose the Inspector wants to get everything right.

6234. Have you had any complaints from teachers about the manner of Inspectors being discourteous?—Well, perhaps not for the last ten years. Before that I had one case in which the Inspector's manner was not courteous.

6235. Would that be under the old system?—Yes, that was under the old system.

6236. But under the new system you have not had any?—No, I think we have been much more fortunate apparently than other schools.

6237. Are the changes of inspectors frequent?—Very frequent.

6238. Would you rather have the same remain longer?—Well I think I would have a man remain perhaps for ten years, till he becomes fairly well acquainted with the teachers.

6239. Are the changes so frequent that he cannot become acquainted with the character of the teachers?—Yes.

6240. You still think that the change of want of courtesy applies to the old system rather than to the new?—That is our actual experience. I asked our teacher as to that very point, and he said that, as a rule, some of them were very discourteous to the teacher even in presence of the children, but he said that, on the whole, they were gentlemen, and courteous.

6241. That is the judgment of your own local teachers?—That is, my local teachers who have been there since I have been there, and longer.

6242. That is all that you can tell us on that point?—Yes. We had a very nice old gentleman there lately, and I thought he was very courteous to everybody.

6243. The Senior Inspector?—The Senior Inspector. I don't know much about the Junior Inspector.

6244. Mr. COLLIS.—Is that in Bellmora district or in Bellm?—I rather think it is in Magherafelt, but I am not sure. I think our Inspectors generally live in Magherafelt now. Formerly they lived in Carrickfergus.

6245. The CHAIRMAN.—Now about the manner of inspection. Have you ever heard complaints from the teachers of not receiving assistance or advice enough of a friendly kind from their Inspector to enable them to improve methods, and so on?—Yes.

6246. Has that ever been brought before you?—I don't think so. You see, my teacher is a very experienced man; he is a long time there, and it was not much required. It was to make the children read with more expression, that is all.

6247. But you say in this document, "We hope the time will come when the teacher will be able to look forward to the Inspector's visits as a source of help and encouragement?"—Yes.

6248. In your experience you confirm what is stated here, that the teachers generally look forward to the Inspector's visit with dread?—I think they do not look forward to it with pleasure.

6249. The BRUCE or ROSE.—Before 1890, was it your experience that they did look forward to the day of examination with pleasure?—I think so.

6250. Mr. COLLIS.—There has been no change then in the case of your particular teacher?—No.

6251. As far as you know?—As far as I know.

6252. The CHAIRMAN.—In connection with that, this question has been raised. You have been manager under two systems?—Yes.

6253. The one that ended in 1899 and the new one?—Yes.

6254. Well, have you formed an opinion deliberately as to the relative merits of the two systems as regards their effects on education?—Well, I have. I think that, no doubt, the old system tended a little bit to crowding, or even a good deal to crowding, but I think that that was now gone entirely to the other extreme, and they are hardly testing the children at all.

6255. Kindly develop that, and tell us what character of examination you would have?—I would have a systematic examination of the children.

6256. Would you revert to the examination of all the children individually by the Inspector every year?

Well, I might, but I would not approve of a certain standard for each child. I mean that does not test the teacher's efficiency, because there may be a very stupid boy, and that boy might have given a great deal of trouble to the teacher, and he might have done wonders for him, and yet he may not be able to pass a certain standard.

6257. Suppose the Inspector proposed to examine a class, should he examine every boy in that class?—I think it would be safer to examine all the boys.

6258. But would you require him now to examine every class of the whole school once a year?—That would involve excessive work.

6259. The BRUCE or ROSE.—That would take too much time for the Inspector?—I think it would.

6260. And leave too little time for actual visits?—Yes. Certainly, when I was at school we had a thorough examination at the end of each term, but then we had people with leisure to do that, five or six masters always.

6261. The CHAIRMAN.—In connection with that I call your attention to a portion of your memorial in which you say that you are of opinion that promotion of the children should, to some extent, depend on the results of the inspection. At present promotions are made by the teacher?—They are. There is also no moral obligation on the child to attend more.

6262. Does that imply that the Inspector has to examine every child, and that the Inspector has to promote the children?—Well, it shows that he must know something about every child. There is a point that I wanted to bring in on that very head, that under the old system the child had to attend a hundred times, that is about every second day—there are about 250 days in the year. He had to attend about 100 times to be promoted. Under the present system the child may make a very meagre attendance. He may then demand promotion, and he may threaten the teacher, if he does not promote him, to go to another school where he will be promoted. I know a case where five children were withdrawn from a school because a girl was not promoted, and my teacher complained very much of that, and said it had a very bad effect. I suppose when children are not individually examined there is not the same competitive feeling. There is none of the advantage of competition.

6263. Now there is another matter that has occurred as a great deal here, and that is the system of merit marks given to schools and teachers, six in number?—Yes.

6264. Have you applied your mind to that as to whether that system should be retained?—Well, that is not a private mark.

6265. These marks do not occur in the rules of the Board, but it is well known that these marks, six in number, are given in connection with the questions of promotion and increments?—There is also, I think, some other scores mark given to the teacher on which his promotion depends.

6266. Mr. KAYLE.—That is the personal merit mark of the teacher?—Yes. We rather object to that secret mark.

6267. The CHAIRMAN.—Have you come across any complaint of a teacher that in making these reports the standards of the Inspectors suddenly rise or fall?—I do not think I have. They have, on the whole, been fairly even in my experience.

6268. You have not come across such cases as would enable you to express an opinion?—Oh, no; I only know what I heard at our meeting of managers.

6269. That is indirect evidence?—Indirect.

6270. You have no direct evidence?—No. There was a point that I wanted to bring out, and that was that the inspection occupies a very short time. I believe that our two Inspectors inspect the school for about four hours altogether. Their inspections together occupy about four hours in the school, and then the report is formed by one of them. The report only comes from one Inspector.

6271. You think it is too short a time?—I think it is a very short time to judge of the year's work.

6272. Is that one of the most serious complaints that you would make about the present system?—I think

4th April, 1913.]

REV. MACHES H. F. COOMES, examined.

[Continued.]

that the inspection is very cursory, very superficial.

6272. Would you connect that with the passage in that document where you say that the inspection is impressionist?—Yes, the inspectors take about four hours in the year.

6273. You endorse that criticism?—I do, certainly. I do not think it is fair to the teacher.

6274. That it depends too much on the idleness of the Inspector?—Yes, and he does not give enough of time to the inspection.

6275. And that combined with a very elaborate system of marking, you think is not a very wise thing?—No.

6276. Where so much depends on it?—Yes.

6277. Mr. KERRIE.—Are you, as a rule, present at inspections in your school?—Well, I have been very frequently. I do not say that I am always there. You get very short notice, and if one happens to be going away or is away, one gets no notice.

6278. We have it in evidence that the notice reaches you on the morning of the inspection?—It reaches me early in the morning—sometimes not till I come back in the evening.

6279. Do you not think that the manager ought to have adequate notice?—I think so. The manager can be very well trusted. It is a surprise visit, but surprise is one thing, and inspection is another.

6280. In the case of the inspections at which you have been present has the manner of the inspector, as a rule, been courteous?—I think it has. I must say it has, but there was a man in our district that we did not think courteous. It is an old story. It was under the other system.

6281. The manner of the inspector and the spirit in which the inspection is conducted are two different things?—Yes.

6282. And in your memorandum you say very distinctly that the spirit and the atmosphere of the inspection is all wrong?—Well, from what was said at that general meeting of managers, I would say that is the case, but I cannot say that is our experience.

6283. There is an undue tendency towards fault-finding?—I think that is natural. An Inspector is mainly critical, supposing he is trying to put things right. Certainly a teacher does not perhaps look forward to his visit with pleasure.

6284. We were told that in the case of an extract from the report, which is forwarded to the manager, the only portion of the report usually sent was the fault-finding portion. Is that your experience—do you get a report saying that the teacher is a very excellent teacher?—I do not get anything so generous as that, but I have got "a good year's work has been done," and I got praise. I think that is not always the case with the written report.

6285. Then your experience seems to be somewhat in conflict with the case made in this memorandum—at least it does not fully confirm it?—I think a good many of us rather agree that there is a great difference between the manner of the Inspector and the written report in the end. I do not think it is the general opinion that the written report is always adverse in every particular.

6286. Your experience would apparently conflict in some extent with that of other managers?—I would say that some inspectors are mainly critical. I could not say that they are all.

6287. Then you think there is a very great difference between one inspector and another?—I asked my teacher about that expression "mainly critical," and he said "some only." Some of the inspectors are very critical.

6288. Then I take it that the inspection of one inspector varies very much from that of another?—There is no doubt at all about that. I have said, I think, that we have a pleasant inspector.

6289. So uniformity is not attained?—No.

6290. The Manager or Boss.—You are comparing your inspector under the present system with the inspector under the old system?—Not altogether, my lord, but with what I hear of other inspectors.

6291. But the difficult inspector was under the old system, and the gentle inspector under the present system?—That is a matter of fact in our case.

6292. Mr. KERRIE.—There is a lack of uniformity among the inspectors?—There is a certain lack of uniformity.

6293. Do you find one inspector laying great stress on one subject and another on another?—I admit there is a great amount of that—a disagreement in the points they bring out.

6294. I have been told that when a new inspector is appointed to a district there is a great eagerness among the teachers to ascertain his particular fail?—That is only the natural desire to make yourself agreeable.

6295. With regard to the examinations, there is an examination for senior pupils at present, upon the basis of which leaving certificates are awarded?—Yes. I have not had any.

6296. Not in your school?—No; not at all.

6297. In form it is rather an impressive document, suitable as an award, and suitable for framing or hanging up. Is there anything of that sort in your district?—No, not with us.

6298. Mr. KAVANAGH.—Now, you get reports from the inspectors after they have inspected?—Yes.

6299. You say you only get a part of the report?—I only get an extract from the report.

6300. And you rather complain about the secret marks mark?—We complain also of not getting the whole report. We think we ought to see everything that is said of us.

6301. If you get an unfavourable report, what action do you take then?—Well, as a matter of fact, I have not got any very unfavourable report—I mean not anything that would prevent a teacher getting promotion.

6302. Not in your experience?—No, I don't think so.

6303. Does the report mention whether fault is found with the school building and equipment as distinct from the teacher himself?—Yes. I was first going to say, in order to qualify what I said before, that I think we did get a report that was not a very good report. I think the work of the school, "fair" or "good," or whatever it was, was not very good, because we were at that time in a very bad and very old building, and then when we were building our new building we went ahead.

6304. How far does the state of the building, do you think, affect the merit mark of the school?—I think it does affect it, and perhaps rightly so, but it is making the teacher responsible for the fault.

6305. The teacher is at a loss by it?—The teacher would be at a loss.

6306. Now, do you hold the teacher responsible for the cleaning out of the school?—No, I do not. I pay a caretaker to do that.

6307. You pay the caretaker yourself?—Yes; but I ask him to see that the children do not throw about papers, and that the place is generally tidy.

6308. Have you known any case in which the teacher has had to pay out of his own pocket to clean the school?—No, I have never heard that; but I have seen a teacher brush out the front of his school.

6309. Of course, if a school is dirty and untidy, the inspector will report against it?—I think so.

6310. And ultimately it comes back upon the teacher that he is responsible?—Yes, it comes back to the teacher. I suppose the teacher should complain to the manager if the caretaker is not doing his duty.

6311. Then there is one matter that we had a good deal of evidence yesterday about, that is the inspectors not shaking hands with the teachers. Have your teachers complained at all in any way of that?—No, I do not think they ever mentioned that point.

6312. Personally, I think too much stress is put on this hand-shaking business. The inspector has to visit a great many schools, and to meet a great many teachers, and on some of these he has to make a favourable report and on some an unfavourable report. Is it not wiser for him perhaps to abstain from any open act of friendship while he is in an official capacity?—Yes.

6313. Supposing he shook hands warmly with a man and then made a very unfavourable report on his school, would not that be very curious?—I am only

speaking from my own point of view. Personally, if I had to report on a school, I would not care first of all to shake hands with a man very warmly and then make a very unfavourable report. Might I put it in this way, that the absence of this hand-shaking business is not an evidence of unfriendliness, but may rather imply impartiality?—Yes; I think the inspector coming in before he had any impression might be as friendly as you like, and if he is disappointed of everything, he might go away in silence.

6314. And then make a very unfavourable report?—Yes; he would in that case, without being guilty of any hypocrisy.

6315. Would that be quite consistent?—Well, I think he comes in as an impartial inspector, and has not seen anything one way or the other to disapprove of.

6316. The *Burner or Ross*.—You complained of the shortness of the visit of the inspector to your school?—Yes.

6317. Would you be surprised to hear that it is a compulsion to your school?—Yes.

6318. All highly efficient schools are visited very briefly?—Yes.

6319. And if your school were not highly efficient, then you would have a formal examination which would last a much longer time?—Yes.

6320. Mr. KETTEL.—Does your school get "excellent"?—I do not know that it does.

6321. Then it does not come under "highly efficient"?—Generally about "good."

6322. The *CHAIRMAN*.—I understand that the inspectors stay four hours at your school?—I mean in the year, putting together all their visits.

6323. Mr. HARRISON.—Not four hours in one visit?—No, not at all; but I do say that about four hours would cover all the time in the year that the inspectors spent in the school. That was the estimate that the teacher made.

6324. The *Burner or Ross*.—Do you notice in your school much desire on the part of the children to secure some clerical post?—Do you mean as against working?

6325. As against ordinary mechanical work or farming work?—I can hardly say. There are some children who do get jobs as clerks—school-boys' clerks, or at a bookbinding press.

6326. Of course, yours is a purely town school?—Well, it is not exactly. We have children coming to us from different directions.

6327. You do not observe anything of an evil tendency on the part of these children to try to go further away from work, and to try to get into some clerical post or other?—No, I do not think so. I was just thinking of one family of boys, and they are all driving horses for grocers, and that sort of thing. One of them may be working in the fields.

6328. But you have not noticed any tendency such as I have mentioned?—I do not think we have. We have a very large amount of factory work; girls all go to that. Fourteen is the age for "half-time"; and often four or five of a family are earning money.

6329. You do not approve of the half-time system?—I think not.

6330. Mr. KETTEL.—Under the half-time system, how many days in the week do the half-timers spend in the school?—Three days one week and two days the next.

6331. That is three full days?—Yes, that is five days in the fortnight.

6332. The *Burner or Ross*.—Do you say that the present system of inspection and teaching since 1900 is calculated to turn the children in the direction of clerical work, and away from the factories and the fields, as against the old system before 1900—and supposing that such a tendency does exist, do you think that a reasonable explanation of it would be to say that it is the result of the present system of instruction?—I have never heard that.

6333. *Prima facie*, you would not think that would be so?—No. Comparatively few work in the fields, mostly town children.

6334. Mr. COFFEY.—You think that individual examination of the children would be an advantage but for the work imposed on inspectors?—Yes, it might be.

6335. But apart from that you think it would be an advantage to the children and an advantage to education to have the children examined?—I think it would, on the whole, taking it all round. I do not think you can test work altogether apart from examination.

6336. You do not think it could be satisfactorily tested without examination?—No. Well, on the other hand, of course, there is the danger of cramming, and there is also the danger of judging of a child by his actual attainments instead of by his possible attainments, his capacity.

6337. I have heard a great deal about cramming, and I have had some experience of school work, and I ask you do you think it possible to cram primary school children?—I think it would be possible to pick out the cleverest boys and cram them up.

6338. Under the results system the defect was said to be cramming, and I had a great objection to it on other grounds, but I have never been able to see how, in a primary school, children of ten or twelve years of age could be crammed?—The teachers might work very hard.

6339. But for the purpose of cramming as it is generally understood?—I think it would be picking out a particular set of questions, and I do not think it could be done with primary school children at all.

6340. Do you think it possible, from what you know of school inspectors, and from what you know of human nature, that a large number of inspectors could agree on their impression of a school?—I think it is impossible. I don't think they do agree.

6341. And, as it is impossible to agree, must not the present system of marks do injustice?—They might agree where there was very little doubt about the efficiency of the school, but in a critical case where the question was whether a school was a good one or not they would probably disagree.

6342. There would be no difficulty, of course, in deciding between a good school and a bad school, but when 60 or 70 men are forming an opinion of a school and trying to draw the line between "very good" and "good," and between "good" and "fair," do you think it at all conceivable that these men could agree?—I do not.

6343. And therefore uniformity must arise?—Yes, it must.

6344. From your experience of the results system (though I think it was vicious in principle, and unsound altogether), which do you consider the better prepared for the battle of life—the children who left school then or the children who leave school now?—That is a very broad question.

6345. I will bring it down to narrower limits. Do you think the standard of education in the schools at the present time so high as it was under the results system?—I really could hardly say. I should be sorry to say it was not. They can turn out some very good boys under our present system.

6346. Mr. HARRISON.—Are there not regulations which require managers to hold periodical examinations of their schools?—I do not know about a regulation, but I know that there is a recommendation.

6347. Have you ever acted on it in any way?—I have been present when the teachers had them under examination, but I have not myself examined, I have taken a child out to read.

6348. But you have not taken a very active part in examining?—No.

6349. Have you examined the papers after an examination?—Oh, no, not the papers certainly.

6350. The *states*?—I have looked at the *states* and at copybooks to see what they were doing in the way of arithmetic, and so on.

6351. At the examination?—No, when I come in. I have been present at an examination held by the teacher.

6352. During the whole of it or only a small part of it?—Not the whole of it, a small part of it.

6353. You say that you complained of the short time given to the inspectors. Are you alluding to surprise visits or formal visits?—I mean the whole thing taken together.

6354. You do not know what would be the time given

4th April, 1918.]

Rev. MARTIN H. F. COOMES, examined.

[Continued.]

to a surprise visit, and to the formal inspection, respectively?—Well, I think that they are all very short.

6370. Are you speaking from personal experience or only from what you have learned from the teachers of your schools?—I am speaking of what I heard from my teacher.

6371. You have never been present during the whole or the greater part of a formal inspection?—No, I very seldom have had enough notice to be present during the whole time. I might hurry down after the second post when I got the notice, and find it half over.

6372. Then I gather from what you told Professor Kettle that your own experience does not tally with some of the strong statements that have been made in the memorial that we have had before us?—I think that on the whole our inspectors are certainly fairer than the memorandum would lead you to suppose.

6373. In fact your own personal experience does not bear this out?—My own personal experience would not allow me to say anything quite so strong as this, but I have heard of the experience of others. This memorandum represents our collective experience, but when you ask for my personal experience you can get my personal experience only.

6374. Mr. BERRY.—You have told us that the total time spent by inspectors in your school during the year amounted to four hours?—Yes.

6375. The sum total of all the visits?—Yes.

6376. Are you aware that after every visit the Inspector must enter in the observation book the time at which he entered the school and the time at which he left it?—Frequently?

6377. Are you aware of that?—No, I was not aware of that.

6378. That is the regulation, and therefore your teacher could have no difficulty in adding up the amount of time that the inspector spent in the school?—I suspect he did it, because he was very definite in saying it to me.

6379. Now do you think you could get the best work from teachers if you did not surprise them?—No, I should think that surprise visits are perhaps a mistake. The surprise visit is looked upon by the teacher as a sort of spying on him.

6380. With regard to the formal inspections at which the manager is expected to be present, do you think it is desirable that notice should be sent to him before the morning of the inspection, lest he should give any information to the teacher of the inspector's coming?—I think not. I think you might trust the manager. If it is not desirable that the teacher should know, you can trust him not to tell him.

6381. Would it not be desirable that the teacher should know?—I do not see why the teacher should not know.

6382. If an Inspector comes to a school on a surprise visit, and wants to test the work of the teacher, might not that inspection be held at a time when all the best pupils perhaps were absent?—That is true, and I do not think it is quite fair, for any little accident might make the school less prepared, and then with a small accident happening you would have perhaps a bad permanent impression made.

6383. Would it not be fair that the teacher should have an opportunity of showing the full amount of work that he had done during the year, in other words, that he should have an opportunity of having pupils who might be absent at that work or other business for the time present for inspection?—I think so. I think it would be much better, and more what one would wish. Any man that is doing any work would like to have it fully tested.

6384. You think that would be simple justice?—I think that would be simple justice.

6385. With regard to the testing of pupils, you have stated that you thought that there was not a sufficient number of pupils tested?—No, I do not think there is.

6386. Would you think it desirable that when an inspector is examining a class he should have at the same time the number of attendances which each pupil made within the previous year, so that he might be able to judge how far the teacher should really be responsible for the state of that pupil's instruction?—Well, I do, I think that would be a very reasonable idea.

6387. Well, that could not be done unless those surprise visits for a formal inspection were done away with?—I think the inspector is very often rather inspecting the teacher than the children, watching him conducting the school, and walking about the schools generally while the work is going on.

6388. Have you had changes of inspectors in your school?—I think we have had a good many. I remember a good many different inspectors. I have to write to inspectors now and again.

6389. We have had it in evidence that an inspector cannot possibly judge of the progress a school is making until he has been two years in the district. Has the change of inspectors been sufficiently frequent to prevent them, in accordance with that opinion, forming a sound judgment on your school?—An inspector came and went away very soon, certainly in two years, but the majority of them are more than two years.

6390. You have stated that there is a tendency in your district under the present system for pupils to seek for steady posts?—I think, on the whole, there is a tendency.

6391. Do you think it would be desirable for any system of education to be devised for the purpose of directing the activities of the children in any particular direction?—I do not really know. I know parents say to me "there is nothing in Antism for boys at school," and they go off to shops in Balfour.

6392. And why should not they be free to go wherever they can sell their labour to the best advantage?—I do not see why they should not.

6393. You do not think it desirable to promote a system of education that would have the effect of turning their energies into any particular channel?—I do not quite understand how you could do it.

6394. Supposing it were possible, do you think it would be desirable?—I think in every country in the world, India and everywhere, there is too great a rush for universality, and not in the direction of manual work.

6395. You stated that under the results system it was common for the teacher to work hard for a short time before the examination?—I think it was.

6396. Do you object to that?—I thought that might give a rather false impression.

6397. Is not repetition one of the means which we have for fixing things in the memory?—I am sure it is.

6398. And would you object to a three weeks course of revision of the whole year's work?—I do not suppose I would; but I would object to what is called cramming, which has a definite meaning.

6399. But repetition of the year's work is not cramming?—No, but it would be very easy to run it into cramming.

6400. I cannot see how. Just one point more; you stated that so long as the building was had you got a bad mark on the school?—I think that was the case before we built our new school.

6401. And the moment you got a new building the mark went up?—Certainly.

6402. So that your impression is that the state of the buildings was taken into consideration, and acted adversely to the teacher in assigning a mark to the school? I think so.

6403. Mr. BRYAN WILKINSON.—Do you think it would be desirable that some means should be adopted to interest the children and make them desire to hold a good place in the school?—Yes.

6404. Of course, you are familiar with the old system in schools of putting to the head of the class the children who answered the questions that the others had not answered?—Yes.

6405. Do you know if that method exercised in any way?—I do not think so.

6406. Do you think there is anything very much beyond that system, or a modification of it, which could be introduced, so as to keep up the interests of the children and the desire to excel?—I think something like that could be done. I mean if you have a top boy in a school, or even in a class, I mean top boy and second boy, and so on, I think it stimulates the children.

6407. And do you think a little more could be done in order to fix the place of children for the time being

4th April, 1918.]

Rev. MATTHEW H. F. COLLIS, examined.

[Continued.]

in the class, so that they might be able to tell their parents "I am head of my class"?—Yes.

6398. You think that would be desirable?—Yes, I see that obtains in the English public schools, and a man will say, "I see my boy has gone up three places."

6399. Do you know what the grade of your teacher is; has he arrived at the top of the tree?—I do not really know; I think he has. He is 35 or 36 years teaching at any rate. I think he is 35; he is certainly 30. I signed for his salary the other day and the total was £47; but then there were two other grants in it.

6400. That was the quarter's salary?—Yes.

6401. That would be £188 per annum?—I don't think he gets that every quarter.

6402. It is certainly the highest grade?—It is the highest grade.

6403. So that your teacher would not be at the present moment relying for his salary upon the merit mark in the same way as a teacher in a lower grade would be?—I would say not.

6404. Mr. HARVEY.—The Burrell grant of £7 is included in the £47; that reduces it to £40, but he is not paid that every quarter. You say that there is another grant?—There is a grant of £15, and there the £7. That leaves £32, and his salary is over £100.

6405. So that he is in that position that he is not depending upon the merit mark to a very large extent?—That is so.

6406. Mr. HUGH WINTERKING.—He has not, so far as you know, lost any increment of salary in respect of the merit mark?—I do not think he has. He has gone steadily up.

6407. And your school is evidently placed under very favorable circumstances, and would not, therefore, be likely to be undervalued upon by any inspector;

there would not, in fact, be the same opportunity for undervaluation?—Not as regards the school.

6408. And you are satisfied yourself that the teacher is a good teacher, and that to undervalue upon his work would show more than normal criticism?—It would. An inspector 14 or 15 years ago told me that he was one of the best teachers in the district.

6409. Well, in considering the opportunity for criticism, we have to consider that the school is in a very good building, and the teacher is one of the best teachers of the district. In measuring the inspector's reports, we should have to bear that in mind?—Yes.

6410. Now, we have to consider what inspectors' reports generally would be. You have met at the Committee of Managers, and, as you know, if it were a Court of Law, we could not take secondary evidence?—No.

6411. But as it is quite impossible for us to have all the managers here to give their own individual opinion, it is desirable that we should have the general impression of managers with regard to the Inspectorial system, and you think that this paper represents fairly the aggregate opinion of the members of your association?—Yes, of our association.

6412. And you yourself consider that you are in a more favorable position than the majority of our members?—I certainly do. I am more fortunate in my experience than some of those there.

6413. And you are placed in circumstances in which you would expect to be more fortunate?—Yes, perhaps I am. We have got a very good school now. We have had experience of a very bad building.

6414. When you first came there?—Yes.

6415. And then you found that the school mark suffered in consequence of the building?—It did undoubtedly.

The Rev. ALFRED S. WOODWARD, M.A., St. Mark's Vicarage, Ballysillan, Belfast, examined.

6416. The CHAIRMAN.—You are Rector of St. Mark's, Ballysillan?—Yes, I am Rector of the Parish.

6417. For how many years?—I am there since 1896.

6418. That is 16 years?—Yes.

6419. And before that?—I was Rector of a country parish, Killybegh.

6420. And was that your only previous parish?—That was my only previous parish. Before that I was curate of Ferintosh.

6421. Now, as Rector of two parishes, I suppose, you have been manager of some schools?—In my previous parish near Coleraine I had no school. My predecessor would not have anything to do with a National school, and the school in the parish was under management not in connection with my Church. So I had no experience of schools in my previous parish.

6422. Are you manager of schools at present?—I am manager of my own school.

6423. St. Mark's?—St. Mark's, Ballysillan.

6424. That is the only one?—That is the only one.

6425. And you have been a manager there for 16 years?—Yes, I have been for 16 years.

6426. As regards building and equipment, is that school satisfactory?—It is generally full up. We are full at present and we cannot take any more children, having regard to our accommodation. The structure at present is not satisfactory, so we have not been able to put up partitions; but that we intend doing in a very short time. We do not see our way to do it yet.

6427. And as regards the upkeep and cleaning and so on, how you fund for that; have you any endowment?—No endowment.

6428. Do you raise subscriptions?—We raise subscriptions for the school. It comes mostly on our parish funds.

6429. The teacher is not responsible for any of these things?—Not for the cleaning; but he is responsible for providing maps and things of that kind.

6430. The teacher has to provide maps?—Well, he has a concert every year, and there is a school display.

6431. Still he has to raise the money?—He does.

6432. And what would that include besides maps?—Well, it appears that the stationery is a very heavy charge.

6433. And he has to provide that?—Yes, and to provide pens and ink and similar things.

6434. And if he did not succeed in raising the money by the concert, would he have to pay it out of his own pocket?—I do not think that we would permit him to do so. I may say that my experience as school manager is this, that I have always worked in the completest sympathy with my teacher, and we are in complete agreement, and we work together on a thorough understanding.

6435. But still if he is responsible theoretically for that?—Yes.

6436. Now, you are Secretary of this Association of Church of Ireland School Managers?—I am Secretary.

6437. And you have been for some time?—Since the year 1908.

6438. Now, you can tell us with great authority how far this document represents the general opinion of your managers?—I think I am safe in saying that they are absolutely unanimous, it being understood that it is not a condemnation of all the inspectors. We say that inspection seems to us in many cases to be impressionist.

6439. Some of your managers would rather have the word "some" for "many" there?—Yes.

6440. But as regards the general purport, you say it represents the views of all?—We are in practical unanimity. It represents about 200 managers.

6441. Mr. COOPER.—With, of course, the reservation that it does not apply to all inspectors?—Not to all.

6442. The CHAIRMAN.—With regard to your own experience of St. Mark's school and the inspection of it, and your relation with the Board, would you confirm what is stated in this document?—I would, from my experience of my own school, and of other schools, and from my intercourse with other managers. In our Managers' Association we are brought closely into touch with our teachers, and I hear these things constantly discussed, and also from my official position, I come perhaps more in contact with the teachers, and certainly I have had a good deal of conversation with teachers, so I have a general experience of the feeling of managers and teachers.

6443. Have you come across cases in your experi-

once in which teachers make serious complaints about the want of a uniform standard of inspection?—Yes, very many. I should like to say that my experience in 16 years of ten inspections is that they have been (I am speaking of my own school now) personally nice and agreeable.

6439. You have no complaint yourself to make of them?—In the case of my experience during 16 years I have had only one serious complaint against an inspector, which involved a long correspondence with the Board; but apart from that I have not. I have got particulars here from 1901.

6440. These are the merit marks?—The merit marks and the names of the inspectors. I have had a selection of 10 different inspectors, and my relationships with them were perfectly agreeable. They have suggested things that they thought we should put right, but everything was quite agreeable, and I had only one case of complaint which was serious. I have had only one serious case of complaint against an inspector in my 16 years.

6441. What was that?—For a couple of years previously, the inspectors in their observations and in their reports had been calling attention to things that were required in the school. The school building was suffering and they thought that alterations should be done there. Early in the year I entered into negotiations with the National Board for a grant. I applied for £250, and told them exactly what I wanted. We wanted to put down a new floor in the school. We wanted to re-organise our infant class work, and put in modern kindergarten desks, and do put in a separate entrance for the children, so that they would not have to be passing and disturbing the senior children of the school, and various other things. I cannot say in what month it was, but I applied early in the year for this. Our intention, of course, was that these alterations should be carried out during the long vacation. Then there came a curious delay. The July holidays came on, and the Inspector of the Board of Works had not come, and it was October before we could begin work, and the contractor had to do his work while the school was sitting. He was hampered in his work accordingly, and certainly the teachers were hampered in their work by his presence. The work had to be done slowly on account of the school going on meanwhile. It went on during the months of October, November, and December. When it came near the end we had to close the school for a short time, on those were things to be done that could not be done with the school going on, and I notified that to the inspector; but the very day that the school re-opened, when my principal was engaged in re-organising and placing the classes, and getting the school into shape, the inspector returned spent some time in inspecting the school, and as a result of that inspection he gave an adverse report on our school. We had uniformly previously for years and spent some time in inspecting the school, "good."

6442. What year was that?—1909.

6443. Mr. KERRIN.—Has the "excellent" been restored since?—No, it has been raised. That was the senior inspector. He has been followed by the junior inspector, who raised it to "very good."

6444. But not to the old "excellent"?—No; but we are perfectly satisfied with "very good."

6445. The CHAIRMAN.—Was any complaint made by you of that to the Central Office?—Yes.

6446. What was the result of that?—The result of it was this. I should say that the inspector came a second time later on, in the month of February, and then sent in this adverse report. I wrote calling attention to this, and after a long time I had the inspector's comments on my report, and the statements which he made I controverted, but I never heard anything more.

6447. He came to re-examine the school, in fact?—He came and examined.

6448. Mr. GERRIN.—What date did you get the bad report?—He reported on the 9th and 10th of February.

6449. Was that after his second visit?—Yes, that was after his second.

6450. The CHAIRMAN.—When did you receive that?—I received that in March.

6451. That report was received by you in March?—That report was received on the 6th of April.

6452. What did you do then?—I then wrote controverting the statements.

6453. Did you write immediately?—The 6th of April, 1909.

6454. Then you protested against the report?—I protested against that report.

6455. You spoke of other examinations?—Yes.

6456. The first was in December?—Yes; the 9th and 10th of February was the date of his second visit. The covering letter says: "I have to forward herewith for your information the substance of the special report of the senior inspector on the subject," and the report reads:—

"Copy of Inspector's Report on the School, visited on 9th and 10th February, 1909.

(Received April 6th.)

"General Condition of the School—"Good."  
Inspector's Remarks.

"The general condition of the school has not realised expectations. The answering in arithmetic was disappointing, especially in third and fourth standards, and the spelling of fourth standard and grammar of sixth were very unsatisfactory. Composition in fourth standard admits of improvement. The senior pupils had not used primers, and the discipline of the junior department was rather lax. Reading, singing, and elementary science give evidence of sound teaching.

"The rooms are tastefully kept, but the teachers are handicapped by the lack of adequate classroom accommodation.

"New floors have been laid, and the playground has been flagged and enclosed, in addition to other improvements.

"F. J. KEMAY, Senior Inspector."

That report did not come till after the second visit, but, of course, his report is founded on the two visits. Would it make things simple if I give you the letter I wrote to the Board with reference to the adverse report?

6457. Yes, I saw your letter in the list of November, 1909. Would that be the protest against that report?—I will read my letter:—

"St. Mark's Vicarage, Ballyfeighlin,  
Belfast, Nov. 1st, 1909.

"GENTLEMEN,

"With reference to the adverse report your inspector has made this year respecting my school, and in consequence of which two of my assistant teachers have suffered grievous financial injury, permit me to call your attention to the following facts:

"My principal and I are keenly interested in our school's efficiency, and for the last eight years every inspector has reported very highly of the school, and reported it "excellent." For the past few years, however, they have been calling attention to structural defects, the result of the wear and tear of time. Very early in the year application was made to you to approve of a loan of £250 to put the place in thorough repair, and carry out much needed improvements. It was decided to do all the work during the summer vacation, but owing to the extraordinary delay of your officials the work could not be carried out then, as we were wanted not to begin until the loan is sanctioned. The consequence was that it was impossible to begin the improvements before October, and as the school had to go on, the contractor was very much hampered, and the school work was discouraged and carried on under very great difficulties during the months of October, November, and December. I was obliged to close the school for the last week in November, while the new floor was being laid, and I noticed the inspector to that effect. The morning the school re-opened, when the principal was engaged making some changes in the position of the classes, and generally getting things into shape, the inspector arrived and spent some time in the school, and expressed himself

dissatisfied with the cedar, etc., of the school. In February he visited the school for the annual inspection, two days before the school concert and display, an annual event looked forward to with keenest interest by parents and children, necessary and helpful in stimulating local interest in the school and providing money for various incidental expenses. Anyone with the slightest knowledge of child life knows that in such circumstances it is unreasonable to expect little ones to have their minds on their lessons. Intense excitement about the 'big event' and the part they are to take being only natural. But the inspector took the school at a more serious and further disadvantage. His visit was nearly five months sooner than expected. He examined the classes in several instances on parts of the year's programme that had not been reached by the teacher, and would not be reached for several months. When his attention was called to this, he gave the impression that he considered that the teacher ought to have been over the whole year's programme, but could not tell them what he expected them to do for the five months remaining of the school year.

"I do not claim perfection for our school. Reasonable suggestions and criticisms by the inspector have always been welcome, and when possible acted upon, but I feel a very serious injustice has been done to my principal, Mr. ...., one of the ablest and most conscientious teachers under your Board, and to two of his able assistants, the Misses ..... where increments have been withheld.

"Yours faithfully,

"ALFRED S. WOODWARD, M.A.,

"Manager of St. Mark's, Ballyville N.S."

6488. Have you anything in 1909 in reply to your letter?—No.

6489. You said the next stage was that the inspector reported on your protest?—And this is what I have now.

6490. What is the date of their reply?—21st of January, 1910.

6491. Do you mean that there was a whole year between the complaints on the report and the inspection?—This is dated from Dublin, 21st of January, 1910.

"L. 506/1909. G.T.

"Covering letter from Commissioners of National Education.

"Office of National Education,

"Dublin, 21st January, 1910.

"Rev. Sir,

"I am directed to inform you that correspondence has been in progress with the senior inspector regarding your letter of 1st November, 1909, in which you took exception to the terms of the general report on the above-named school, furnished by that officer after his visits of the 9th and 10th February, 1909.

"I have to forward herewith, for your information, the substance of a special report from the senior inspector on this subject.

"I am, Rev. Sir

"Your obedient servant,

"W. J. DUFFOON,

"Secretary.

"Rev. A. S. Woodward, M.A.

"H. R. L."

"Copy of Statement.

"With reference to the manager's complaint that the inspector's visit in February, 1909, occurred two days before the school concert, the senior inspector observes that this would not account for the fact that even the senior infants had not read a primer prior to 9th February, 1909, and that they had been taught to read words of three letters, nor would it explain why their proficiency in arithmetic and draw-

ing was only mediocre. Discipline in the infants' department was too lax to be accounted for by a mere passing cause. Above all it would not explain away the serious defects referred to in his general report.

"To the manager's remark that the inspector took the school at a further and more serious disadvantage, as his visit was five months sooner than was expected, the inspector replies that the general inspection was held in March in the previous year, and that the manager here tacitly assumes what the principal expressly told the inspector, viz., that he prepared his pupils as if for an examination in June, that the entire programme was covered before Easter, the remaining portion of the school year being devoted to revision.

"The inspector tried to convince the principal that this mode of proceeding was injudicious, that it would be much better to proceed slowly, and allow the pupils time to assimilate what had been taught, and that as the examination would be confined to the portion of the programme traversed, the teacher could not be taken unawares. The inspector denies to the manager's complaint, that he examined classes in several instances on parts of the year's programme that had not been reached by the teachers and could not be reached for several months. Inspector states that his practice is to ascertain how much of the programme has been taught and to confine his examination to that. If the teachers happened to misinform him—a most unlikely circumstance—that was their fault, not his. The statement that he examined on portions of the programme that would not be reached for several months is at variance with what the principal told him—that the entire programme was covered before Easter; there were not several months between 10th February, 1909, and Easter.

"As regards the manager's further objection that when the inspector's attention was called to this, he gave the impression that he considered the teachers should have been over the whole year's programme, the inspector states that he told the principal he was proceeding too quickly, but the latter still seemed to think he was not. The inspector considers that there are three possible ways of accounting for the falling off in efficiency:—(1) The principal was the collaborating in the preparation of texts in arithmetic, which have since been published, so that it is not improbable that his mind was diverted to some extent from his school work proper; (2) his own daughter, who had never been a monitor or pupil-teacher, was appointed assistant, and her lack of experience doubtless militated against her success as a teacher; (3) a long series of 'excellent' reports may have lulled the teachers into a false sense of security, under the idea that no inspector would have the moral courage to interrupt the tradition.

"The written exercises were disappointing.

"As an illustration of the condition of the school, the inspector states that he divided third standard into three divisions for arithmetic, each division getting different questions. He gave two exercises in simple multiplication to twelve pupils, and only two or three were right in each. And that was in the month of February.

"The work of Miss ..... would doubtless appear to better advantage if the principal had kept the infants' department under closer observation, and had given Miss ..... such guidance as a principal might be expected to give an assistant.

"The inspector adds that he cannot withdraw or modify any statement he has made respecting the general condition of the school."

6492. The Senior or Ross.—It seems to follow from this that the inspection took place in February, 1909, and that you did not make the complaint until November, 1909. They say: "In answer to your letter of the 1st of November, 1909?"—Yes.

6493. So that the dates are that the inspection was in February, 1909, and the complaints on the 1st of November, 1909, and then their reply to you of the 21st January, 1910?—Yes.



4th April, 1915.]

The Rev. ALFRED S. WOODWARD, M.A., examined.

[Continued.]

6464. Mr. CHURCH.—What time did you get the original minute, and the school having been inspected on the 9th and 10th February, 1909, why was the protest not sent until the 1st of November, 1909? What was the date of your getting the minute?—The 6th of April.

6465. The CHAIRMAN.—What followed that?—The Inspector's comment on my reply in his report.

6466. Sir HENRY WILKINSON.—I think it would be desirable to have the whole of that?—I will read my reply to the letter of 21st January, 1910.

Copy of Manager's Reply to the Inspector's Statement.

"Belmont, 20th February, 1910.

"GENTLEMEN,

"I thank you for yours of the 21st ult., enclosing the senior inspector's special report on my previous communication. Will you please note that he completely ignores the principal statement of my letter, i.e. that the school was very seriously upset by building operations during the three months of October, November and December, a fact quite sufficient to account for any lack of discipline among the infants, and for any deficiency shown by an examination held the following February.

"The principal did not tell the Inspector that he had prepared for an examination in June, but that he tried to finish the programme as near Easter as possible, so as to give time for a thorough revision of the more difficult parts before the July vacation, especially the teaching of arithmetic problems which require a knowledge of two or more rules.

"The Inspector did not criticise his examination to the portion of the programme that had been taught. In standard VI, he gave a question in proportion of fractions and another in mensuration, neither of which rules had been taught. I can give instances in other subjects. I visit the school daily and I have presided at meetings held in the evenings by our teachers to discuss the best methods of teaching the programme, and I emphatically deny that the principal has shown any evidence that his mind has been diverted in the slightest degree from his school work proper, by any literary work done by him in his spare time.

"It was with the desire of carrying out the Board's wishes to encourage intermediate students to enter the profession, that his daughter received an intermediate education, instead of that of a matriculate in a National School.

"The suggestion that a long series of 'excellent' reports may have lulled the teachers into a false sense of security, under the idea that no Inspector would have the moral courage to interrupt the traditions, is utterly unwarranted and should not have been made.

"His special report is a justification of his inspection report in every particular, and I am afraid I must add, somewhat vindictive. I have been a manager for 18 years, and this is the first occasion on which I have reason to complain of an Inspector.

"I am, Gentlemen,

Yours truly,

"A. S. WOODWARD.

"P.S.—I thank you for sending Miss A. ....'s inclosure.

"A. S. W."

I received no reply to this letter and the matter dropped.

6467. The CHAIRMAN.—Does that end the matter?—I never heard anything more of it.

6468. That closed it?—Yes.

6469. The Director or Boss.—Had that inspector been dealing with your school for any time previously?—He had inspected the school in the year 1904, when he gave the school a report of "excellent."

6470. But he was not continuously your inspector from that time?—No, you will see we had one every year.

6471. Then he came to you at a very awkward time,

particularly so in my opinion, and he should have made the greatest allowance. Had you any reason to imagine that he selected the time, or that he had any knowledge of the circumstances?—No, I did not impute any motives; but I notified him that those works were going on, and that the school would have to be closed for a week, and he turned up the following morning. Then as to his second visit. Of course, he did not know that a school concert was coming on in a few days, and if the Inspector is, as I understand he is from the revised programme, supposed to be the friend of the teacher, he might have paid a friendly visit and said: "I won't judge the school to-day"; but you use it in the infant that he calls attention to.

6472. Is that Inspector a married man?—I do not know. I may say that this Memorial has the approval and sympathy of our Bishop, the Bishop of Down.

6473. Mr. HENLY.—Was all this apart from the question of the paraffin?—The question of the paraffin was subsequently running on for the last two or three years. That is rather a new question, but that is ancient history.

6474. Mr. CHURCH.—What is the explanation of not writing the letter of protest from April, when you had the minute, until the 1st of November?—The Report came on April 6th, two months after the inspection. My principal and I talked the matter over, and resolved not to take any action, as it would only cause friction, and because the "mark" would most likely be missed again the following year. However, when we found that one of our best assistants had failed to receive her increments, we concluded that it had been withheld owing to the Inspector's adverse report, and accordingly on the 1st of November I wrote to the Board, and the increments arrived by return of post.

6475. Mr. HARRISON.—Was the visit upon which the adverse report was based a formal visit?—Yes, it was a formal visit.

6476. Had you the notice that seems to be necessary in the case of a formal visit?—I cannot remember.

6477. I thought he was bound to write to the manager?—Yes, and the notice came by the last post, probably after the Inspector had already arrived. If you ask me to suggest improvements later on, I have something to say on that subject.

6478. But it was what is known as a formal visit?—That was the formal visit, the second one.

6479. One other question. Was there any superior officer sent to enquire into this case or not?—No; there was no inquiry.

6480. It simply occurred that your objection was sent to the Inspector, referred to the Inspector, minuted by him, and his minute sent out to you?—Yes.

6481. Mr. HENLY.—Now, in connection with this case, do you think the present arrangement of a uniform school year is preferable to having a special school year for each school, in which case the possible state of affairs could not have occurred?—As managers, we are very much divided on that subject.

6482. I am asking for your opinion?—I don't know that I had an opinion. I am not prepared to give an opinion.

6483. You see, if each school had a school year that that school would be tested on a year's work, and this difficulty about the teacher's statement, that the Inspector examined a part of the programme that had not been reached, could not possibly arise?—That is my own idea. But the answer to that question is that the schools are not examined now, they are simply inspected, and therefore the Inspector can come at any time. He has not to sit down and examine the children. He has to come in and form his impression of the school. He can do that at any time of the year. Personally, I prefer a school year for each individual school.

6484. And you in favour of the impressionist system of inspection?—No.

6485. You are not?—No. Now, as to impressions, we have recently had a director on leave, the tone of the school. Now, that is a very indefinite thing. Each Inspector has to form his own idea about it, and some of the men, I do not believe, have any idea on the subject at all. For instance, here is a difference of opinion about what time is. I suppose we have all

our ideas on the subject. In a school that I know there are two assistants, nice refined girls, certainly ladylike in every way in their manner, and an inspector said to me: "These girls are fine young ladies. What we want is more of the animal."

6485. Mr. KETTER.—What exactly does he mean?—I know exactly what he meant. The expression is rather strong, but what he meant is this—animal vigor, a great deal of go and life, but he does not like a young lady for a teacher. He thinks they are very nice for a drawing-room. There is that man's idea of tone.

6486. Mr. HANBY.—Then you do not think it is possible to have a uniform method of marking under the present system?—Certainly not.

6487. Do you think that the system of marking ought to be abolished, "excellent" and "very good," and so on, when we cannot get uniformity?—On that point we are not unanimous in our Association; but, at the same time, we believe that if the inspection were a reality, we would not condemn the system of marking; but as it is at present, it is a very serious thing. Now, you take the case of a young teacher being put in charge of a school, a young man, full of enthusiasm, wanting to do the best for his school. He comes down and he is put in charge. The young fellow does his best, but he does not please the inspectors, and when he ought to be given his first increment, he gets a low mark, or a mark that was lower than had been given to the school, and the total result of that one bad mark to him in his career is a loss of £119. Now, that is a very serious thing, to lose £119 upon "an impression."

6488. The CHAIRMAN.—That is the result of a single unfavourable report?—Yes, from the delay of his increment all the way through.

6489. Mr. HENLEY.—You say that the inspectors do not sufficiently test the pupils?—I say in some cases. Some inspectors do. Some inspectors examine the schools; it is the regular old system of inspection. Another inspector comes in and states that in a quarter of an hour he can tell you what the whole school is worth.

6490. You complain also that you do not get a full report?—Yes; we get only extracts from the report.

6491. Would it not be better if we could get the full report on every school, indicating whether it was doing good work or not?—I wanted to give you an instance where an adverse report occurred. A young man put in charge of a school drew up his school programme to the best of his ability. An inspector came down and examined the programme. The inspector found fault with it and said it was altogether wrong. This young man is anxious to do his best, and he discussed the matter with the inspector, and asked the inspector would he kindly help him and draw up a programme. The inspector drew up a programme, which was adopted by the teacher, and the teacher taught on that; and within a year, another inspector came round, criticised that programme, and pulled the whole thing to pieces.

6492.8. The CHAIRMAN.—What was the result of that?—I cannot say. He has to pay for trying to improve his school. And there was one of the discouragements that he received. Of course, the inspector was very much taken aback when the young man said: "It was drawn up by so and so."

6494. Mr. GOWER.—You used the word "programmes"?—Time-table—I beg your pardon.

6495. Mr. HENLEY.—Would it not be better if he gave a full report on the school, specifying the subjects satisfactorily taught, and those that need amendment or improvement, and indicating whether the school was, as a whole, working satisfactorily, without attempting to sum up the merits or demerits of the school in one word like "excellent" or "very good"—would that not be an improvement?—It certainly would; but the Board seems to consider that the mark is necessary in calculating the teacher's salary.

6496. But we have not to consider what the Board consider necessary, but what is for the good of education?—As managers, we do not lay stress upon the "excellent" at all, except as to the effect upon the teacher.

6497. I ask you which you would prefer?—I would prefer a full report.

6498. And not to have it summed up in the way it is done at present?—Yes.

6499. Now, as far as your experience goes, have you found the inspectors in any way helpful to the teachers?—Yes; I must say that my experience is that in many cases they are.

6500. In what way?—In talking in a friendly way with them. I have no charge against inspectors as inspectors. There are just a few instances on the other side, but the inspectors, as a whole body, I must say, are doing their work well, and I must say that the fault is not with the inspectors, it is that they are victims of the system.

6501. Then whatever satisfaction you get from the inspectors, am I right in stating that you get none from the Central Office?—An inspector has written in the Observation Book: "It is a pleasure to be in a school like this," and words like that.

6502. You say in that Memorial that the children are practically not tested at all. What are we to understand by that?—In some cases the children are practically not inspected at all, but the teachers only "S." That is the point. In some cases they are not. In the case of an inspection of a school, the inspector simply stands there a few moments and passes on. He may devote himself a good deal of time to one, but then "many men, many methods."

6503. You suggest in the Memorial that the promotion of the pupils should depend to some extent on the reports of the inspectors. Would not that imply a report based on an examination of the children at the end of the school year?—I suppose it would, but my own feeling about it is that at the present time there is not the slightest inducement to a child to do well. Now, it is the teacher really that does the inspection. The children really get no inducement even to be at school on that day. Formerly their promotion depended on it. If some way could be found by which the inspector could give some actual certificate, or in some way indicate that those children ought to be promoted, if it was even a matter that the inspector would cause a list of children that passed or were satisfactory to be written out and hung up in the school, the children would be proud of having their names there and have something or other to go on; but at the present time the children do not care whether the inspector is there or how they do.

6504. I am in agreement with you on that, but in order to carry out that suggestion of your Managers' Association, should we not have a school year for each school, with an examination and test of the children at the end of the school year?—Personally speaking, I should be in favour of it.

6505. Do you think that the effect of that would be to stimulate the industry of the children and induce them to attend more regularly and take a regular interest in their work, and interest the parents as well in the progress of their children?—Yes; if a modified system of examination could be introduced; but it is just the difficulty of not going back to the old results system. For instance, if you take my idea on the subject (I am speaking for myself personally), I can imagine an inspector going into a school and being friendly with the teacher, and shaking hands with him and speaking in a friendly way, and if there was a spirit of friendship between the teacher and the inspector the teacher would not be afraid to speak to the inspector, and the inspector would say: "Well, now, pick me out your six best boys," and when the teacher picks out the six best boys, he will take one and ask him some questions, and say: "That is a good pupil. Now let me have your careless boys," and a friendly word like that would draw him out; he would examine one or two and he would get to really understand them, and the teacher would not be feeling all the time: "This is a defective and he will mark me down."

6506. Do you agree with Sir Joshua Fitch that what the parent wants to know is not that the class did well, but what his own son did?—I think so. I do not think they trouble themselves about anyone else's children.

6507. Then your suggestion of examination by sample

would not satisfy the requirements of parents as to how their children were doing?—Yes, but supposing that those boys stood up whom the teacher honestly knows to be good boys, and he simply asks a question or two, and then the middling boys and then the bad boys?

6508. According to your plan, it is only the boys that are selected that will be promoted?—Yes, can he not take it on the word of the teacher? The teacher is not afraid of the inspector in this case, and he can ask the question: "Why is this boy so backward?" and so on.

6509. But the point is, for instance, I have a son going to that school, and that boy is not among those that have been tested by the inspector—how can I be satisfied without a record of the progress that the boy is making in the school?—But then you will go back to the old examination system?

6510. I am asking you what would be the proper system, whether it would be desirable in the essential subjects of reading, writing, and arithmetic, to examine individually every pupil with a certain number of attendances, that the teacher can be held morally responsible for?—I certainly think it would be desirable.

6511. And the only objection is, that the Board's rules, as they stand at present, are adverse to that?—They are adverse to it. I think it would be desirable if we could have a modified examination.

6512. Now, with regard to subjects like geography and grammar, would you think it necessary, or would you think it insufficient, if they were put in a class and questions addressed to them by the inspector, and that it was judged from a few records of questions, whether their knowledge was adequate or not?—I think it could be done in that way; but otherwise you would have to go into close personal examination. I think your suggestion would be sufficient.

6513. You say that the spirit of the inspection should be changed. Will you state exactly what you mean by that?—Well, as to the spirit of inspection, my only experience of the instructions given to inspectors is from their telling the parts of detectives, and also being largely influenced by their own bias. I am not now charging the inspectors as a body. I know cases of inspectors who, instead of going through the front door of the school and coming in like honest men, slip round and go in through the back door, and are in the school a few minutes before the teacher knows that the inspector is there. Now, that does not conduce to inspire confidence and friendly relations between the teachers and the inspectors. Then, as to bias, I suppose we have all got our bias; but where our teachers' salaries are depending on these facts, it becomes a very serious matter. In some schools the pique is played, while the changes are made. Here is a school in which it is not done. An inspector comes along and says: "Why don't you have some music while the children are changing? It would help them to march round better." The following year another inspector comes round and says: "Stop that noise; if the children were properly trained they would walk round in an orderly manner without the piano."

6514. I see in the memorial a suggestion as to uniformly, that is, that specimen questions should be drawn up. Now do you think that desirable?

Sir HIRSH WATKINSON.—Has Mr. Woodward any other suggestion to make?—Yes. A suggestion as to the relationship between the managers and the inspectors. I think that when an inspector comes and inspects a school, the manager ought to know that the inspector is coming. You have already brought up the point of the notice that is given now, and the manager, who is supposed to manage the school and take an interest in the school, gets a postcard on the very morning of the inspector's coming. Now, he has his arrangements made before 8 or 9 o'clock in the morning of the day of inspection, and it is to be at the inspection, he must forgo or neglect his other engagements. If they are important, he must keep them, and cannot be present at the inspection. Now, when the inspection is being held, if the inspector sees anything wrong, or anything that he would like to ask a question about, would it not be far better for him to talk the matter over with the manager, when he will, perhaps, find a satisfactory explanation of it. Instead of that, he makes a written report, putting it in the observation book, where it stands

as a permanent record against the school. He may find the need is lacking, or something of that kind, when the explanation is this—that there had been a storm and a shak has been blown off the roof. That would be settled at once. Or, say, it has been discovered that a boy's cap had got into the down pipe, and has not been known all the time came on. There is the record, put in the observation book as a serious charge against the school, and in succeeding years a manager reading it will think you had neglected your school. The managers, at the present time, are little more than sub-agents of the National Board.

6515. Mr. KETTER.—May I ask you about this separate case. I understood you to say that you visit your school daily?—Hardly a day passes without a visit.

6516. You have every opportunity then of forming an opinion as to the character and efficiency of your teacher?—Yes.

6517. You assured the inspector of those facts that you brought before us that hampered the school work in that particular case?—Yes.

6518. And your statement was ignored?—Yes.

6519. Arguing from that case, the attitude of the National Board towards the manager, who is satisfied enough to visit the school daily, is one of distrust?—Yes. I don't think the teacher had a fair chance in that instance. I gave, with the new classroom and new desks and new floor, and all the other new things just put in while the school was actually going on.

6520. The CHAIRMAN.—Is there any other point that you wanted to mention?—I think that some more discretion ought to be left to the managers as to the teaching of special subjects—cooking and elementary science, and so on. Now, the condition of the school and the class of children that are attending should be taken into consideration. It is absolutely impossible in some cases to teach elementary science. The elementary science taught in our school is fairly advanced; but it is absurd to say that a lot of ragged gutter children, that will never be able to use it, should be taught elementary science as they are taught it, say, in a school like mine, where the boys are of a better class, and will be going into shipyards and to the technical school. There it is most desirable that we should have elementary science taught, as it is taught effectively, with all the apparatus and everything else; but it is absurd that an inspector should come along to a school with the very poorest class of children and insist that science is to be introduced into that school, with the result that if the teacher does not do it, his instrument is withheld. Similarly, take the case of cooking in a one-room, or perhaps, in a two-room school, where there is no place to put the cooker except in the class room that is used for other purposes. The manager ought to have it in his discretion to say whether in such cases the teaching of cooking would really be an advantage, and whether that advantage to the children would be counterbalanced by the serious disadvantages of the classes having to sit for a length of time in a room in which cooking is going on—say, of odours or fried herrings. It ought to be left to the manager, who knows the teacher and the district, and I have known cases in which instruments were withheld from teachers because the manager had not introduced cooking in his school, and subsequently those instruments were restored only on an undertaking given by the manager that cooking would be introduced in the course of the following year.

6521. Was that made a condition?—Yes.

6522. Mr. HANLEY.—Would this meet your view, that the programme should be such that the essential subjects, namely, reading, writing, and arithmetic, should be compulsory in all schools, with perhaps some grammar and geography, with an option to the manager then to select from a number of other subjects such additional subjects as he thought would suit the requirements of his own particular school and his own locality, and the ability of the teacher to teach them?—Yes; but, at the same time, recognizing that all managers are not ideal managers, I think I would leave to the Board some authority, some little compelling power. All I ask for is more liberty. You will understand, if I were to find fault with inspectors, that there are managers to be found fault with too.

4th April, 1913.]

The Rev. ALFRED S. WOODWARD, M.A., examined.

[Continued.]

6528. Suppose you have these subjects compulsory, and the managers were compelled to introduce one or more, as the Board should think necessary, while it was left to them to select that one or two to suit their own localities, so that you might have elementary science in one school, and in another part of the country Irish; would that be advantageous?—I think it would be advantageous.

6529. Mr. KETTLER.—Have you got the leaving certificate at all in your school?—Yes.

6530. Has it been found of any value?—Yes, but we have not had much experience of it. It was only

recently introduced. Personally I have not had any experience of it.

6531. Is it accepted by employers?—Yes. A suggestion I would make is that the teachers, instead of being dependent for their salaries on these varying reports given by inspectors, ought to have a personal salary, that part of their salary ought to be personal, depending upon the man's own efficiency and qualifications, and so on, as it is at present, and that the rest should be a school salary, which would depend more or less upon the character of the school, and that increments ought to be automatic and annual, in the absence of serious censure.

## FOURTEENTH DAY.—TUESDAY, APRIL 15TH, 1913.

At 23, Kildare-street, Dublin.

Present:—Sir SAMUEL DILL, M.A., LL.D., LL.B. (Chairman); The Most Rev. DENIS KELLY, D.D., Bishop of Ross; Sir HIRSH SHAW WILKINSON, LL.D.; Mr. JAMES CONNERY; Mr. HERBERT R. B. HARRISON, B.A.; Mr. JEREMIAH HEINLY; and Mr. THOMAS MICHAEL KETTLER, B.L.; and Mr. ARTHUR J. DONNELLY, M.A., B.Sc., Secretary.

Mr. JAMES JOSEPH HEINLY, M. A., ex-Chief Inspector, examined.

6527. The CHAIRMAN.—Might I ask you in what year did you retire?—My retirement dated from the 1st January this year.

6528. Up to that you had been chief inspector?—I was acting up to the 31st of December.

6529. How many years were you inspector?—I was appointed an inspector in June, 1876. That makes about 36½ years.

6530. You entered the service of the Board in 1876?—Yes.

6531. As a junior inspector?—I was appointed a district inspector in June, 1876. I was appointed senior inspector in 1890, and I was appointed chief inspector in 1904.

6532. So from 1876-1890 you were a district inspector and you became senior inspector in 1890 and chief inspector in 1904, and you were one of the first senior inspectors appointed under the new system?—Yes, I was in the first batch. There were 23 appointed, and I was one of them.

6533. So that you have no experience of the work of the chiefs of inspection under the old system?—No.

6534. You have no direct information to give as to that?—No.

6535. Or as to a transference of their duties?—No, except by hearsay.

6536. You know that the chief of inspection dealt with reports in the way the examiners do now?—Yes, I am aware of that.

6537. And the chief inspectors now have nothing to do with the reports?—Not in the first instance. Of course, they may be referred to them. Any special case may be referred to them for their opinion.

6538. A special case?—Yes.

6539. That is one that might involve a re-inspection?—Well, not exactly a re-inspection.

6540. Would you be consulted about a report?—Yes, we might be asked to read reports that the inspectors had sent in and express an opinion; but I was repeatedly told verbally by the Resident Commissioner that I was not to hold a re-inspection.

6541. Then you think that you have not the power to hold a re-inspection unless you are specially instructed?—Certainly I would think I had not.

6542. That you had not the power?—Not such an action of mine might be questioned.

6543. But you have a right as chief inspector at any time to visit any schools yourself?—At any time.

6544. In your province?—Yes, at any time.

6545. And have you done that frequently?—Frequently.

6546. Have you had any cases in which you have been instructed to re-inspect schools?—It was not put in that form, we were not told to re-inspect; but I am speaking from memory. I do not think (to the best of my recollection), that there was any case in which I was instructed to re-inspect or to hold another inspection. The wording of the instruction would be: "The matter is referred to the chief inspector for his opinion." I think that was the general form; but the words: "after perusal of the documents, and after conference with the manager and teacher," would sometimes be added.

6547. That is in the first instances?—In almost every instance I would say; but on the first occasion, or second occasion, I had a conversation prior to going out with the Resident Commissioner, and he explained to me that I was not to re-inspect the school; and he gave his reason for that. He said that under the old regime (I do not mean that those were the exact words, but this is what he conveyed to me), that under the old regime very often there was a protest against the inspector's judgment, and it was referred to the chief inspector, or perhaps the head inspector (there were head inspectors at that time), and the chief or head inspector in some cases reversed the junior inspector's opinion, and the Resident Commissioner believed that the junior inspector was perhaps as competent, or more competent, to form an opinion of the school, than the officer that was called in on appeal.

6548. More competent than the head inspector?—Or the chief inspector, and to a certain extent I agree with that.

6549. Then I understand the Resident Commissioner did not attach much value to the chief inspector's review of a junior inspector's work. You have put it in that way, that the Resident Commissioner implied that the junior officer was as competent as the senior. Is that what you meant?—That his opinion might be quite as correct, or more correct or reliable.

6550. That is what you meant?—That is so.

6551. What is the function of the chief inspector—one of his functions now under the circular that we have is to control the action of the inspector in his province?—Well, their journals—their diaries of work—are submitted to the chief inspector at the end of every week. He must see that the arrangement of the work has been satisfactory, and that they have spent an adequate amount of time at official work, and have spent a due amount of time at inspection of different kinds.

15th April, 1933.]

Mr. JAMES JOSEPH HYDER, M.A., examined.

[Continued.]

6552. You have not mentioned a subject that has occupied you very much, that is the manner of their marking?—We discussed that regularly at conferences.

6553. How many conferences, might I ask you, did you hold—were they regular, and every year?—Every year.

6554. How many?—I had 11 circuits under me, and I was chief inspector 8 years, so that would work out to 88 conferences.

6555. You held a conference in each circuit?—In each circuit, yes.

6556. That is with the three inspectors of that circuit, the senior and the two juniors?—Yes, except in the case of Derry, and in the case of Belfast. There are two senior inspectors living in each of those places, and so at the conferences there two senior inspectors and at least ten district or junior inspectors attended. Sometimes there might be quitted men working in circuits, and these men would come in and attend.

6557. One question at these conferences was the question of uniformity of marking?—Invariably.

6558. Did you ever summon together all the senior inspectors of your 11 districts?—Never.

6559. That is unknown?—That is unknown. Of course, they have been brought up to the office by the Commissioners.

6560. I know they were, once; but the chief inspector never did that?—No.

6561. You never called them together to a conference?—No; I would not have power to do that without special instructions. I would not consider that I had.

6562. You really think you had not power to do that?—If I thought it necessary to do it, and I wanted to do it, I would make special application for authority to do it.

6563. But with reference to the whole system of marking, if there were great complaints all over the country, would you not regard such conferences as of importance?—No, I would not, and I do not think it would be very advantageous. When a lot of men come together like that they talk so much, and the man that is the least satisfactory talks most, and says he does everything in the best way. Under the old system the inspectors used to be called in together by each head inspector, and I have a very distinct recollection of the useless way in which the conferences were carried on at that time; it meant nothing but talk and waste of time.

6564. You do not attach much importance to them if they are numerously attended, if they are more than three or six?—On a small scale I would favour them, but if they were numerous, it would be more trouble some. Whenever I went to a conference I had very elaborate notes, and I did not allow any branching off from the main issues. I would allow each man to express his opinion and discuss the matter adequately, but I would not let him draw me into side issues at all. I got through my work in the day. I was anxious to hear their opinions, but I was very anxious that they should hear my opinion too.

6565. You took some practical steps, I suppose, to secure such uniformity as is possible under these circumstances?—Oh yes, I had frequent opportunities of giving that. In some circuits I saw that the standard was rather low in some cases, and I always discussed the matter with the senior inspector afterwards.

6566. You did observe differences of standard in different circuits?—Yes—differences of opinion, and differences of standard between one man and another. That is simply unavoidable. If you hope to get uniformity among a large body of inspectors, you are hoping for what is impossible.

6567. Especially with the present system of having six merit marks. That fact makes it more difficult?—The employment of six merit marks adds to the difficulty. The system of awarding increments and promotions on such marks is an abominable one, I think.

6568. You do?—I do certainly. It is a most artificial thing, and it does a great deal of harm, particularly if it is applied by men not acquainted with the schools.

6569. Would you give that as your deliberate opinion?—Certainly, I give that as my deliberate opinion.

6570. And would you go so far as to say that it ought to be abolished?—I certainly would.

6571. I gather from what you said that you think it would be impossible for 76 men to deal with these merit marks with anything like uniformity. Do you ground your opinion on that?—Oh, that is one reason.

6572. And also, I suppose, because so much depends on whether a man gets one or other of these marks in certain years?—Oh, yes; the artificial arrangement now in the case of failed grade, in order that a man may get his increment, in that he must obtain one "good" and at least two "fair's" during the three years, and I think the "good" must be in the third year.

6573. We have that in evidence?—And he must have two "good's" in the first, and not a lower record than "fair" as well as I remember.

6574. And do you think that the internal system involves great hardship sometimes?—Very great hardship, particularly on inspectors. It puts the inspector in a position in which an Angel could not give satisfaction, and it sets the teacher and the inspector at logger-heads. They are set against one another, and the energy of the teacher then is expended in denouncing the inspectors and the office, and that is most injurious to the interests of education.

6575. I was going to ask you a question on this point, that the inspectors feel so strongly about the third year. We have had it here in evidence that some of them are inclined to be perhaps over-indulgent in that third year's marking?—I would say all of them are inclined to be indulgent, but some of them are inclined perhaps to be over-indulgent.

6576. That is in consequence of the effect of the marking in the third year?—Oh, no; we are getting into a different question altogether. The teachers are always talking about the critical year, and the third year. In a great number of schools with a staff of three or more teachers, every year is a critical year for perhaps some teacher of this staff. Speaking for myself, I never knew anything at all about that, or took into account the question of the increment or promotion of the teacher. I went in and I opened the school, I formed my estimate of it, taking no inkling as I could, but quite regardless of the fact that it might prevent a teacher from getting increment or promotion. I think the majority of the inspectors are in the same position. They do not bother about these things unless the teacher tells them, and the teacher very often calls the inspector's attention to it, and the inclination is to be sympathetic and lenient. I know that was always my tendency when a teacher spoke to me, and I believe it is the feeling of nine-tenths of the inspectors to lean to the side of mercy.

6577. Now, you were a district inspector for many years under the old system. Were you retained long in the same district?—In one district I was over 15 years; the first district I got.

6578. Under the present system, it is alleged that the inspectors are changed too frequently?—I quite think they are.

6579. You agree with that?—I do.

6580. Under the old system you retained the inspector long enough to make a thorough acquaintance with the schools and the teachers of the district?—Yes. I was for many years in one district, and one effect is that when an inspector has been in the same place for a considerable time, even a man who is not very observant, will learn a great deal about the history of the school, and will understand the disadvantages and advantages under which it labours. Another reason is that naturally a teacher is always suspicious of a strange inspector coming in. Of course, the first time an inspector comes he must be a stranger, but the abominable thing in this new arrangement is that it is nearly always a man with a strange face that comes to the teacher's school.

6581. Would you attribute a good deal of the present discontent to the frequent change of inspectors?—Certainly, I do.

6582. And would you rather have the old system?—When the new system was introduced there were

three inspectors sent to each circuit, a senior and two districts men, and the plan was that of rotation. Every year they went from one section to another, and we found that very bad, and when I got into the office then as chief inspector I discussed the question with Mr. Purser. We agreed that it was a very bad arrangement, and some attempt was made to get it altered. We had to be very cautious, because if we went too far we would be considered as trying to get back to the old style, so this concession in the present arrangement was made that each of the two junior members of the inspection staff of the circuit should remain permanently in their sections. They might remain up to seven years, or even longer, but the senior inspector has a small batch of schools of his own, and, in addition to that, he takes 20 per cent. of the schools of each of his colleagues, a different 20 per cent. every year, and in that way the senior inspector in five years goes all round the circuit. I do not see much advantage in that at all. I see great objections to it.

6588. And are the seniors not retained long enough to get a thorough knowledge?—The limit of time for a senior is the same.

6589. But as a matter of fact are the seniors changed frequently from one circuit to another?—Some of them remain a long time; but when a senior comes to a school at the end of the fifth year, he is a stranger to the teacher. The latter naturally distrusts all strangers, and thinks the inspector is a bit hard on him.

6590. Have they not to deal with changes of standard?—Yes; I had to deal with some of them.

6591. That is in Clonmel and Belfast; but I am not going into those cases for the moment. There is no official of the Board whose business it is to call attention to a sudden change of marking?—No.

6592. It is not part of the business of a chief inspector?—It is certainly not the business of a chief inspector, because he does not deal with the reports. They only come to him in exceptional cases where there is some irregularity or appeal by the manager or teacher, and then the next step would be to refer the matter perhaps to the senior inspector, or perhaps to the chief inspector, if it was considered a very grave case.

6593. There does not appear to be any officer of the National Board whose business it is to direct attention to any abrupt change of standard?—No, there is not, but it would arise in this way. When the record of a school is lowered or raised, the question always arises then whether the senior inspector has approved of it; if he has not been consulted previously by the junior, he is consulted then by the office about it, so that a mark will not be raised or lowered without the joint opinion of the two men, that is, the junior and the senior.

6594. Mr. HYNES.—But if the senior examines the school, and changes the mark, he has not to consult the other?—If he changes the standard he need not consult the other, but I think he invariably does. I know I would not think of changing the standard without consulting the inspector in permanent charge. I think it would be absurd.

6595. The CHAIRMAN.—Do you prefer the present mode of appointing inspectors to the old system under which you were appointed yourself?—I certainly do not. I think it is a most objectionable mode of appointment.

6596. Would you return to the examination system?—I would have both.

6597. They were formerly appointed by examination?—First of all they got a nomination. That implied, of course, that the Commissioners who nominated them had, of course, a previous interview with them, but that was not necessarily so. Nobody connected with the office had an interview with me up to the time I passed as inspector. They knew nothing at all about me; but, of course, I had to send in a medical certificate.

6598. That was in 1876?—Yes.

6599. Then you got your appointment by examination?—Certainly.

6600. At present they do not get the appointment by examination?—The present arrangement is very peculiar. The cart is put before the horse. That is what I object to. A lot of these men send in testimonials, the best of them being qualified by experience and college distinctions and so forth. These are invited to come in to an interview with the Commissioners, and previous to that they have to undergo a qualifying examination; but I do not know to what extent the examination affects the appointment. I do not think it affects it very much; but I think that the candidate ought to be interviewed first, that there should be a competitive examination afterwards, and that the man who scored best should be appointed.

6601. That is the system that you would have, an interview with the Commissioners, and a competitive examination?—Yes, and let the best man get the place.

6602. Is the present system of training a young inspector sufficient for the purpose?—I think it ought to be. When I compare it with the complete absence of any system of training when I joined, the system at present seems very satisfactory.

6603. It is better now?—Yes; they are kept twelve months on probation, going round with the senior inspector for the first six months. At the end of that time, if the report on their fitness is satisfactory, they are allowed to do independent work; but they are not permitted as full inspectors till the end of the year.

6604. They are with the senior inspectors all the time?—Yes, with selected inspectors. Of course, the senior inspector, if necessity arises, may contrast the training of a new man temporarily to one of his colleagues, a district inspector; but that would be an exception.

6605. Do you, looking back, regard the results system as superior to the present system?—Certainly not. As regards general education it could not be compared with the present system. The old system did not give education at all, to my mind.

6606. You say that you regard the education given under the present system as, on the whole, really superior to the old?—Well, I must modify that a little bit. The instruction in some branches was more effective before than it is now. The children nowadays do not spell as well as they did formerly; but I do not think that a great grievance, because the former method was absurd; we used to prepare them as if they were going in for one of those spelling competitions, spelling tests they called them, to spell words not in their vocabulary at all. Now they can spell very well words in the vocabulary that they have to use.

6607. You say the present system is superior in some respects?—It is more educational. More attention is paid to reading and articulation, and cultivation of intelligence, and of the sense of cleanliness and order, and all those things that come under that word that everybody is condemning, the "tone" of the school. No attention was paid to tone at all before. It was often referred to in the reports, but it did not affect the teachers' awards.

6608. Then you agree with the emphasis that the higher officials have laid on tone?—Certainly, I do.

6609. You entirely agree with that?—I quite agree with it, and I cannot understand anybody not agreeing with it.

6610. The BISHOP or BROS.—On the point on which you have been asked, you say that under the present system there is more education in the genuine sense of the word?—Yes.

6611. While under the old results system there was more instruction?—Yes, higher in some branches, for instance, geography and spelling.

6612. With regard to the observation about the cultivation of the intelligence of the children, which of the two systems was the more efficient in cultivating their intelligence?—The present system certainly; I have not a doubt about it, and one reason of that was that under the old results system the teachers did not seem to look to that end. The thing was to get the dead knowledge into the child, so that it could be pumped out by the inspector coming round as the results inspection, and very often it was forcibly driven into the children.

6608. And a good deal of that information was, in your opinion, dead knowledge. You said the child got dead knowledge?—I did not use the word in a depreciatory way, because that knowledge, although it is not to be compared with educational knowledge, is very important in its own way. It is of some importance, too, in cultivating the children's memory, and I think the memory should be cultivated just as well as any other faculty.

6609. Now, had the pressure put on the children to get that knowledge massed into their minds a deadening or stupefying effect in many cases?—I am afraid it had. I often went into a school where the teacher was teaching the children in the old-fashioned style, under fear, and the children were so goaded that their brains could not work. I have often seen that, and it would be no use to ask a question that would require intelligence that the children could not exercise.

6610. That process could not have any improving effect on the mind of the child?—It would improve the memory.

6611. But no other faculty would be improved?—No.

6612. Under the present system, as in your opinion that the children are brighter and happier and more intelligent?—Certainly; I have not a doubt about it.

6613. And that if you put them a question they will stand up to you and answer better?—Certainly; they are anxious to please, and they like to get an opportunity of showing the knowledge that they have.

6614. So that, as a system of training, and of rearing children, it is better. I don't know whether you would agree with me that in the case of the younger children in the schools especially it is really a question of rearing them?—Certainly.

6615. Bringing them up?—Yes.

6616. And that merely putting knowledge into their heads is not rearing them in any sense of the word?—It would be well if you could lead them gently on to knowledge.

6617. The present system, in your opinion, is a much better system of training and education in the sense of up-bringing?—Certainly; that is my conviction.

6618. Do you regard drill as very important in this up-bringing of the children?—I think it very important.

6619. You do?—I think it very important, because it is healthful. Of course, drill, like everything else, might be abused, but a proper system of drill is healthful and conducive to the order of the school, proper execution of the movements, and so forth.

6620. Do you regard a little singing as they move from one class to another as desirable?—I think it is most desirable.

6621. Do you think does it brighten them up?—Certainly; it is most humanising, and it helps the work of the school. I think that singing is essential in an elementary school.

6622. So that on the whole you are entirely in favour of the present system, that is, of its general effect on the mind and spirit of the nation, as against the old routine system?—Oh, yes; but I do not call the present system at all ideal. I am only contrasting the two systems. I consider the present system much superior.

6623. Did you find in your experience much desire on the part of the parents to have their children appointed monitors or mistresses in the schools?—Yes, formerly; but of late not so much. In the 'twenties, when I entered the service, the country was very poor and very miserable, and the wretched pliancy that a monitor would get was in those days looked upon as something important, and there was a desire on that account to get into the service. There were very few other openings with good employment for them; but gradually the country has been improving; we all see that, and I say that a revolution has taken place when I compare the present conditions with what I remember when I joined the service. The revolution that has been effected in the meantime would have appeared to many incredible, and I could not have believed it possible. The people are more comfortable, they are better clad, there is more money in

the country, and the little pitances that monitors would get is not now as tempting as it was in those days.

6624. Now, does the desire to get into the service as teachers through the doorway of becoming monitors continue?—Not among the male candidates; but I think amongst the women or girls there is nearly as much desire to be appointed mistresses as before, though not quite as much. I would not like to express any very decided opinion about that, because I have not looked into the matter very much.

6625. I was simply asking you your experience of a dame as you found it through the country?—My experience of that kind ceased years ago, and the chief inspector has nothing to do with the appointment of monitors.

6626. I am quite aware of that; but would you be surprised to hear that in the part of the country in which I live the competition is much keener than ever it was to get into the service of the National Board, both amongst boys and girls?—I would be somewhat surprised. I think there are not as many openings for young people in the way of business there as in other parts, say in Dublin, here, or Belfast, or Derry. That might account for it.

6627. And would you be surprised to hear that I got frequent complaints myself as a Bishop against both teachers and managers, because certain people did not succeed in being made monitors and mistresses?—I should not be very much surprised.

6628. Even last Sunday I had a complaint of that kind?—I should not be surprised.

6629. I think the figures show that except in the Church of Ireland Training College, the number of candidates is twice and three times the number that can be admitted?—Candidates for training?

6630. Yes?—It is largely in excess. I do not know the number.

6631. Those who pass the examination, and who are qualified are largely in excess of the number that can get in?—Yes.

6632. Both amongst males and females?—Well, amongst the males it is rather a tight fit at Marlborough Street. In fact, the number of applicants is so limited that the range of selection is very small. Some of the colleges only take candidates that have passed in the first division; but I think in Marlborough Street, and in the Church of Ireland College, they take candidates even in the third division.

6633. The number in the Church of Ireland Training College is small, but Marlborough Street caters principally for Presbyterians?—Oh, yes; but it has students of other Protestant denominations and Catholic students also.

6634. The number of Catholics is very small?—It is comparatively small. I do not know the exact number.

6635. Practically it is a Presbyterian College?—And there are Church of Ireland candidates there as well.

6636. Mr. HANCOCK.—You alluded to a change in the duties of chief inspectors. I understood that formerly they were in the office and had a very large amount of clerical duty. They acted as examiners of reports, did they not?—Yes, they did; they examined the reports, and made notations on them, and recommended the action to be taken.

6637. Do you think the change was a good one or otherwise?—From what point of view?

6638. It seems to me that it is employing very highly trained officials who would have a thorough knowledge of the schools and the work of inspection to do work that could be done by, at any rate, well trained clerks?—I do not know that it could be as well done, for those clerks deal with matters that they know only by hearsay; they could not have the practical acquaintance with the work that the inspectors had.

6639. Do I understand that under the present arrangement there is always one of the chief inspectors in the office at a time, to whom any reference can be

13th April, 1928.]

Mr. JAMES JOSEPH HYMES, M.A., examined.

[Continued.]

made where personal knowledge of the schools is necessary?—That is so.

6539. Is not that a better arrangement than confining these highly trained officers to purely clerical work?—There is a good deal to be said for and against, but the chief inspector has a great many other duties to perform in the office, and his time is very much taken up. His work is very engrossing, and in many cases the examiners do not refer to the chief inspector. Sometimes they refer the case, when the mischief has been done, and action has been taken that should not have been taken, and then it is sent to the chief inspector to patch up the mischief.

6540. Do you think that supposing all this clerical work that is now done by the examiners was done by the inspector, they would be able to detect these cases, and to prevent unnecessary friction?—Undoubtedly they should, and they would.

6541. You know that in England none of the officers of the Board of Education, or very few, have any practical knowledge of the schools?—But they are men of high University distinction, most of them, are they not?

6542. Quite so. My point is—does it require a man who has had a life-long training in outdoor work to do this clerical work in the office?—It is not exactly clerical work; it concerns the exercise of judgment, the value of the recommendations he may give, and the general supervision he may have; and then the chief inspector would be better able to appraise the difference between really essential things and things of minor importance.

6543. But I am supposing there is a highly trained clerk, a man with high education. I am supposing that?—That is a very big supposition.

6544. I thought your examiners were?—No; I must not be understood as saying a word against our present examiners. They are most excellent officers, but at present, at any rate, a considerable proportion of the clerical staff get in as "Abstractors" on very modest qualifications.

6545. But you would have no change in these people if you had the chief inspector in the office?—I do not understand.

6546. I mean to say the clerks would still be the same sort of people?—Oh, yes; but they would not be dealing with these cases.

6547-8. But the men who deal with these are the examiners, are they not?—Exactly. I maintain (at least it is my opinion, of course I am out of the service now), that if I were in the service, I should not like, from the selfish point of view, to go back to the old arrangement, because it would throw too much work on me.

6549. And if the chief inspectors do that work, they cannot exercise the same personal supervision out of doors, can they, over their colleagues?—At present they have very little time to look after their colleagues. They have too much routine work in the office.

6550. But formerly it was nearly all routine work, was it not?—Yes, formerly they were nearly always confined to the office.

6551. But, not to press the matter too far, you have no regret, on the whole, for the change in the duties of the chief inspectors—may I put it in that way?—You may; but I think the change was a bad one in this way. I think that if the chief inspectors had continued to deal with the reports, there would have been a good deal less of this discontent and this friction, because they would know exactly what they were dealing with, and they would be, I think, less rigid, and more sympathetic with the teacher. That is my idea; but on the other hand, I do not think that if I were chief inspector, I would like to have the reading of all these reports.

6552. The chief inspectors cannot both read all the reports and go about among their colleagues, can they?—Certainly not.

6553. It is impossible?—Yes, it is quite impossible; but then you speak of the examiners consulting with the chief inspector when occasion arises. The way

that is done is this. The examiner as a rule brings in a report to the chief inspector, and the chief inspector at the time is very busy with other work and he cannot give it the attention that it probably would deserve. By night, he should study that case very carefully. An off-hand opinion is not worth much, I think. If he were dealing with these cases himself, he would study them carefully and deliberately, and give a well-considered opinion, but when he is liable to be interrupted by an examiner coming in and asking him his opinion on such a case, the chances are that the opinion would not be a valuable one.

6554. It seems to me that what you would like would be this. You would like to have the examiners men who have had personal experience of the schools, and you would like to have chief inspectors who could also go about among their colleagues?—I do not say that I would like it at all, because it is not a matter of liking; but I think the better arrangement is to have these reports dealt with by men who have been in touch with the schools for many years and are experienced inspectors. The clerk's duties would be to look over the papers to see that there were no technical irregularities, and if there were any, to call the attention of the chief inspector to them, and with a little experience in training themselves they might suggest a noting on the file, which the chief inspector might adopt or decline to adopt, as he thought proper.

6555. Now, you said that re-inspection of a school is only made after reference to the Resident Commissioner?—Certainly. I think I might add that I said that there is no such thing as re-inspection.

6556. Perhaps we want to define re-inspection—a visit to a school arising out of any report?—That is not what I would understand by re-inspection, and when the Resident Commissioner spoke to me telling me that I was not to re-inspect a school, that was not what he had in his mind. He meant that I was not to go through a formal or systematic inspection, combining inspection and examination, and that is the way I understood it.

6557. But you considered that you were within your rights in again visiting any school as to which you had received a reference?—Yes, certainly; but even without a reference, I would consider that I had perfect liberty to go to any school.

6558. But if you had a reference about a school, would you consider that you had to refer to the Resident Commissioner before going to the school?—No, I would not. I might consult him about it; but I would not feel it at all obligatory on me to do so.

6559. The Chairman.—Do you think you had the right to visit a school if you had received a reference?—A perfect right, and if the matter were questioned I would be quite prepared to defend my opinion.

6560. Mr. HANCOCK.—There was a case that arose, I think in Gloucestershire, which was referred to the chief inspector. He appears to have gone to the school, and then to have pronounced his opinion, which I think reversed the verdict of one of his colleagues, and that was considered rather ultra vires by the Resident Commissioner. You remember the case?—I remember the case.

6561. Would you, in a similar case, have considered that you ought to go to that school without a reference?—I might or might not; but I consider that Mr. Pinner was quite within his rights in going.

6562. He was within his rights in going?—Certainly.

6563. There was no reason to understand that it was contrary to the wishes of the Resident Commissioner?—I do not think so.

6564. Now, you mentioned frequent changes in the district recently. Can you tell me what reasons there is for those changes?—Retirements and other causes.

6565. Have those changes been made for reasons for which the Board cannot be held accountable?—Certainly.

6566. They have not been in any sense exceptional?—Not at all, changes are avoided as much as possible.

6567. And the Board have avoided them as much as possible, and it is simply owing to circumstances that they have been unusually frequent of late?—The Board have really nothing to do with them. It is the chief



inspectors who recommend these changes, and their advice is nearly always adopted.

6684. It is the chief inspectors and not the Board?—I would not in any way put any responsibility for these changes on the Board.

6685. But if they delegate their powers, I suppose they are responsible?—If the chief inspectors think the change necessary, they draw up a scheme and submit it to the Resident Commissioner for his approval, and it is then adopted.

6686. The Resident Commissioner makes it his own?—Yes.

6687. And he acts for the Board, so that it comes to this, that it is the Board's act?—But it appears to me that you really think there is something systematic in these changes.

6688. I want to know whether they are from unavoidable causes or not?—I think we are at cross purposes. The change I was referring to were removals from one circuit to another. Under the present system there are changes in this way, that the senior inspector comes round each year and takes a fifth part.

6689. I understand that?—That is the change.

6690. It is not the changes in the circuits; but it is the change of district that you are alluding to?—Yes, that is so.

6691. You think that the present system, by which the senior inspector has a district, and there are two circuits in that district, is a bad one?—Yes. It is not as good as the former one; and with reference to that I was going to mention another reason for thinking so. At present inspectors coming into a school are very frequently different. That used to be quite the exception before; there would be the same inspector, perhaps, for seven years, and in my case for twelve years I was coming round and inspecting the same schools. Now the changes are much more frequent, and the worst of that is that if a district goes down, the responsibility cannot be attached to anybody in particular. It does away with the sense of responsibility.

6692. You would prefer some thing like the English system, where a man was in charge of a district, and there were divisional inspectors who had so many districts over which they exercised separate supervision?—I would prefer the old system that we had in this country—six head inspectors and ten district inspectors, each of them in charge of a district. The head inspector at that time had ten districts and ten inspectors under his charge, and going about from one to the other of these he had a very wide experience of the schools, and he had a very good knowledge of the different standards of the men, and by that means he was enabled to arrive at a proper and a reasonable judgment.

6693. I do not understand where your objection lies to the present system—is it to the circuit system?—To the circuit system.

6694. If you had a district system, would you not have rather to enlarge the number of districts?—There were sixty districts. A circuit under the present system contains somewhat more than two of the former districts.

6695. The CHAIRMAN.—There are twenty-two circuits now?—Twenty-two.

6696. And there were sixty districts under the old system?—Yes.

6697. Mr. HARRISON.—It is the circuit system works badly?—I do not approve of it, and a man who is responsible cannot see enough of his schools. The responsibility is divided, and strange inspectors come round to test; and the senior inspector is not in the same position as the old head inspector was to attain uniformity.

6698. Under the old system the senior inspector could not possibly visit all the schools once in the year?—Not at all; in fact, sometimes he did not visit some of his districts once in the year.

6699. Now, we have heard something about the enlarged curriculum, and that is entitled a certain amount of hardship upon the teachers. Have you anything to say on that head?—Yes, I think the programme is over-weighted.

6684. Would you indicate in what respect?—With too many subjects, and subjects that are not suited for every class of school.

6685. You are alluding to obligatory subjects?—Yes, I am referring to the obligatory subjects. They are all obligatory, more or less.

6686. But there are certain extra subjects?—Well, the extra subjects have to be taken up too.

6687. Can you specify any cases where hardship comes in?—I could, but I was going to remark that I think the programme is over-weighted. There are too many subjects, and too much is required in each subject; but it is specified and distinctly stated in the note prefixed to the programme that this is a minimum programme, and teachers and managers are invited to send in modified programmes.

6688. Can you tell us of any cases of hardship that have come under your personal knowledge?—I could, but I would not like at present to mention names.

6689. You could give us a typical case?—Certainly; but I was going to mention that in some cases, not many, modified programmes have been sent in when managers and teachers found that too much was expected from them, and in a good many cases (I would hardly like to estimate the number), these modified programmes have been adopted.

6690. In what subjects generally?—I would say in science. Science is a most important subject and I think it is most desirable to have it taught in suitable schools, but it is a very absurd thing to take up in a school where the attendance is extremely irregular, and the home influences are bad.

6691. And where the teacher has not been specially trained in science. But can you tell us has any pressure been put upon teachers to take science where it should not be taken?—I think so. In many cases they take it without direct pressure as the part of any official, because they think the school will lose prestige if they do not teach that particular subject.

6692. But you do not think that there has been any undue pressure on the part of the inspectors?—I cannot recall any.

6693. It has been want of judgment on the part of teachers who have enlarged their curriculum unduly?—No, the fault was that they did not send in a modified programme, that they did not propose to have the curriculum reduced as they were at liberty to do.

6694. But they do not require any permission to leave science out?—They do.

6695. Do they?—If a school is equipped, and the teacher has been trained in science, science must be taught, and in them schools (I call them slum schools, I think you will understand what I mean by that) the children attending there are of the poorest class, they live in tenement houses and have no opportunity for study at home, any time they do not spend in school is spent on the streets, and they attend very irregularly. It seems very absurd to be teaching these children science, yet, in a good many cases, it is being done. In Bolton lately I was trying to get a teacher to send in a modified programme. There is one school I have in my mind's eye at present. It was attended largely by half-timers, attending a mill one day and school the next day. I spoke to the teacher and found that he was teaching science on an elaborate programme, and I said: "Why do you not send in a modified programme?" At first he felt inclined to do it, and then afterwards he said he would rather not, and he thought I would take some action in the matter. It is a tremendous pressure on the children, and then he said: "In Mr. so and so's school further down it is taught, and my children would go away from my school to his" (a better class school) "if I gave up teaching science."

6696. That shows that a certain number of parents appreciate the instruction?—That was only an exception, it did not actually occur.

6697. Well, in country schools no science is taught?—Science is taught in country schools certainly.

6698. Would it include nature study?—In schools that are not equipped, and in which no member of the staff has received a training in science, nature study will be taken as a substitute for science.

15th April, 1913.]

Mr. JAMES JOSEPH HENN, M.A., examined.

[Continued.]

6998. Is it your opinion that generally the number of hours allotted to reading, writing, and arithmetic, is very low in most of the schools?—I do not think so.

6999. What would be the time given to arithmetic as a rule in the country schools of Ireland?—Very often half an hour a day, sometimes an hour a day.

7000. An hour a day would be five hours a week?—Five hours a week.

7001. It would be a quarter of the whole time given to secular instruction, roughly?—Yes.

7002. Is that in your opinion too much?—I think it is too much. It all depends on the teacher. From one point of view it is too much, the relative value of the subject.

7003. And the relative value of reading would be as high, would it not, as of arithmetic?—Yes.

7004. Then, if you give the same time to arithmetic, the reading and arithmetic will take up half the time given to secular instruction, will they not?—Yes; but, as I said, in many cases in the schools they give half-an-hour, and in some they give an hour. I say this with great hesitation, because I have not made any investigation into the matter; but I believe that in the majority of cases half-an-hour a day would be the maximum.

7005. I have been looking at a great many time-tables, and I have seen a very large number of them with five hours a week to arithmetic?—That is very absurd.

7006. It seems to be quite a common thing?—Yes.

7007. I think history and geography are taught in some of the schools?—Yes, a little.

7008. Only a modicum?—Yes.

7009. How much time is given to drill?—In some cases, I should say, half-an-hour a week, and in some cases two half-hours a week.

7010. Is half-an-hour enough?—It depends on the teacher. It depends on the work they have. If they are alert and go through exercises smartly, half-an-hour is a great deal. Drill is one of those subjects that should be going on all day. There is drill in the way that the child sits at his desk, stands on the floor, or moves from the desk.

7011. Is it in your experience usual to devote a few minutes sometimes at the change of lessons to drill?—It is, but I do not approve of it very much. I think in some schools they went in for five minutes' drill every day in the week, and I don't think that was any use at all. The drill that could be done in five minutes is not worth talking about.

7012. With reference to these observations about the Clonmel case, I want to ask you one or two questions. That case was referred to you?—It was.

7013. And you make a report upon it?—Certainly.

7014. And would you tell me what was your estimate of the perforce senior inspector in that district?—My estimate based on what?

7015. On his standard. What was the standard of the previous senior inspector?—I would not like to express an opinion on that. I think I went into about 25 or 24 of the schools. That would not be sufficient to base an opinion on, the previous report had not been made by the senior inspector in every case; but I think if you get my report, and if you take the trouble to read it, you will see exactly what I think about it, because it gives the particulars in full of the good and bad.

7016. Then you are quite satisfied with Mr. Welby's standard?—We differ in some details. In some cases his rating was more favourable than mine; but I could hardly make the contrast, because in some cases long intervals of time intervened.

7017. But you had a fair opportunity of forming a judgment?—Yes.

7018. And the judgments of both of you very nearly coincided, did they not?—Yes; I stated that in my report, that his estimate fairly corresponded with mine.

7019. I suppose that the real fact was that Mr. Welby applied his standard on going to the new district a little too suddenly?—Yes, I think so.

7020. It was a little want of judgment on his part, was it not?—Well, I should say so. It is a thing I would not have done myself. If I found a school back-

ward, and I thought it was owing to the easy-going ways of any predecessor, I would warn the teacher and put a warning in the book; and if I did not see that they were inclined to respond to my suggestions next year, then I might recommend action.

7021. Now, can you account for the rather numerous cases of irregularities found by Mr. Welby as matters of book-keeping and registration in the district?—It shows that Mr. Welby is very keen and alert about these matters, and that some easy-going men had not paid attention to that. Some inspectors are under the impression that under the new system, there is no falsification going on. That is a mistake. There is any amount of inducement to falsify.

7022. Have you ever had a number of cases in the same district with anything like this in a given time?—I do not think so.

7023. It is most unusual?—Oh, it is unusual.

7024. To have so many cases?—The peculiarity here was that after a long period during which no cases occurred, then a number of cases cropped up when Mr. Welby appeared on the scene. It shows Mr. Welby was very alert and vigilant.

7025. Does it not also show that there was rather a low tone or morality in that district with so many cases? How many cases altogether?—I do not remember the figures.

7026. I think there are about 108?—About 10 cases out of between 250 and 300 schools?

7027. Mr. HENRY.—392 schools?—That would not indicate that matters were so very bad.

7028. Mr. HANNAH.—But those were the only cases that were discovered. He would not have visited 360 schools in the time?—To give you an answer on that point, I would want to know how many schools he had examined, and in how many of those he found the accounts correct.

7029. But it is a large proportion?—It is a large proportion.

7030. Mr. COWLEY.—Do you know anything of the particulars of those cases?—No, I do not know anything of those cases.

7031. Mr. HANNAH.—Were there any complaints of Mr. Welby's verdict in those cases?—Not that I know of; but that was not my division. It was during the interregnum, after my colleague, Mr. Punter resigned, that I went down there.

7032. But did you not know that there was any dispute of those cases at all?—I do not.

7033. Would you kindly tell us what sort of cases those would be?—Various kinds, probably sending of marks, changing of figures.

7034. That would be in registration?—Yes.

7035. You spoke of falsification of accounts?—When we speak of falsification, we mean falsification of the Roll Book or the Report Book, or the Register. If there is any inducement to a dishonest teacher to make the average appear larger than it is, there are different ways of doing that. In some cases the teacher would not mark the attendance present till the end of the day, and he would take his chance of the inspector not coming.

7036. This falsification of accounts then means falsification in the registration?—In the registration. You understand the Register in a different sense from what we do. Your accounts are quite different from ours. We call registration entering a child in the registry, but in the roll book the daily attendance is marked.

7037. Well, in the attendance book?—Yes, in the attendance books. The roll book and the report book refer mainly to attendance, and it is in those books that there is a temptation to falsify the entries.

7038. And I may take it, I suppose, that under the present rules of the Board, there is a very great temptation put in the teacher's way?—There is.

7039. A temptation to increase the number on his roll?—Certainly. A certain average is required for the appointment of a junior assistant mistress, a monitor. For second class salary and first class salary, and if the teacher has not that, even if he is qualified in other ways, and he has not the number, there is a great temptation to raise the number fictitiously.

7040. Can you tell me why it was that since complaints about Mr. Welby were so long delayed?—I do not know.

18th April, 1918.]

MR. JAMES JOSEPH HYNES, M.A., examined.

[Continued.]

6742. And then that they were apparently all forwarded in one batch?—By the teachers?

6743. In my opinion they mainly followed the lead of the Belfast teachers. The Belfast teachers are a very business-like, practical sort of people, and they do not go in so much for education as for money making. That is what they think of, and they did very well under the results system. They managed to drive the knowledge into the children, and the children did well at the examinations; but when the new system came in, they were not quite so well suited for that. A lot of them, I am not speaking of them as a body, a lot of them are excellent men, most gifted and most earnest, and most sympathetic with their children, but these are not the men that got up the agitation. It was men that were not skilful teachers, that were not very apt at the new subjects, or the new system and methods, and got lower records—these are the men that set the agitation going, and the others chimed in, and I was very much disgusted with them, because they misrepresented the inspectors in the grossest way. Indeed, listening to their statements, and reading their letters, one would imagine that the inspectors were most evil-disposed persons, trying to injure the teachers on every occasion.

6744. Without going very fully into the Belfast case, you say your view is that the Clonsilla teachers were following the lead of the Belfast teachers, and that on that account they waited till they had got a certain number of cases—they talked up old cases, some more than a year old, before the complaint to the office, and when the cases were altogether too old to be dealt with?

—Yes, and when the Belfast application was made first I mentioned that, and I said that the scope of the inquiry should be limited, that we should be given a limited number of cases (I think I said about 20), and that they should be within a comparatively recent time; but the teachers would not do that, they would not take on themselves the onus of selecting those cases, and they sent up, I think, 330 cases.

6745. I am not asking about Belfast, but about Clonsilla, and the complaints made about Mr. Wexley. Those complaints ranged over somewhere about two years, did they not?—Probably. I do not remember exactly.

6746. Now, among the complaints made about Mr. Wexley were some about his manners and his conduct in school. Have you anything to say about that?—I do not believe that Mr. Wexley was disconcerted. I know Mr. Wexley very well, and he is a perfect gentleman. He is a most considerate man, and would not be harsh to anybody.

6747. Did it come within your functions to investigate any of these charges personally?—Well, in one case.

6748. What was the result of that case?—It was not exactly a charge.

6749. Well, a complaint, we will say?—I do not think I investigated any case—well, perhaps, the case of Mr. Keegan, I think the name of the school was Rosegreen. He complained of something in Mr. Wexley's manner, and I think Mr. Wexley made the same complaint to Mr. Keegan's manner. They both referred to each other's manner.

6750. But from your knowledge of Mr. Wexley, you believe him quite incapable of having acted in the way in which he is reported to have acted?—I do, except that I think he may have been a bit hasty. He was going away on some other very important business, and he was pressed for time, and possibly he was a little bit sharp in his manner.

6751. But none of these cases were, as far as you can remember, personally investigated by yourself?—That was the only case that I can remember on the spur of the moment; but you seemed to have my report there before you.

6752. But in that case you was not enabled to arrive at any very definite conclusion?—Well, I did not consider any other cases outside those mentioned in my report.

6753. Mr. Corbett.—You told us that the present system is superior to the results system?—Taking it all round, it is.

6754. That is, it is not a case where there is a certain fee for each child passing the examination?—Yes.

6755. The present system is superior?—The present system is superior, I think.

6756. But you qualified that statement of your appreciation of the present system by saying that you were not satisfied with it. Is that so?—Certainly.

6757. You do not think it is a perfect system?—No. As I said, the programme is over-weighted. The schools, too, should be classified. There are serious difficulties in the way, but they should be graded for programme purposes. A school in a slum should not have the same curriculum as a school in a well-to-do part of the city.

6758. You say the programme is over-weighted?—Yes; but remember that in the note prefixed to the programme, the teachers are told that it is a maximum programme, and that modified programmes will be accepted.

6759. Well, from one circumstance or another, these modified programmes have not been perhaps proposed to the extent that they might?—Quite so.

6760. And the teacher and pupils at the present time have these hours of school life spread over a number of subjects?—Yes.

6761. They are stinging and drill, and these are very desirable subjects in the school?—Very desirable.

6762. So is science a proper subject to be taught?—Under proper conditions.

6763. And cookery and hygiene?—Yes.

6764. They are all desirable subjects?—Very desirable.

6765. With the teaching of these, must there not be a loss in what are called the essential subjects of primary education, such as arithmetic?—Certainly.

6766. Spelling?—The time for these subjects would be encroached on.

6767. Has the time been encroached on?—It must have been.

6768. Do you think that there is a gain in one direction and a substantial loss in another?—There has been a loss, but the gain has been much more substantial than the loss.

6769. You say they have gained in cleanliness and tidiness and brightness. Are there not other circumstances beside the education given at the school, making for improvement in the country under these heads?—Certainly, but I think that the school has a great deal to do with it too.

6770. There has been a deterioration under the heads of arithmetic and spelling?—Yes, in practical arithmetic, and in spelling words outside their ordinary vocabulary. I must make a distinction there. They cannot spell these very difficult words that they used to learn before such as "apocrypha." They would make a poor attempt at those at all now, and I think it is no great loss, but the gross blunders that ordinarily occur in spelling and writing are in writing "the" for "they," and they do not make these mistakes to the same extent.

6771. Am I to take it from you that in ordinary spelling for composition or in exercises of dictation, apart from these very unusual words, the spelling has improved?—I would not say it has greatly improved; I am inclined to think that the spelling of words in their own vocabulary is better now than it was formerly, or it is as good now, but certainly they are not as expert in spelling unusual words now as they were before.

6772. While you have perhaps made the children a little readier to speak?—And to think.

6773. And perhaps to think?—Yes, you could not get them to speak unless they think.

6774. Has there not been a marked deterioration in memory cultivation?—I am afraid there has.

6775. Do you not think that is a very sad loss?—A decided loss. I think the memory should be cultivated just as much as any other faculty, and the earlier you begin with a child the better.

6776. Now you said to Mr. Harrison, I think, that the examiner sometimes brought to the chief inspector the papers for consultation?—He might or he might not.

6777. The examiner was not bound to do that?—No, the examiner was not bound to do it.

6778. And as a matter of fact you had no responsibility at all for those cases?—Not the least.

6779. You talked about the Belfast schools, and the agitation got up in Belfast?—Yes.

6780. And you have stated this morning that the present system of marking the schools is abominable and artificial?—Yes.

6781. Now, in view of your own evidence, do you not think that would give good grounds for agitation and discontent on the part of the teachers?—Certainly, but there is no reason on that account why they should fasten on the inspectors and find them for their manners and their conduct.

6782. I am glad to hear that?—I have scores of anonymous letters of the vilest kind in my possession. Letters addressed to me and to the Resident Commissioner, of the vilest kind, all emanating from Belfast when this conspiracy was going on. Of course, the aim was to intimidate the inspectors. It would be a very bad thing for the country and for the public if the inspectors were intimidated. It is very important to have an independent and courageous body of inspectors.

6783. So that while you held that opinion, and while you deprecate and condemn this agitation or any agitation against the inspector carried on in an improper way (and so would I), still you say the agitation against the system would be justified?—Yes.

6784. And that they had good reason to complain against the system of marking their schools?—Yes, but the inspectors were not in any way accountable for this system of marking. It is not the system of marking, but the way of applying the marking afterwards to the salaries and increments of the teachers that is in fault.

6785. You told us that the Resident Commissioner at all times seemed to regard the re-inspection of a school by the chief inspector as undesirable?—Yes.

6786a. And they looked with disfavor on the charging of a mark as he thought the junior inspector might be as capable of judging any school as the senior was?—Well, I did not put it exactly in that way, but I said that cases had occurred. He referred to cases under the old system, and indeed under the new, in which an appeal had been referred to the superior officers, the chief inspector or the senior inspector, and in which the original judgment was reversed, and his idea was that it was just as likely that the judgment of the first officer was right, as that of the second officer.

6786b. Was any appeal case ever sent to you?—Numbers of them were.

6787. I mean an appeal case where the teacher appealed against the merit mark assigned by the local inspector, for we had it from Mr. Downing that, in his experience, he never got an appeal case, and we had it from Mr. Purser, that in his experience he never got an appeal case. Apart from the Glenside and Belfast cases were appeal cases referred to you by the Resident Commissioner, that is, appeals against the merit marks of the inspectors?—Oh, yes, repeatedly. I think Mr. Downing was mistaken about that, because certainly he had appeals to deal with too. In fact I have good reason to know that he had.

6787. You had appeal cases?—Certainly.

6788. Where the manager appealed against the merit mark of the local inspector?—The manager or the teacher.

6789. Appealed to the Board?—Yes.

6790. And the appeal was sent to you for investigation as chief inspector?—Yes, for my opinion.

6791. And did you re-examine the school?—I visited the school. I did not re-examine, and I did not go through a formal re-inspection. I mentioned to you before that I got verbal instructions not to do that, but I spent what I considered a sufficient time in that school observing the teachers' methods. I put such

questions as I deemed necessary to any classes in the subject they were learning at the time, without any interference with the time table at all. Then I carefully looked over the written work and the drawing, and all that, and formed an opinion in that way.

6792. Now this was quite the thing from the Belfast appeals or the Tipperary appeal?—Oh, quite distinct, nothing unusual.

6793. Had you a good many of those cases?—A great many.

6794. About how many?—There might have been hundreds in eight years?—Oh, well, it would not be hundreds, perhaps somewhere about 50 to 100.

6795. Did you ever know the merit mark of a teacher to be changed on those re-inspections?—Certainly. Now I have one case in my mind, a case up in Belfast. The teacher was for a long time trying to get into the first of first class, but the inspectors, keeping to the regulations, raised an objection. The matter was referred to me, and he got his promotion. The objection in his case was that he was an untrained teacher, and therefore was not eligible for first class.

6796. That would not be an appeal. I am referring now to appeals from the merit marks?—Oh, yes, a great many cases of that kind came to me.

6797. And did you know the merit mark ever to be changed?—Certainly.

6798. Mr. Hume. Was the old merit mark cancelled as a result of that change?—A new minute, as well as I remember, was sent out embodying the changed mark.

6799. Did that cancel the old one?—Certainly, and the teacher got the benefit of the more recent mark in the matter of increment and promotion.

6800. Mr. Conroy. Was your large experience as a practical educationalist availed of in any way in the drafting of this revised programme?—No, that revised programme was drawn up before I was appointed to the office of chief inspector.

6801. We had it from Mr. Downing and Mr. Purser, that in the preparation of your annual reports for the Blue Book the chief inspectors were not to form a judgment or express a judgment on the schools contrary to the new education policy. Did that apply in your case also?—It was before my time, but I have heard that was the case.

6802. That it was on the successes they were to report, and not on any shortcomings?—It was not exactly put that way, but really that is what it would convey, I believe.

6803. We have had complaints from Mr. Purser and Mr. Downing of what, to put it mildly, may be regarded as an unjustifiable and irritating exercise of power over the chiefs of inspection. Have you had any similar experience?—No. I have not had any experience of that kind.

6804. No experience of irritation or aggressiveness on the part of the Resident Commissioner if you had a different view?—Oh, no, I am in the habit of expressing my view whether people like it or not; I very often gave the Resident Commissioner my view, and if it did not tally with his own he was sometimes a little sharp, and one morning he said that I seemed to make a point of contradicting everything he said.

6805. Some members of the Committee seem to think that the visits of the Resident Commissioner to schools, as a sort of superior inspector, must have had a disturbing influence on the free discharge of his duty by the inspector?—There is not a doubt about it.

6806. And you think the visits of the Resident Commissioner have had a disturbing influence?—A disturbing influence.

6807. On the exercise of his free judgment by the local inspector?—Yes. Looking back at it, now that I can see the thing clearly, I would say so. At first I thought that the visits of the Resident Commissioner to the schools were very advantageous, giving him an insight into the work, and I thought they might make the easy-going inspector smarten up a little.

but now, looking back, I find that it is very bad. There are some men who, when they have come to a fair judgment, are not sufficient confidence in their judgment, and are not self-reliant enough, and if they heard that the Resident Commissioner said that a certain school had been under-marked or over-marked by them, would not have the moral courage to keep to their own judgment, which, perhaps, would be right; and there are a lot of nervous men in that way who mistrust their judgment when a person in superior position challenges it. For a good while back I thought these visits were very objectionable, and I let the Resident Commissioner see that. I objected to them in many ways. I objected in the first place utterly to being withdrawn from my pressing work going round on these excursions which were not altogether educational, and when I would come back I would find a pile of papers awaiting me. And then our visit was so brief that it was only tantalising. Many of the schools I had never been in before, and I would want to spend a couple of hours there to see what they were really worth, instead of carrying away an impression made in such a hurried form as that. Then I had to speak to the inspectors at conferences with reference to these visits, that the Resident Commissioner considered such a school over-marked, and another school under-marked, and whenever I could (nearly in every case) I went round, and formed my own opinion of these schools. I am now referring to cases in which the Resident Commissioner went round without me; in a good many cases the Resident Commissioner was right, but in a great many cases he was wrong, and formed a hasty conclusion. If you go into a good school, a really very good school, there can be no difference of opinion at all about it, but when there were two schools in the same place—one a boys' school and the other a girls' school—both very good, the girls' school always seems to a casual visitor the better. They have a nicer manner, and are more orderly and more agreeable, and in some cases the Resident Commissioner was taken in by that, and when I went round and stopped a good while in the school, I saw that in some of these very nice girls' schools there was no depth in the teaching, the intelligence was not developed, and it was all superficial, whereas in the boys' schools it was a little bit rougher, but their brains were being developed, and real educational work was being done there.

6808. Do you not think that an average inspector of some years' experience would be a more competent judge of the work done in a school than the Resident Commissioner?—Yes, but it is a very good thing to see a thing with new eyes. Many defects will escape the attention of a teacher who is always in his own school, and will escape the attention of an inspector that has been inspecting the same school for a long time. His eye will get accustomed to some defects that he sees year after year. He has got accustomed to them, but a fresh eye, as in the case of the Resident Commissioner, coming round would note some things at once. Those visits were useful in a good many ways, no doubt, but as disturbing the judgment of the inspectors and causing friction between the inspectors and the teachers, I would say that these visits are most pernicious.

6809. I think the visits of the Resident Commissioner to make himself acquainted with the schools are desirable in a general way?—Yes.

6810. But he should not pronounce any judgment?—I do not think he should, and that was too much the case in spending a fortnight or three weeks in the year in that way, while there were important duties in the office requiring his attention, and he takes away the secretary, too, though the secretary has important duties to do in the office. The Resident Commissioner takes him away to inspect schools. Now that is not his business. That is not what he is paid for.

6811. Did the former Resident Commissioner make any tours of that kind?—Sir Patrick Keenan frequently visited schools, but it was done during his vacation. Sir Patrick Keenan was very encouraging to everybody in the school—to the managers, the teachers, and the pupils.

6812. What is meant by a check examination?—There is no such thing now. Under the results system there was. It was an examination by a head inspector in all prescribed subjects of every pupil who had attended 100 days, and was intended as a check of the standard and thoroughness of the district inspector.

6813. The expression is used in a letter that we had before us from Dr. Starke to Mr. Parker. Were any orders to your knowledge issued at any time by Dr. Starke in relation to these so-called check examinations?—Do you mean written instructions or oral instructions?

6814. Well, I call them orders?—I do not know of any.

6815. It was stated in the letter that he had issued orders that the chief inspectors were not to hold check examinations?—They must have been oral orders, and I do not think the expression seems correct there. The reference there is to such oral instructions as Dr. Starke gave to me, telling me that I was not to hold a re-inspection. That is what was referred to probably as check examinations.

6816. But he never used such an expression to you as far as you remember; he never ordered you not to hold a check examination?—He never ordered me except as far as I say, that when I was going down about a particular case; he said, "You are not to hold a re-inspection." In fact the word "Examination" was very little used since the new system was introduced; it was telephoned, and the word used was "Inspection."

6817. I have been reading through your report with regard to the Cannel circuit, and having had experience of the good and bad which you always brought to the discharge of your duty, I think, reading between the lines of that report, that you were not satisfied that you had a proper opportunity of thoroughly investigating the Cannel schools?—Certainly not. My time was limited by circumstances, and I had my own division to attend to, and these were practically flying visits, and I gave my opinion with a great deal of reserve.

6818. I notice that you did not say in that report that you agreed with Mr. Welby, but that he was in fair accordance with his chief inspector?—When I said that he was in fair accordance, I meant to convey that my investigation was not as complete as I would like.

6819. But as the issue was very important, and the cases were so very important, why did you not take time enough to make it complete?—I took a good deal of time at it. I must have been over a fortnight visiting these schools.

6820. You say in your report that your visits were necessarily brief, and that you were not satisfied?—Yes.

6821. So that you were not satisfied that you had sufficient time to enable you to form a proper judgment of these schools?—I would not say that, because probably my judgment was quite proper and quite correct, but I did not say it with as much confidence as if I had spent twice as long in the school. And then another reason for my hesitating to set my view against Mr. Welby's was this—I was coming in as a sort of casual visitor without previous experience of the schools, and he had visited them frequently, and on that account would be in a much better position to form an accurate judgment than I would.

6822. There were some references in this report to delay on the part of the teachers in making their complaints in the first instance?—Yes.

6823. As a matter of fact, it is quite clear from some of the cases here that they had appealed before that, and that the appeal had been disregarded?—I have no knowledge of that.

6824. It appears in one of the cases. The papers were referred to Mr. Welby in June. How is it that he was allowed to retain those papers till the 25th of August?—You must remember that the July examinations came off in the meantime, and I think Mr. Welby was employed conducting some of those examinations, and marking the papers. The marking of the papers in the Easter and July examinations is regarded as of paramount importance. Everything else must be set aside for it.

6825. The July examinations?—The Training College examinations.

6826. Have you noticed that with regard to these schools in the Cleland circuit, your mark differs in 46 per cent. of the cases from Mr. Walpy's?—No. Of course, I gave my opinion.

6827. But you differ in 46 per cent. of the cases?—Do I? I did not calculate it; I do not know that. But do I differ materially?

6828. Forty-six per cent. is the extent of the difference at any rate?—But the differences might have been very trifling.

6829. "Weak fair" or "weak good" is not an official term at all?—It is not.

6830. And you differ in 46 per cent. of the cases, and when Mr. Purser and you inspected 12 cases in the Belfast circuit you examined and inspected them on the same day?—Yes, a joint inspection, a joint examination.

6831. And I think your mark differs there in 46 per cent. of the cases?—From Mr. Purser?

6832. Yes?—Quite naturally.

6833. The point I want to make is that it is impossible to have perfect agreement?—Impossible and undesirable.

6834. Why undesirable?—Because it reduces these people to mere machines, and makes their work mechanical. What I object to is making the increment of salary depend on these little points. That is what I object to. Here in Ireland the inspectors and the teachers are pitted against each other. In England it is quite the other way. They are not brought into contact at all.

6835. Mr. HARRISON.—We have had it in our time?—You had in a very small way. I saw a lot of the English system sixteen years ago. I visited English Training Colleges and schools, and I saw a great deal of them, and of the Scotch too.

6836. Mr. COFFEY.—Do you believe that the only real test of a school is examination?—No, I do not. We had that under the results system.

6837. Do you believe that examination is necessary properly to appraise the work done in the school?—I do, examination and inspection are both necessary.

6838. I am quite there with you?—We had examination pure and simple in the results system, and it was very unsatisfactory to say the least.

6839. Of course, that was where it came to the payment for the individual pass, but you think that pass examination was desirable?—I think it would be very desirable, but under the present system it is left entirely to the discretion of the inspector to examine as much or as little as he likes.

6840. But is it not possible for a senior inspector to go into a school, and lower the mark in the school without examining any class or any pupils?—It is a thing he could not do.

6841. But is it possible under the letter of the instructions in the late circular of June, 1911?—I do not know whether it may be possible, but I do not think it would be assessable on the part of the senior inspector to do it. He might raise the mark; I would not object to that so much; he might miss it without examination, but he certainly ought not to lower it. I might object to his raising it, but I would not object so much to his raising it as to his lowering it.

6842. Do you not think that a capable circuit inspector going into a school and putting half a dozen rounds of questions to a class would be able to see whether the teacher had done his duty fairly?—In one particular subject?

6843. In each class, a class for reading, a class for geography, a class for analysis, without taking account of the individual mark of an individual child, would he not be able to see whether the class had been properly taught?—Certainly he should.

6844. By a half dozen questions?—In the case of reading it is a different matter.

6845. But I am taking it that he would ask questions on the subject matter of the reading?—Yes, if he adopted a proper method, he ought to be able in that way to form a very accurate opinion.

6846. And you think it inadmissible that liberty is given to lower the mark without examining any class?

—Yes. When I want to form an opinion of the reading in a school, I do not think it is necessary to examine every class in the school. I generally prefer to take one of the senior classes, and then I always ask the teacher, "Now get the children to read, and you may select any lesson you like." And I say, "Now let us begin with the best reader, if there is any better than the others;" after that I would take the next best, and when the teacher has gone through all these, I would then get to the others, the bad ones, and see for myself what kind they are.

6847. Do you think that with a well-versed programme the children in the primary schools of Ireland between five and sixteen years of age should be able to get all the education to which they are reasonably entitled?—Certainly.

6848. But at the present time you think that they are not getting that owing to an overloading of the programme?—Owing to that and other reasons.

6849. What are the other reasons?—There are several other reasons. They do not attend regularly; the school-houses are bad and unhealthy in some places, and all these things are operating against the schools.

6850. We have to put up with bad buildings for some time, and I suppose we have to put up with bad attendance for some time, but I think there is one thing that could be more readily amended, and that is providing a sensible programme. Do you think that the present programme leaves enough time for the essential subjects?—But I say the programme is a maximum programme, and as a maximum programme it is very good, and if the teachers and managers select for each school and locality the subjects and the amount in each subject that each school can tackle satisfactorily, I think the thing would work very well; but they do not do that, they make a pretence of teaching all this programme, and waste a lot of the children's time, and there are no satisfactory results from them.

6851. Might I put this supplementary question: do you think that a programme confined to reading, writing, arithmetic, grammar, geography, and an agricultural text-book, if it is suitable, ought to be adopted by the National Board?—It might or might not, but I am inclined to think that it would not, because I myself would not agree with that programme that you have selected. Here in Dublin and in Belfast in several convent schools, and other schools where there are half-timers, they have a limited programme in some cases, and singing by ear is only required, and the theory of music as well as history is eliminated as well as my memory serves me.

6852. What do you think of the dropping of the text-book on agriculture from the National Schools?—The reading of agriculture is not of much use at all. First of all there should be a practical illustration, and if the teacher does not examine judiciously, even that loses all its value.

6853. Well, was not the revised programme intended to make the schools more practical; was not that the idea? I certainly think they ought not to throw ridicule on the reading of agriculture, for a good deal of agricultural teaching can be put into it?—I thought it was a very great loss to the country to drop it. But you think that there was a good deal of benefit from the mere reading?

6854. I do.—I quite agree with you, but it depended on the teacher, and in some schools and with some teachers it was not of any value at all.

6855. Although it might not be much to the young boys at school at the time to read about drainage or about the rotation of crops or about weeds or manure, would it not be bound to come back in practical life to this boy as a man?—Certainly. I made that remark recently to the Resident Commissioner, and I said that the only agriculture I ever learned or gardening was from the old agricultural class-book, and I consider myself a very good gardener now. If I had a farm to attend to, I could very well attend to it, and I understand all about rotation of crops, and that sort of thing, and it was all from reading that book.

6856. Mr. HYNES.—Did I understand you right in thinking that you were in favour of the idea that the

15th April, 1912.]

Mr. JAMES JOSEPH HUGHES, M.A., examined.

[Continued.]

chief inspectors should be restored to the work formerly entrusted to them in the office of revising reports and recommending action?—I should say that was the proper way of doing things, but from the chief inspectors' point of view it would be undesirable to have that duty imposed on them, though for the public benefit of the service it would be better if the chief inspectors would undertake it. I do not at all intend to disparage the officers who are doing it at present. They are doing it wonderfully well, but the chief inspectors would have practical knowledge of what they were dealing with.

6867. I ask you to bear in mind that my question is simply from the point of view of the benefit of the service. Now was it found necessary after the chief inspectors were appointed to bring in an inspector to do portion of the work that was formerly assigned to the examiners—was Mr. Stronge not brought into the office for the purpose?—I do not think he had exactly that class of work. He was brought in rather as an adviser to the Resident Commissioner. The Resident Commissioner could consult him.

6868. Did he not deal with diplomas and promotions?—He did.

6869. And was not that entrusted to the examiners?—Not in my time.

6870. But first before he was brought in?—I do not know.

6871. We have evidence on that point. And then on the retirement of Mr. Stronge, was not Mr. Wyse brought in for the same purpose?—Certainly.

6872. And was it not found necessary in addition to have one of the chief inspectors constantly in the office?—Yes, but not particularly in connection with that class of work.

6873. But it was found necessary to have him there on the spot?—Yes.

6874. Are you aware that complaint was made by Archbishop Walsh that the Commissioners were in a difficulty that when they wanted technical advice they had no one able to advise them in the early days?—I am not aware of that.

6875. We have had that in evidence from Mr. Downing. Now if the chief inspectors were made chiefs of inspection, as they were formerly, would you be in favour of the restoration of the head inspectors?—I would, or of additional chief inspectors. I would not fall out about the title.

6876. The title is nothing, but do you think that there ought to be some inspectors who would exercise more control over the inspectors throughout the country with the idea of securing uniformity?—Yes, I do. I think it most desirable, but I would not like the chief inspectors to be confined altogether to the office. They should be at liberty to go round and visit the schools in order to keep themselves in touch with the work.

6877. Would there be the same necessity then for a body of divisional or head inspectors still?—I think it would be desirable in any case, because otherwise after some years the chief inspectors that up in the office would have got out of touch with the schools, and would be dealing with the cases very much as the examiners are at present.

6878. Dealing with things of which they would have no personal and real experience?—No recent knowledge.

6879. With regard to the circuit inspectors you say there is no real responsibility that can be fastened on any inspector?—It is very difficult to fasten responsibility on anybody.

6880. What change would you suggest for that?—I did suggest already that we should revert to the old district system, leaving an inspector in charge of his district for a number of years—seven years or more—then if the district was exceptionally good, he would get the credit of it, and if it was exceptionally bad he would get the discredit of it.

6881. And in addition to that he would have an opportunity of knowing the teachers and the managers, and all the circumstances?—Quite so, and in the remote days teachers and inspectors were very friendly. That was my experience; we were always on the best

terms. Sometimes, perhaps, they did not approve of my reports, possibly they thought I was too strict, but we were always on the best terms.

6882. Now, Mr. Downing has told up that he considered that it would require two years for an inspector to become thoroughly acquainted with his district, so that his opinion with regard to the schools would be of real value?—I agree with that.

6883. I have before me here a list of schools. One of these schools I find examined in 1905 by Mr. Chambers, in 1906 by Mr. O'Connor, in 1907 by Mr. Fenlon, in 1908 by Mr. Downer, in 1909 by Mr. J. Kelly, in 1910 by Miss Burke, in 1911 by Mr. Coleman, and in 1912 by Miss Kelly?—I am not surprised.

6884. If it requires an inspector to be at least two years in a district in order to be in a proper position to appraise the work being done in the schools, is it possible for these inspectors, no matter how conscientious they were, to properly appraise the work of that school?—It may or may not be possible. If a school is a very good one, there would be no difficulty at all about it, and if it was a very bad one there would be no difficulty at all about it. These are the cases of schools as to which there would be no disagreement, but take a middling school, a case in which an inspector, a stranger to the locality, might not know with what exceptional difficulties the teacher has to contend. He might not make due allowance for these, but to safeguard that he must consult with the senior inspector before he changes the mark.

6885. But then apart from that the inspector would require to be at least two years in the district in order to be in a position to appraise properly the work of the school, and how, therefore, with a change of inspector every year for eight successive years could the work of the school in the case I have mentioned be properly appraised?—It is very undesirable to have so many changes, but I know it is a fact. I was recently in a school in that locality in Ballymacarrett, and I found that of the last five reports each one was sent up by a different inspector, but they were all very good, and the school was very good and deserved it. I spoke to the teacher, and this question came up about the five inspectors, and I said, "You must have met a great many of the inspectors," and he told me he had met half the staff. "How did you get along with them?" I asked, and he said, "They all treated me very fairly, sir; I have not a word to say against any of them."

6886. You have been inspector of training colleges?—Yes.

6887. And in your report for 1907-8 you used these words: "The supply of male candidates is still inadequate, and several colleges still fail to obtain their quota of students." I suppose you adhere to that statement still?—I have no reason to doubt it, but I cannot remember exactly the circumstances, still I am sure it was my opinion at the time.

6888. You say, "With this dearth of candidates it is vain to think of raising the standard of the Training Colleges?"—Quite so.

6889. And "Considering the number of inferior candidates who had to be admitted in order to maintain the full complement of students the results of these examinations must be regarded as fair?"—Possibly, yes.

6890. Then it appears from that that the supply of candidates for the teaching profession is not adequate at the present time, that is, the supply of properly-qualified candidates?—That is the supply of eligible candidates.

6891. To what do you attribute that dearth of candidates?—I attribute it a great deal to emigration, and to the improvement in the circumstances of the country, and to the fact that there are other openings—commercial life, and that sort of thing.

6892. You think that there are other openings offering more attractive returns than teaching?—I think so, or equally attractive, and perhaps the entrance to them is not as boded in as the entrance to the teaching profession.

15th April, 1913.]

Mr. James JOSEPH HENRY, M.A., examined.

[Continued.]

6863. Do you think the slowness of promotion has anything to do with it?—It may have. I could not say whether it has or not, but, of course, it would make the office less attractive.

6864. Is not the prospect of having to wait 36 years in order to reach the top of the profession anything but a rosy one?—Oh, it is not at all satisfactory, and what is less satisfactory is the low initial salary.

6865. But the salary is low all along?—Is a low all along, but really when you get up to the highest grade, though it takes such a long time to get up there, it is comparative affluence. When young men going up to Dublin have to live on £26 a year, even if they get £7 in addition to that, and to keep up a decent appearance with things as dear as they are now, it is a very difficult problem to solve.

6866. And then you have to take into consideration in addition to that, that there are standard numbers in the higher grades that cannot be exceeded?—I consider that most objectionable.

6867. And you must consider that there are increased averages, while there are a large number of small schools, so that the prospects of promotion are very remote?—Yes, quite so.

6868. Would that not be sufficient to account for the want of proper candidates?—It would account for it to a great extent, or to some extent, I am sure.

6869. You have told us that the programme is overloaded?—I think so, that is, overloaded for schools that are not worked under favourable conditions.

6870. Quite so. Now I suppose you would agree that reading, writing, and arithmetic should be compulsory in all schools?—Certainly.

6871. Would you agree then to have a programme drawn with these three, and perhaps two more subjects made compulsory, and that managers and teachers might be free to select such other subjects as they deemed suitable for their localities, taking one or two in addition?—Would you call composition a separate subject?

6872. I would not.—Would you consider grammar a separate subject?

6873. I think along with reading, writing and arithmetic, there should be a little grammar?—I cannot speak as regards grammar, but only as regards reading, writing and arithmetic, because grammar, you remember, would be going on all day.

6874. Or agriculture could be approved for one school and in another you might have Irish?—Yes, if they were made to suit the localities.

6875. Would you be in favour of a programme of that kind?—I would in a general way, but before I would be in favour of a particular programme, I would look at it. In one way the programme is very wide, and some of the teachers manage to make it wider still. They look upon reading and grammar and composition as different subjects. Of course, the grammar ought to be included in the composition. And then they have a great habit of wasting time, too, hearing home lessons, giving up a separate half hour for home lessons, and not connecting them with the subjects. Of course, what they should do is the evening before that on which a lesson, say, in geography was being given, or a lesson in formal grammar, they should have a home lesson on that, and begin the half hour with running over the work, and developing the subjects in the rest of the half hour. Instead of that they isolate the home lessons altogether from the ordinary lesson on the subject, and a great deal of time is lost in that way.

6876. And you think they could manage their time better than they do at present?—I should think so, and the better class of teachers see to that themselves; they have died going on all the day, the cultivation of speech, articulation, correct phrasing, that is going on all day too. They insist on the children speaking distinctly.

6877. If your inspectors are making so many valuable suggestions, how is it that they have not been able to get the teachers to adopt so simple a reform?—It might be explained by their slowness in taking up suggestions. Even in the Training College, where you have two years' persistent treatment of a man, you find very often he comes out not very much improved.

6878. We do not find that except where they are deficient in knowledge?—Want of natural capacity?

6879. It is not so much that as want of knowledge, accurate knowledge which all teachers require?—That is very essential, and another very important thing is good manners, that the teacher should have a good, encouraging manner, putting the subjects in an interesting way, and, above all things, speaking articulately. At the Training College very frequently I have had to complain of the hurried way in which the King's Scholars speak at the examination.

6880. May not that be partly due to nervousness?—It may, but I have experience enough to be able to detect whether it arises from nervousness or whether it arises from bad habits.

6881. We thought that one of the things that the new system has brought with it into the schools is distinct articulation?—Yes.

6882. That the pupils are more ready to speak?—Yes.

6883. Would not that habit have been reflected in the bearing of the students of the Training College?—Certainly.

6884. But how so?—Yes, it has in some of the colleges.

6885. I can only answer for one?—But as I mentioned before in some of the colleges they have an abundance of applicants, and they can pick the cream of the lot, and in others they have to go very low down in the scale to fill their vacant places. In those colleges they might have got the same teaching from the schools, but they did not profit as well.

6886. Now you told us that you were sent down to inquire into the Clonsilla case?—Yes.

6887. And one of the things you mentioned was that the teachers delayed in sending up their complaints?—Yes.

6888. Now is it not natural that a teacher, if his mark has been lowered, would think in the first instance that that might be due to something exceptional in the school, and he would rather not speak about it?—It might be quite possible.

6889. And that state of things might continue in the district for some time?—Quite so.

6890. Until they began to hear that there was a lowering of reports generally?—Yes, but if you ask me to investigate these cases, I must decline to go into them unless I can ascertain the correct facts. I may give me some recent cases, and I will investigate them.

6891. They sent up a memorial to the Education Office which was received there on the 27th of January?—I do not remember the date. It did not come to me, you know.

6892. You may take it that that is the correct date?—I do not doubt that that is right.

6893. When were you sent down to investigate the cases?—I think in November as well as I remember.

6894. Surely the teachers are not responsible for the delay between June and November?—Certainly not.

6895. And they complain in the office that they could not investigate the cases properly on account of that delay?—It was not on account of that delay, but on account of the delay in bringing up cases relating to inspections that took place two or three years before. I do not exactly know the period that was covered, but it was a very considerable period.

6896. I am not aware of the dates of the cases that they brought up, but surely I think it would be hard to blame the teachers for delay when there was a delay from June to October on the part of the office to investigate their complaints?—I do not know anything about that delay or the cause of it, and I am not responsible in any way for it.

6897. Can you give us any reason why Mr. Pusey was not sent down?—No, I could not offer any suggestion.

6898. Now, you did not investigate all the cases?—I think I investigated all the cases that were referred to me.

6899. I have no doubt of that?—Allow me. It comes back to my memory now. The Resident Commissioner looked over the files, and he picked out (I forget now whether the number was 20 or 22), cases



1864 April, 1913.]

Mr. JAMES JOSEPH HINES, M.A., examined.

[Continued.]

that he thought were most favourable to the teachers' claims, and in which they had the strongest case. It was in the teachers' interest that those 22 were selected, and these were given to me to investigate; he believed from reading the papers and from his own visit that the teachers had perhaps some justification in those cases, and then he said to me—"What of those?"

6929. Your judgment differs from Mr. Welby's to the extent of 46 per cent.?—That may have been so; I do not know.

6931. Did those teachers in whose cases your judgment was favourable to them, as against Mr. Welby, obtain redress?—I fancy so. I do not know really. I remember now one case, the case of Mr. Mansfield. He got the benefit of it. I lost sight of the matter altogether. I know nothing about the developments of it later than by reports.

6932. Now, when I look at this document I find that Mr. Welby says that Mr. Little submitted a statement in which he says: "Of the teachers who came before my notice roughly about 20 per cent. were giving satisfactory service, and over 45 per cent. in addition were deserving of praise. Nearly 40 per cent. fell below standard." How long was Mr. Little in the district at the time when he wrote that?—I have not any recollection; not very long, I think.

6933. I see it was for a period of three months, and if it would require two years for an inspector to form an accurate judgment of the teachers and the school, what is the value of the expression of an opinion after three months' visit?—His opinion may be correct or it may not, but he was not in the best position for judging.

6934. Should that opinion be taken against the opinion of the senior inspector who was there before him?—A good many other matters should be considered in connection with it.

6935. But it is used in any service to take the opinion of a junior, particularly under such circumstances, and put it against that of his senior officer?—I would say not, and I would not go so far as to say that if I were investigating the matter I would attach very much importance under the circumstances to Mr. Little's opinion.

6936. In another paragraph he says: "Messrs. Fitzpatrick, Franklin, and O'Connell, and Miss Roche Kelly have all worked here either under me or independently." Can you give any idea of the date, and what experience they had?—Mr. Fitzpatrick, I should say, roughly, would have 22 years experience, or 30 years experience. Of course, I could not give you dates.

6937. What about the others?—The others are very junior; Messrs. Franklin and O'Connell, and Miss Roche Kelly were all recent appointments, but I could not give you the dates.

6938. They were all, with the exception of Mr. Fitzpatrick, recent appointments?—Yes.

6939. And yet, the opinion of these inspectors was taken. Have these got districts at all?—No, they were unattached, except Mr. Little and Mr. Fitzpatrick.

6940. Mr. O'Connell.—Is it a fact that Mr. Little was only temporarily there for three months?—I am inclined to think so.

The CHAIRMAN.—Mr. Welby says here—"From January, 1911, to March, 1911."

6941. Mr. HINES.—Here are the words: "Mr. Little, who had charge of Section A for three months ending 31/8/11." That is in the Appendix to the 77th Report, page 105; so that now when we have a number of inspectors lumped together as corroborating Mr. Welby's judgment on these schools, it turns out that one was only there for three months, and almost all the others were more junior inspectors who had very little experience?—Yes, but you are implying now that the Commissioners' action was based on the report of these junior men.

6942. I am only dealing with the documents.—I admit that these were junior men, and there is no disputing that, but I cannot give you exact information as to the dates of their appointments. Mr. Fitzpatrick had a considerable experience as inspector, but the others were juniors.

6943. Mr. Browne was there for seven years?—Yes.

6944. And Mr. McNairy was there for seven years?—Quite so; I do not dispute it, but I do not know.

6945. Mr. Yates had been there for three years in 1907?—Yes.

6946. And do you think it reasonable to put against the opinion of men like Mr. Browne, Mr. Yates, and Mr. McNairy, men of experience, men having been a long time in the district, the opinions of inspectors like Mr. Franklin, Mr. Carroll, and Miss Roche Kelly?—I did not put them against them.

6947. But it is done here in this document?—Yes, it is done there.

6948. I am asking you do you agree with this, that weight should be attached to the opinions of Messrs. Franklin and Carroll and Miss Roche Kelly, in opposition to the others?—If I am to decide the matter altogether on length of service and experience, I would certainly attach less importance to the opinion of the man of less standing than to that of the man of long service.

6949. Now, if the men and women of this district were getting good marks from Mr. Browne, and from these other inspectors, had they not just cause of complaint when the marks were suddenly lowered by Mr. Welby and the inspectors under him?—Well, if the reports were unduly or unduly lowered, they ought to have made an appeal at once, and not have waited till several years intervened, when the facts became unrememberable, and a perfect judgment could not be arrived at.

6950. But several years did not intervene. Mr. Welby went to the district in 1909, and the memorial was forwarded in 1911. Would that have been several years?—Two years.

6951. Now, under Mr. Browne, they got 157 "excellent" and "very good," and these were reduced to 79; they got 161 "goods," and these were reduced at the same time to 154; and they got 77 "fairs," which were raised to 148, and 5 "middlings," raised to 19. Now, with such a change in the marking as that, had not the teachers, who were fulfilling all the requirements of the senior inspector, whether he was right or wrong in his standard, just cause of complaint?—They had a perfect right of appeal.

6952. And they did appeal?—Yes; I quite agree that they had a perfect right, and were quite justified in doing that.

6953. Which does Waterford district or Clonmel district stand highest in the estimation of the inspectors?—I could not tell you. Neither of these was in my division. I was in charge of the North of Ireland, and I was never in charge of Clonmel or Waterford.

6954. When you investigated a number of the cases, your judgment disagreed with Mr. Welby's to the extent of 46 per cent.?—Possibly; I do not know. I do not dispute it.

6955. In Belfast were the teachers complaining that there was a lowering of the marks in 46 per cent.?—Yes.

6956. And if there was a discrepancy between you and Mr. Welby of 46 per cent., would not the teachers have a serious cause of complaint?—I do not quite see the point.

6957. If he differed from you to the extent of 46 per cent.?—But you must remember that our judgments were formed at different times. In some cases, I visited the school five or six months later than he did, and in the case of one school, it would appear that he found it very dirty and slovenly, and when I went there the school absolutely looked to perfection, with everything neat and tasteful. Of course, that was owing, or at least probably so, to Mr. Welby's visit and report. If I had gone when Mr. Welby was there, very probably I would have taken that into account in my judgment too.

6958. But still an isolated case like that does not touch the lowering of the marks over the whole district?—But you are talking of another thing, of the percentage of difference between Mr. Welby and myself, and I think that is a misleading way of putting it. I do not mean that you are doing it to mislead, but that is the effect it would have, because those little points of difference in the summing up of

19th April, 1913.]

Mr. James JOSEPH HYNES, M.A., examined.

[Continued.]

a judgment are explained in my report, in some cases owing to the length of time that intervened, and changes in the conditions, perhaps, from the results of Mr. Welby's suggestion and advice to the teachers. That would lead to some difference in the judgment and the setting of a school. Is not that so?

6940. It might possibly be so. Well, were you present at the conference that was held in 1903 of the 25 senior inspectors?—Certainly.

6941. And one of the problems suggested to you was to define an "excellent" school?—To me personally, or to the conference?

6942. To the conference?—I do not remember that particular point, but I am sure it is all right.

6943. We had it in evidence from Mr. Dilworth that after the conference the senior inspectors went away and explained to their junior inspectors, or sectional inspectors, the decision arrived at?—Yes, I believe so.

6944. It is said there, in the report of that conference, that a school is defined as "excellent" under seven heads—programme, method, tone and discipline, order and tidiness, house and premises, equipment, and records. In order to award "excellent," it is defined that the premises must be in good repair, and of good class, that the equipment must be ample. Now, did you as senior inspector convey the decision to the others who were working under you at that time?—I certainly did if I was instructed to do so.

6945. And then the junior inspectors had to take these things into consideration in awarding "excellent"?—Of course.

6946. So that the character of the building and of the equipment might tell against the teacher?—But that was overruled.

6947. But at that time it did?—At that time it probably did, but I do not know that. An intelligent inspector would not penalise a teacher for some defect in the building, which was attributable to the manager.

6948. But remember the decision given on that point was this, that in order to earn the merit mark of "excellent," the premises must be of a good class and in good repair, and the equipment must be ample?—I do not agree with that at all.

6949. But that was the decision arrived at?—That was the decision of the majority, and I certainly never acted on it. Why should I blame the teacher for what the manager should do?

6950. But that was the decision arrived at?—If you show me that in an official document that the senior inspectors arrived at that decision I will believe it, but I am trusting to my memory.

6951. Mr. HYNES.—It is here?—Well, if those are the words that I used I do not approve of them. I would certainly take into account when I would be awarding a merit mark the state of the school, so far as the teacher was responsible for it. The building might be defective, but if the premises are leaky, and yet if there is an attempt to make the best of what is bad, I would give the teacher credit for it. Circulars have been sent out (I cannot give you the dates, but you can easily get them at the Education Office), directing the attention of the inspectors to that point, that they were not to penalise the teachers for defects in the buildings, or other work that the locally should attend to.

6952. Mr. HYNES.—You were also engaged in investigating the cases in Belfast?—Yes.

6953. And obviously the marking there differs from the inspectors to the extent of 40 per cent.?—I dare say, but that is a misleading way of putting it, because in some cases an interval had occurred between the two inspections and the chief inspectors put in certain terms—I do not remember the exact words—a weak "good" or a strong "fair." What they meant to convey was, that if the inspectors gave "good" or "fair," it would not be any undue departure from an exact and reasonable judgment of the school.

6954. Mr. HYNES.—I understand that, not content with six merit marks, you seem to have introduced

some intervening ones?—We did not introduce any new marks, but in a case where we differed from the inspector, he gave "good," and we thought it merited only "fair," but we said it was a very narrow dividing line, and we would not blame a man for calling it "good" or "fair."

6955. But you do use those terms, a strong "fair" and a weak "good"?—No, we do not use this term officially.

6956. Mr. CORRY.—They are in the official report?—They are in the chief inspectors' report, but they are not used in the General Report.

6957. Mr. HYNES.—But they were used by you in the Belfast schools?—I will tell you the way in which we used them, to convey that such cases were very near the neutral line. That was all that we meant to convey by them. But before we leave that, let me say that you cannot assess the merits of a school with mathematical precision. The thing is utterly impossible. You cannot say that it is actually "fair" or actually "good." You go as near it as possible; and I always impressed that on my inspectors at the conferences, and I say, "Always lean to the side of mercy. If you are inclined to think it a strong 'fair' call it 'good,' and if you think it a strong 'good' call it 'very good.'" Give the teacher the benefit of the doubt." That is what I always say.

6958. But when a system which you describe as abominable is in operation do you think that the teacher has just cause of complaint?—I think they have, but I say they did not go the right way about amending it, and their campaign of denouncing the inspectors, I think, was most culpable and vicious.

6959. "The growing insolence of authority, so noticeable nowadays in all classes of subordinates," you think, perhaps, had a good deal to do with it?—I think the writing of those threatening letters, and certain abominable articles in the papers, and denouncing the inspectors at their meetings, that governing spirit had certainly a great deal to do with it.

6960. If their marks were reduced, and if they thought they had a cause of complaint, why should they not be at liberty to appeal?—I have no objection at all to their appealing, but to the way in which they appealed, and in which they carried on the appeal.

6961. In many cases, as in Belfast or in Chelmsford, although you investigated a number of cases, and although your judgments differed from those of the other inspectors, the teachers got no redress?—I do not know that. I do not know, and you may be right. As soon as my report went in I had nothing more to do with the matter.

6962. Would you be in favour of more examination of children in the school than at present?—Yes, but some inspectors go in very much for it at present. I do not know whether that is the case or not, but I have heard, and it is possible that some of them go very far with the examinations still.

6963. You are in favour of a certain amount of examination?—Of a certain amount, and that would vary according to the school and according to the inspector. A man might observe the work of the school, and he might form an opinion, and then he might like to fortify that opinion by examination. Things might seem to be going well, but still the result might not be satisfactory. I would leave that to his discretion; but what I would say is too bad, and especially under this present system, is that increments and promotion are decided on these little points, technical points, which are rigidly carried out.

6964. If you did away with that you would do away with a great deal of grumbling?—I would.

6965. Do you think there ought to be a uniform school year as at present?—There is a good deal to be said on both sides, from the inspectors' point of view and from the public point of view. It would be much more desirable to go back to the separate school years, and the teachers would like it better too, but there are many objections to it.

6966. What are they?—Well, first of all, the teacher knows the inspection is coming round, and the teachers

12th April, 1913.]

Mr. JAMES JOSEPH HENRY, M.A., examined.

[Continued.]

are not all perfect. Some of them rest on their oars, and they used to do so under the result system. They do not do that so much now, but they used to rest on their oars, and when the time of inspection was coming on they would put on a little steam, and overwork the children. That was very common.

6976. Mr. CORRY.—I never could imagine how good work could be done unless it was done all the year round?—I do not say good work was done in those cases, but the teachers and pupils worked very steadily during half of the year and very hard during the other half. That is a very bad plan. The object of the new system is to enable the inspector to see the school in its everyday aspect.

6977. Mr. HENRY.—Would it not be possible to combine the two methods, and would not that remove your objection to the separate school year?—It would to a great extent.

6978. Would it not be unfair to the teacher and the pupils to have their work appraised at the end of the year?—Why?

6979. Because the teacher could have all his pupils there?—I quite agree with you in that.

6980. He could have the work revised?—Yes; but under the new system it is not the results that are looked at, but it is the way that the work is being carried out. It is mainly the methods that are looked at.

6981. But no method is good if it does not produce good results?—If the method is good, and the conditions are good, and altogether the tone of the school is good, the results must be good, but very often when I went into a school I heard the teacher giving an excellent lesson, and I would say, "This school ought to turn out very well," but later on I would come round to examine it and I would find that it did not, and the inference was that the teacher was not always teaching at his best, and he seemed extra good while I was there.

6982. Would your surprise visits not check schools like that?—Two surprise visits at least in the year are desirable but that number cannot be always given, as the inspectors are often overpowered with work.

6983. Do you think it is right to trust the body of teachers with distrust?—Certainly not; I never did it in my life.

6984. But is not the principle of surprise visits distrust of the teacher?—It may be, but it is very essential. In every business there is some sort of check or supervision. You cannot expect that people are all perfect, and large sums of public money depend on these matters. When I went into a school I would really go to look at the accounts, but I would never do it in an ostentatious way.

6985. Have you any suggestions to make as to the way appeals from teachers when necessary should be dealt with?—That is appeals against the inspectors' reports, or anything of that kind?—Well, it would depend on the class of inspector against whom the appeal was made. If it was against a junior inspector the usual course would be to refer it to the senior inspector, and get his opinion on it, and if there was a senior inspector involved, a chief inspector would go. I think that is a satisfactory arrangement, but I can understand perfectly well that the teachers would not thank so. They would like to have the Court of Appeal constituted some other way.

6986. But when an appeal is lodged by a teacher that appeal is referred back to the inspector?—For his observations, as a rule.

6987. Are those observations submitted to the teacher subsequently?—Now you are taking me out of my depth, because I did not deal with these matters. I think they would be sent to the manager.

6988. Mr. CORRY.—That would be when the final decision was given?—No, before that. A great deal would depend on the character of the case; but I know if I were the inspector that was going down, the senior or chief inspector, to deal with an appeal, I would certainly let the teacher know what the inspector's observations were, or I would let the manager know.

6989. Mr. HENRY.—And would you be in favour of letting the teacher know?—Certainly; I see no objection.

6990. And would you give the teacher an opportunity of answering these observations if he could?—Certainly.

6991. Sir HIRSH WILKINSON.—Mr. Henry was asking you with regard to surprise visits. There are generally, I understand, three inspections in the year, when that can be accomplished?—Yes, if they can be accomplished.

6992. One is a general inspection, at which the manager is invited to be present?—Yes.

6993. Where it appears that the practice is to let the manager know on the morning of the inspection, or even after the inspection has begun?—Yes, if he lives near the school.

6994. I take it that it would be a great advantage if his presence was secured on every occasion?—Very desirable.

6995. Now, if surprise visits are desirable on some occasions, would this particular inspection admit of notice being given to both the teacher and the manager without detriment to the object sought to be attained?—It would not then be a surprise visit you know.

6996. But suppose that surprise visits are on occasions required, could this be made an exception to them without detriment to the object to be attained?—It could not, because these surprise visits in many cases are to check the accuracy of the records of attendance.

6997. But you would have other surprise visits besides this regular inspection?—We have them at present. The term "surprise visit" would not be used, but the inspector comes to a school unannounced. If he intends to spend a longer time than an hour (if he does not exactly specify the duration of time) if he intends to spend a considerable time there he is required to notify the manager that he is in the school, and the manager will come down, or may come down.

6998. The manager on many occasions is away from home?—Yes; the thing does not work well at all.

6999. It does not work well?—No.

7000. And that being admitted I should like to make my point clear. Surprise visits during the year are required?—Certainly.

7001. I suggest that this visit, when the general report is made, might be an exception to that, and what I am asking you is, do you think that it could be made an exception without detriment to the object to be attained?—An exception in this way, that the teacher would get a longer notice?

7002. That he should get notice of it. There are some things that have been pointed out to us as being in favour of it. There are days when, without any fault on the part of the teacher, a considerable number of the boys may be away, a larger number than the ordinary absence?—Yes, and the school then is not in a favourable state for inspection.

7003. Under the old results system they always had notices?—They had notices, yes.

7004. Might not that notice be given in this case, so that the manager might make an effort to be present, and that the teacher might make a special effort to have as large a number of the boys present, notwithstanding the difficulties, that we all know of, as to securing regular attendance?—It would be quite possible to do it, and it would be very desirable, but it would interfere with the objects that the Commissioners had in making the present arrangement.

7005. Would your other surprise visits not suffice to secure the object for which the surprise visit is intended?—I think they might.

7006. And you think, then, that the ordinary surprise visits might be combined with an annual visit, of which notice might be given to both teacher and manager?—I think it would be desirable. The inspectors, under the present system, are not sufficiently in touch with the manager at all.

7007. The CHAIRMAN.—We have heard that the managers, under the present system, are often unable to attend the inspection?—Yes; a great many cannot attend, and some resent the shortness of the notice, and do not attend. Even one of the Commissioners themselves resented this very much, and complained of the inspection. That was Dr. Traill. I think he did it two or three times, though the inspector was simply complying with the regulation.

7008. Sir HIRSH WILKINSON.—In what light did you look upon these representations from Belfast and Clonmel?—I do not quite understand.

7009. I take it that you looked upon these in any case as complaints against the inspectors?—Certainly.

7010. But was it not at the same time an application for the redress of grievances?—Certainly.

7011. Now, can you suggest that there was on any one of those occasions any redress of any grievances given at all?—There was in one case, I know. I mentioned Mr. Mansfield's case. I do not exactly remember now what he was looking for, whether promotion or increment.

7012. You gave a higher mark than the inspector had given?—Yes.

7013. Of course, we all know what eventually happens, but do you know whether in the interim he got the benefit of your report?—I am inclined to think he did, but I cannot say for certain. It passed out of my hands. I think he did; and in the case of another teacher a reprimand was issued, and that was withdrawn in consequence of my report.

7014. Do you happen to remember the other case?—Yes, the case of Mr. Keegan, of Rosgreagh School, near Clonmel.

7015. Mr. COFFEY.—That was not one of the twelve cases?—Well, I was mixed up in the same case. I forget how that case came to me. I dealt with both at the same time.

7016. Sir HIRSH WILKINSON.—You were saying that the cases called out for your inspection were cases that were considered most favourable for the teachers?—Yes.

7017. That seems to me a very puzzling statement. It has puzzled me all along, looking at this matter, how it is possible that a man who had got "excellent" could get any better mark by your going to see his school?—What school was that?

7018. On page 303.—The reason I went to that school was that the Resident Commissioner thought that school was overmarked.

7019. Well, that was not most favourable to the teacher?—No; that was an exception, and I quite agree with him that "very good" was quite enough for that school.

7020. Instead of "excellent"?—I do not believe there are 80 "excellent" schools in Ireland, instead of having 40 "excellent" schools in one district. I do not believe there are a dozen "excellent" schools in Ireland. It depends on the meaning you attach to "excellent." My idea of "excellent" is very high, but I object to all these artificial distinctions and terms.

7021. Now, out of the Clonmel schools you examined, or re-examined, how many?—About 20 or 25.

7022. The BRURBY OF BOAS.—There are only about 13 on this list (list handed to Witness)?—Well, that is all.

7023. Sir HIRSH WILKINSON.—Will you kindly look at that list and you will see that out of these only five were selected. There are Cullen (boys), Mandryk, McNeer, Mowatt (boys), Shevardsgh (girls), and Loughmore (boys)?—In fact, I am not sure that I ever the list.

7024. I see Rathkevin is not inspected?—You mean not inspected by me?

7025. Yes?—I told you the reason was that the Resident Commissioner went round to all those schools, and he picked out the schools in which he

thought that the teacher might be able to make out a case. That case of Rathkevin was not referred to me. The Resident Commissioner did not think the teacher there had any grounds for appeal.

7026. I am merely referring to the fact, and I want you to be satisfied that there were only five of those schools that you did re-examine, and I want to come to the result?—I got a list of these schools that I visited from the Resident Commissioner.

7027. Mr. COFFEY.—In order to visit them?—To visit; and the reason he gave for selecting these was, that he thought they were the best cases of teachers. That Loughmore case, which he thought was overmarked, may not have been in this list at all, but he mentioned it to me and said, "You had better go and see that."

7028. The CHAIRMAN.—That was for another purpose altogether. He thought it was overmarked?—Well, it was merely that I thought he differed from the opinion of Mr. Welply, the Senior Inspector, and he wanted to have my view on it.

7029. In fact, Loughmore was put into the list to which it did not belong?—I think, as well as my memory serves me, Mr. Welply raised the mark there from "very good" up to "excellent," and the Resident Commissioner thought it did not deserve that, and I did not either.

7030. Sir HIRSH WILKINSON.—I understand that after a certain time, when you had dealt with these cases, they passed out of your cognisance, and that you are not able really to give us what the result was?—No; I may have heard incidentally, but I do not remember.

7031. That is in the Clonmel cases, and now with regard to the Belfast cases, would not the same remark apply that whenever one may say with regard to the complaints that were made if there was any reasonable object, it was not simply to complain of the inspectors, but also to get redress for the hardship that was imposed on the teachers by the inspectors' reports?—Quite so.

7032. And there does not seem, throughout I may say, with regard to that any recognition of that particular point at all?—I think the teachers' right to appeal was recognised there. It was recognised that they were justified in making that appeal.

7033. That they were quite justified in doing it?—It was the manner in which they did it that I objected to.

7034. But there was something else. If they were right in making that appeal, would you not think it right that some redress should be given, yet this is the result of the whole business?—Having carefully considered in all their aspects the difficult questions involved, the Commissioners are of opinion that while, in view of the facts disclosed, the teachers were justified in appealing to them, there is no evidence to show that there has been any concerted action on the part of the administration to deal severely with the Belfast teachers?—Yes, that is right.

7035. That there was no concerted action?—That there was no concerted action.

7036. Have you any doubt that some of the teachers, and a large number of them did believe, that there was concerted action?—I could not answer that.

7037. Of course, that is certainly a different thing from them being concerted action, but it was asserted over and over again that they did believe it?—Well, it was asserted over and over again.

7038. Of course, I could not insist by asking you whether you believe there were any instructions on that point?—Certainly not. I will tell you a thing that may have led you, and I think I mentioned in my report that the Resident Commissioner visited this district, and I visited one school that used to get a very good report. I am inclined to think that we arrived during the midday interval. We arrived between 12 and 1, as well as I remember, and the pupils and the teachers were away, and the school was locked, but we went in. There was a lot of written exercises on the table; we commenced looking

15th April, 1915.]

Mr. JAMES JOSEPH HYNES, M.A., examined.

[Continued.]

over those, and the way in which the correction of errors had been neglected was something outrageous; so we waited till the teacher and the pupils came, and we went further into the matter, and we found that the school hardly deserved "fair," and it was getting "good," and, of course, I had to make the representation that the Resident Commissioner directed me to take to the senior inspector, and the inspector in charge, and that he might have put some of them on the qui vive, and they might have looked after things more sharply than before.

7039. The CHAIRMAN.—Do you mean that that visit suggested concerted action?—No, but that it might have had the effect on the inspectors of raising the standard or of looking more minutely after the work in the school.

7040. Sir HIRSH WILKINSON.—Of course, there is no doubt we are all agreed upon this, that it was most deplorable that any number of teachers should have entertained such a suspicion?—Very deplorable, but at the same time I do not think that any very large number did. You cannot judge by the names of those teachers that are on the list who signed the appeal or the memorial, because those signatures were gained in a very curious way, as I will tell you. One teacher went round on his bicycle during the day and asked each man to sign. Here in Ireland, if you want a man to sign a memorial for anything, unless it is very objectionable to himself (which is something different), he will be quite willing to sign it.

7041. The HONORABLE ROSS.—Rumors go round that inspectors get private instructions from the Board with regard to the conduct of their work, which are totally different from the public circulars and other documents?—That is utterly untrue. There is not a particle of foundation for that.

7042. I merely want to have your contradiction, because I was asked that question within the last two weeks by a manager, who had his information from a person that he thought ought to know?—Oh, no, there is not a particle of truth in it.

7043. Sir HIRSH WILKINSON.—Of course, it is always difficult to know exactly how widely a belief of that sort is entertained, but your own opinion, I suppose, really could not be relied upon as determining the extent with any great certainty. You would not be likely to hear that?—I would not, but I do not think it was very widely entertained. Of course, the leaders of the agitation might have induced the other teachers with ideas that they had not entertained before, and I know that they led them to endorse these attacks on the inspectors. I have had conversations with several teachers in Belfast who expressed quite different opinions regarding the inspectors. Mr. Ward, who taught a National School for many years in that city, and is now a Commissioner, told me, in reply to a query of mine, that he had met a great number of the members of the inspection staff—that some of them were "perfect gentlemen," and that not one had treated him unkindly or unfairly.

7044. But I understand that, although you think that they were misdirected in the application, they still had a grievance?—They had in the way that I mentioned to you with regard to this artificial arrangement about increments and promotion, and as long as that exists they will be discontented and at loggerheads with the inspectors.

7045. The CHAIRMAN.—They had a grievance against the system, but not against individuals?—Yes, instead of attacking the system, they attacked an innocent body of men—the inspectors. Now, I thought that was very unfair; a lot of them had been treated very well by the inspectors. I have had letters from some of them for the way I treated them. Well, one of these men wrote to me six months before this thing came to the surface, and told me his poor father never went to bed of a night without praying for me, and he reminded me of some kindness I did him long ago. This man had not the courage to write to the papers and say—"Well, all the inspectors are not like what they are represented, and we meet with a good deal of kindness from some of

them." That is what disgusted me. I do not mind the ringleaders at all, but the other men who did not come forward to tell the truth.

7046. Sir HIRSH WILKINSON.—You are familiar with the letter of June, 1911, of Mr. DUNN, addressed to the Secretary of the Belfast teachers?—Yes, I am.

7047. I take it that a fair summary of it is contained in this paragraph, that having carefully considered in all their aspects the difficult questions involved, the Commissioners are of opinion, that while in view of the facts disclosed, the teachers were justified in appealing to them, there is no evidence to show that there has been any concerted action on the part of the administration to deal secretly with the Belfast teachers. And then the rest of the letter is summed up in the last paragraph, which states that they are taking further steps, whereby their policy shall become adequately realized and carried into effect. And that was the manner that the teachers got. And all that the teachers were told practically was that there was not any conspiracy on the part of the inspectors and the Office to deal unfairly with them; but they got no redress whatever, although it was admitted that they had a most serious grievance?—I do not think it was admitted that they had a grievance.

7048. Yes, they say they were justified in appealing to them?—They were within their rights in appealing, but they did not establish that they had a serious grievance to complain of.

7049. I do not go more fully into this, because I consider that you condemn, root and branch, this shoddy classification?—Quite so, but that question that you are referring to now, was not at all under consideration in connection with this appeal. The appeal was against the judgment of the inspectors, their raising of the standard; it was not against the system.

7050. But was it not revealed that a different standard had been applied to them from that applied to them before?—In previous years, but that applied to every part of Ireland. In the early days of the present system (I cannot give you the dates, but somewhere about 1900) a circular came out announcing the changes, and I think it was succeeded by other circulars calling the inspectors' attention to the fact that this was a revolution. A lot of new subjects were introduced, and many of the teachers had no previous acquaintance with those subjects; therefore, the inspectors were told that they should not be too exacting, and that they should be very reasonable, and that for every reasonable attempt credit should be allowed. All the inspectors were very glad to do that, but when you begin to make allowances you never know when to stop. But after the transition period had passed, after three or four years, some earnest inspectors, men that were zealous about their work, began to think, after four years' training, we ought to be able to do something better with this, and they put up the standard, while other easy-going men like to go in the easy-going way that was easier for themselves and for the teacher, and they kept a low standard. That was the way it occurred.

7051. But you admit that they had a grievance against the system, and that is revealed there, and there can be no doubt of it, for it is acknowledged that a different standard was applied to them from what had been applied before, and if people are to earn their money upon a particular mark, and a different standard is applied to them later, that, I submit, without fear of contradiction, is a grievance. And at any rate they had a perfect right, if they had a grievance, whether they made a mistake or not, to appeal for redress, and they got no redress?—But remember, the Commissioners will not admit that they had a grievance. Of course, the Commissioners are not responsible for my statement. I am giving you my individual opinion.

7052. But they are responsible for the statement that they had applied a different standard to those men, which reduced their emoluments below what they had been in the habit of receiving before?—That was the natural outcome.

7053. It may be natural, but it is not justifiable?—Certainly it is justifiable.

15th April, 1914.]

Mr. JAMES JOSEPH HYNEK, M.A., examined.

[Continued.]

7054. Do you think it is justifiable to raise the standard without warning, because there had been no warning given to them?—There was not any sudden raising.

7055. Well, it appears to me very clearly proved in this case that there was a sudden raising?—That is a point that we do not agree about; but you must admit that in the early days of the new system it was only fair to allow a lower standard than would be admissible after six or ten years.

7056. But we have it here in the case of Mr. Welpy, for instance, and there is no mistake about it, that Mr. Welpy did apply a standard that his predecessors had not applied, and they put down here in their own statement that especially in the County Down a higher standard was applied. Well, it was applied suddenly, because these complaints were all of the sudden raising of the standard, and lowering of the marks?—Yes.

7057. I thought nobody would have contradicted the fact that they had a grievance, but your attitude towards it is this, that you consider that the system was a bad one?—We are mixing up two different things. I think instead of the teachers having a grievance, the public had a grievance for allowing them to have such a low standard during such a long number of years after the introduction of the new system. The real ground of complaint is not that a higher standard was put on in 1906, but that it was not put on in 1893, or a good deal earlier.

7058. So that you think it is no grievance to a man if he does work up to a certain point on the promise that he will get his salary, and you immediately say "I have changed my mind, and I will pay you on a different standard"?—Well, I would not put it that way.

7059. I put it that way, and you do not agree with the way it is put?—But do you not think that when the system was introduced in 1909 it was reasonable to expect very little at first. The teachers were new to the subjects; singing had not been compulsory in every school, drawing had not been compulsory in every school, science had not been known—these were things in which the teacher would be backward, and you would have to be satisfied with very little on those lines, but as years rolled on, and as they got opportunities of being trained, you would expect better work from them, would you not?

Sir HIRSH WILKINSON.—You are I am not in a position to answer questions.

7060. Mr. KERR.—Did the sudden lowering of the marks in Belfast come about, not through any change in the programme, but through a change of inspectors?—It was not through a change of programme or a change of inspectors, but the inspector that came in had been gradually working up, and the others remain in the transition stage still.

7061. I fully agree with Sir Hiram, that the teachers have a grievance if they are promised promotion and increments for doing a certain work, and an inspector comes in and changes the standard of the work, and I think you will agree with me that what is at the root of the whole thing in this very artificial arrangement of "fair" and "excellent," and so on. The Commissioners said, "You have to have certain marks to get an increment of your salary," and under a certain inspector a teacher will get two "very good," and you change your inspector and the mark is reduced to "fair"?—The teachers appeal against the new inspector. They imply that he is wrong, but the Commissioners are inclined to think, on looking into the whole thing, that he is right and that the other men are wrong.

7062. Mr. HANEY.—How could the teachers know that?—To my mind, an efficient teacher will have a good school no matter what mark the inspector applies, and these men in Belfast are very practical, sensible men, and even if the inspector were very easily pleased, yet, for the sake of the children and the public, they ought to have made good progress.

7063. So they did. Look at Clonmel. There were three inspectors—Messrs. Browne, McEnty and Yates—all men of standing. Mr. Browne was removed to Waterford and the teachers were working

there up to 1909, satisfying all the requirements of the officials placed over them, and another official comes in, and he reduces the mark wholesale. One of the junior men reduces them 76 per cent.—I admit there were things that were objectionable, and that I have no sympathy with at all.

7064. Have not these men a grievance?—They have in a sort of way, but to my mind the schools are primarily for the children and for the public, and what I look to is anything that injures the children, if the schools are very bad, and the teachers get "excellent" from the inspector, I say that is very bad for the public and for the children.

7065. If you could fancy yourself again a junior inspector?—I can do that.

7066. And if you were getting a personal mark as the teachers are at present?—We are now coming back to this radical fact, that it is utterly objectionable whether applied to inspectors or teachers or anybody.

7067. Supposing that you did a certain work, and that you were getting "good" for it for ten years, and that you worked for the eleventh year, in exactly the same way, and they gave you "M"?—I would cut up very rough, but I would not start maligning my senior inspector or telling lies about him because I was hit that way.

7068. Mr. HARRISON.—In these Belfast cases it is said that there was no redress. Do you know if there was any case where the lowering of the mark had adversely affected the financial position of any teacher? I am not sure there were cases.

7069. And these cases were not reconsidered?—Possibly they were. When our report went in all these cases were.

7070. But you have no information on that point?—No, I have not.

7071. Mr. HENLY.—You only think that these cases that you reviewed yourself were considered; but what about the remainder of the 111?—I am inclined to think they were not.

7072. The CHAIRMAN.—But you have no personal knowledge?—I have no personal knowledge.

7073. Sir HIRSH WILKINSON.—With regard to the point that was mentioned to-day as to the inaccuracy of the returns of attendance, I suppose you are aware that that is a difficulty that is not confined to this country?—Certainly.

7074. We had it in England too, and I think you are aware of Matthew Arnold's proposal with regard to that, in order to prevent any difficulty at all, that when the roll is called, there should be a thought for absentees and a cross for presentees. Do you know how they mark it in Ireland?—Certainly.

7075. How?—The "present" mark is a line drawn obliquely in the square from the topmost right-hand corner down to the left, and the "absent" mark is naught.

7076. But we see that difficulty is one of the old difficulties when Matthew Arnold thought it necessary to deal with it?—It exists in England too, but not to the same extent, and I do not think it is as closely looked after.

7077. Of course, it would be desirable to arrive at that state of perfection in which it would not be necessary either to have surprise visits or examination of these rolls?—If we could attain that we could dispense with police and armies, and prisons and everything else, and we would be very happy.

7078. I suppose it is desirable in your opinion to retain a system which makes it important to the teacher whether the attendance is large or small?—It would be very desirable not to expose them to temptation; but I doubt if you could devise a working scheme to replace the present one.

7079. You think that it is desirable that there should be, as there is at present, remuneration depending on the number of attendances?—I think it is desirable to some extent, but it should not be a very large amount.

7080. In these cases that we are referring to you do not know the individual instances?—Well, no.

19th April, 1913.]

Mr. James Joseph Hynes, M.A., examined.

[Continued.]

7081. So we have to conjecture as to whether very much really did depend on the accuracy or inaccuracy of the roll?—We have to be guided a good deal by the amount of the penalty. Unless it was a very gross case, the penalty would not be severe, particularly if it were a case of a first offence; but falsification of accounts is a very serious thing, because it is not merely that the amount of the grant is affected, but the very pupils in the schools are contaminated by it.

7082. In some cases what is called falsification of accounts is inaccuracy?—No, there would be a great distinction made between these. An inaccuracy in a trifling matter would not be fined at all, but a caution might be given. It is a matter that, in fact, the inspector might not report. He would speak to the teacher, perhaps, or make a note in the observation book, and request the teacher to be more careful, but the teacher would not be penalised by this.

7083. It is possible to have an unintentional inaccuracy?—Certainly. Such inaccuracies occur very frequently, and it is patent to the inspector that it is the result of oversight or blunder. It is not intentional. It would not be criminal.

7084. You mentioned that you thought you had something between 50 and 100 references to you?—I merely made a rough estimate. I would not attach much importance to the number I mentioned. I am almost sure I had more than that.

7085. Mr. COFFEY.—There were appeals?—Appeals against the grading of the schools by the inspector.

7086. Sir HIRSH WILKINSON.—Against the lowering of the mark by the inspector?—Yes; I could hardly fix the number.

7087. Because I think it very strange that Mr. Downing said he had none?—I think Mr. Downing was mistaken; because I remember that I was the inspector who reported, and that there was an appeal against my judgment, and it was referred to Mr. Downing, and he reported on it; I think there were two schools, one in Dublin and the other in Kerry. I was rather sore about it, because I thought I had made full allowance for all the difficulties the teacher had to contend with, and I was so lenient.

The CHAIRMAN.—Is not this a case where, if there is to be any value in the evidence, there ought to be statistics?

7088. Sir HIRSH WILKINSON.—Those vague statements do not help us at all. The teachers complain throughout here that there is no use at all in appealing?—That is not the fact. The teachers' way is this. If they make an appeal, and if the Appeal Court does not decide in their favour, the Appeal Court must be wrong. Perhaps you will have the pleasure of experiencing that yourself when your own report comes in. If you are unreasonable to them, they will certainly object to your decision.

7089. We wanted really to find out whether there were many appeals, and whether on appeal many cases were reversed?—Oh, it would be very easy to ascertain that from the Education Office.

7090. The CHAIRMAN.—The Committee tried to ascertain that, but without success. Do you think there is a record that we could get at?—There is. The clerks might have to go through a great number of documents, but certainly they have a record of the cases in which appeals were made and the result of those appeals.

7091. We have not been able to get it?—If you ask for the information for a limited period, it would be more easily obtained. If you ask for a return of that kind for the last ten years, that would take a long time to make out; but if you say for the last two years that would be practicable.

7092. Sir HIRSH WILKINSON.—With regard to appeals a question was put to you before as to the communication of the inspector's statement to the teacher. Would you look upon it as a natural and proper way that all the inspector said against the teacher should be communicated to the teacher?—Certainly.

7093. And that the teacher should have an opportunity of rebutting anything that was said against him?—Yes, and practically I believe that they have that at present.

7094. Well, whatever the evidence on the subject was, certainly that is not the impression it produced on my mind?—When I say that, I mean that the inspector who is dealing with the case lets the teacher know what the other inspector says about him.

7095. But then we have many cases in which no inspector is dealing with the case other than the original inspector. I understand that what happens is this—that the inspector makes his report, that is, the general report § 77A, and then in the 26th paragraph of that, he makes a brief minute of the result of the inspection suitable for transmission to the manager. I understand that the whole of that is not sent?—I think so. If there is anything elaborate, anything unimportant or any mis-spelling, that is not sent; but I do not think there is any radical change.

7096. And the answer to Number 13, that is, the mark of the school, I think that is given to the teacher too; but I do not think Number 13 there, which is the teacher's own rating, is given. It is the examiner who deals with these?—I did not deal with them, only incidentally.

7097. Is there not some difficulty with regard to the programme where there is a mixed class of boys and girls, and the girls are set to cookery and the boys are not?—Yes.

7098. And yet the girls are expected to arrive at the same excellence as the boys in other subjects?—Yes, that is the fact.

7099. There is that difficulty?—Yes.

7100. With regard to the number of those who applied to have a separate programme for themselves, you recognise how much easier it is to follow the list rather than to suggest a new programme, which would involve really in many cases a very considerable extension?—But not an unreasonable extension for a man who was interested in his school.

7101. But has he not to justify a departure from what the united wisdom of the Board of Education considers ought to be followed as far as possible—has he not to justify that in his own particular district?—Well, he has to decide how much of what is proposed he can undertake.

7102-7112. And what he can substitute for something that is in the programme?—No substitution is allowed.

7113. Is it to be wondered at that there should be few of those?—I know if I was teaching a school in one of those very poor localities where the circumstances are very unfavourable, I would not hesitate a moment, and I would set to work to draw up a modified programme, and submit it. There are men, perhaps, who would think it was a game not worth the candle, and who would not take the trouble, and who would have no idea that their proposal would not be sanctioned.

7114. Do you think that that would be a very natural idea to come into their mind?—Yes.

7115. The evidence that we have had, as I understand, on the question of rejection of proposed modifications of the programme amounts to an expression of opinion that there have been some cases where new schemes have been proposed, but that in most of the cases they were not as good as the Board's own.—My recollection is that that evidence was given by the chief inspectors, that they have had applications of that sort, but that, in some instances, the programmes proposed to be substituted were not as good as the Board's programme.

The CHAIRMAN.—And were not sanctioned?—Oh, that is quite possible. They may have been undesirable. The portions of the subjects that were struck out were not approved of in the office, and probably they underwent some modification in the office, and that was sent back, and they were told that they could take up that programme. I have had a lot of these cases to deal with myself, and in a great many cases a modified programme has been adopted. When I say a great many, I do not mean hundreds. Perhaps there are a dozen of those cases.

7116. Mr. HENRY.—Proposed modified programmes of their own?—They submitted a modified programme.

7117. And it was accepted?—Yes; it was accepted, in some cases, with some slight modification.

7118. Substantially accepted?—Yes; here in Dublin even.

15th April, 1919.]

Mr. JAMES JOSEPH HYNES, M.A., examined

[Continued.]

7119. Were they obliged to keep in all the subjects?—Some subjects were left out. Formal grammar was left out in a recent case in Belfast, and I think history was omitted, and science was omitted, and then there was a considerable reduction in the arithmetic, and in the other branches.

7120. So HIRSH WILKINSON.—We have had some expression of opinion with regard to inspection and examination. Some are of opinion that any man going into the school, who has had experience of inspection, should in a very short time (I think, in one case, 10 minutes was mentioned, whether that was intended to mean really 10 minutes or only a short time) be able to tell very fairly well what the school was—I have no hesitation in saying that I would go into a school, and after spending two hours in it, would be perfectly able to say whether it was a good school, or a bad school, or a middling school; but I would not go any nearer than that.

Mr. COFFEY.—You would not go nearer than "good"?

7121. Sir HIRSH WILKINSON.—And would you do that in two hours?—I merely say that in round numbers. It is quite possible that I could do it in 10 minutes.

7122. In reference to school No. 4, on page 10—?—That is Templemore school?

7123. Yes; this is what the inspector says: "I made a visit on 26th September, 1919. Owing to the occurrence of play and religious instruction, I did not see much of the teaching in the school. I heard Mr. O'Grady then give them a history lesson, on which he made a great display of vigour, though the answering of the pupils was always in chorus, and I felt that if he were as energetic as that throughout the year, he would inevitably produce pretty good results." He adds, "On the 6th October, however, when I came to put some tests on the work that had been done, I found the pupils had no adequate grasp of what they had been taught." And he goes on to say, "When the inspection was over, and everyone out of the school, Mr. O'Grady asked me what I thought, and I said, 'There is a great lot of show about the work, but with nothing solid behind it.' To this he made no reply at all, because he knew only too well from what I saw and heard, that it was perfectly justifiable criticism."—That might happen.

7124. That case shows, at any rate, that a man making a very short visit could be very easily deceived as to the merits of the school?—Quite so.

7125. Mr. HARRISON.—Take this Templemore case, and turn to page 3. The teacher at that school made a complaint about the lowering of his merit mark, and when the teacher complains about the lowering of his merit mark, Mr. Welby's reply is this—"This is Templemore school, the teacher of which has for years been running a publichouse in his wife's name in the town of Cashel." Now, is that an element that ought to enter into the fixing of the merit mark of the school?—I am not aware that it entered into the merit mark.

7126. This document is Mr. Welby's reply to the complaint made with regard to the lowering of the merit mark. His reply is that the teacher keeps a publichouse in his wife's name?—I do not know. I do not think that that is the general report.

7127. But this is the reply of Mr. Welby. These are the observations on the cases that have been submitted in the appeal. These are the observations he makes with reference to those teachers who sign the appeal or memorial?

Mr. HARRISON.—The memorial comes after.

Mr. KERRIE.—The complaint is that the merit mark of the school has been abruptly lowered, and Mr. Welby's first reply is that the teacher keeps a publichouse. That is a very singular reply, and it does not point to good relations between Mr. Welby and that particular teacher at any rate?—I have not read this very carefully now, and I do not know whether I read it much before. The case was not in my division, and when I sent in my report, I had not any further dealing with it; but it would seem to me, from the glance I am taking now, that that remark is not very relevant.

7128. I understood you to suggest, at any rate, although not so definitely, that the discontent amongst the teachers was due largely to agitators?—I certainly say so.

7129. And from your investigation of the Glommal cases, you advise us to disregard all these charges about lack of courtesy or dictatorial bearing, as far as they affect Mr. Welby?—I forget the words in which I put it.

7130. You said that you could not conceive Mr. Welby as being anything except courteous and considerate?—Quite so.

7131. The point that I want to ascertain is this. There are 12 complaints emanating from the Glommal circuit. Am I, in every one of those 12 cases, to take Mr. Welby's word, and to disregard the teacher's word?—I do not say that.

7132. Is not that what it comes to?—I do not think so. In the case of the Rosegreen school, which is mixed up in this matter, Mr. Welby took exception to the teacher's manners, and the teacher took exception to Mr. Welby's manner.

7133. But in these particular cases, twelve teachers took exception to him?—Which twelve?

7134. Practically all of them mentioned in this document?—There is nothing in these remarks that would make me come to the conclusion that Mr. Welby was deficient in manner.

7135. There is also another case on page 8. I am only suggesting that the attitude of mind shown by Mr. Welby is hardly that of an impartial man?—But you must remember Mr. Welby was not inspecting under ordinary conditions at that time. He had been attacked and maligned, and naturally he felt sore about the treatment that he got. He would not be human if he had felt otherwise.

7136. Mr. COFFEY.—What had the publichouse to do with the appeal against his marks?—I think that remark of his is not relevant. If the teacher was running a publichouse, or was seen in a publichouse, the matter ought to have been reported in due course; it ought not to have been introduced here in the first instance.

7137. The CHAIRMAN.—Does not that mean that the keeping of a publichouse, either personally or vicariously, would interfere with education?—No; but that it is contrary to the regulations; it is a violation of rules.

7138. Mr. HARRISON.—It is not by way of a sneering remark, but that this man had other interests than his school?—That is what I took it to be.

7139. Mr. KERRIE.—That is not the impression which it gave me. Here is this document before me, who know nothing about any of these details. Your suggestion was that Mr. Welby was a very courteous and considerate man, and apparently always master of his temper; but I wish to point out to you that his own observations suggest the contrary?—I do not agree with that.

7140. It is also plain that Mr. Welby adopted an attitude of distrust towards his teachers?—Yes.

7141. Now, on page 3, you will find an instance in which, as to facts, there is no conflict between Mr. Mansfield and Mr. Welby. There is this statement by Mr. Welby:—"At the half-yearly meeting of the County Tipperary Teachers' Association, held in Thurles at the end of 1910 or beginning of 1911, I read in the Cork Examiner that Mr. Mansfield referred to the inspectors of schools, who he said were inefficient, and told how one of them had opened and invaded his school before school hours. On the 28th November, 1910, arriving at 9 o'clock, I got the key of this school from the adjacent cottage, where it is kept, and in virtue of the Commissioners' rule 3, I caused the door to be unlocked, and I went in and occupied my time in checking accounts, filling up report forms, etc., till Mr. Mansfield arrived." Now, do you think that account of the Inspector, who, without any particular grossness, entered the school-room, unlocking the door before the teacher is due to arrive, and proceeded to inspect the records is the attitude of a man who is always courteous and considerate?—I would not consider that discourteous conduct. It is a thing I would not do myself; but Mr. Welby would be better able to answer you on that subject than I would. I cannot imagine how he knew that the key was in the cottage next door.

7142. You will find an explanation of that further on?—I would not approve of that.

7143. But the element of distrust in it is very marked at any rate?—I do not see that at all. Mr. Welby is



12th April, 1913.]

Mr. JAMES JOSEPH HYND, M.A., CHAIRMAN.

[Continued.]

a very early bird. He arrived at 9 o'clock, and the key being available he went in, and the books, by right, should have been looked up, and he states that he found them lying on the desk and spent his time looking over them.

7144. Is it your suggestion that this discontent amongst the teachers is the result of artificial agitation?—To a very large extent, I should say, it is.

7145. Have you not described the system of inspection as an abominably bad system?—But you are confounding two things. The agitation which they commenced was against inspectors who were doing their work quite properly, and it should have been against the system.

7146. But you admit that in addition to a bad system you may have occasionally a bad inspector as well?—Yes.

7147. So that a priori it is quite possible if a teacher makes a complaint against the system and the inspector, that the teacher may be right?—Yes.

7148. And that a bad system in the hands of an equally bad inspector might become worse?—But the teacher can appeal to the Commissioners, and if the Commissioners found that the inspectors were in the wrong, they would punish them severely.

7149. The teachers have officially, by their organization, declared their absolute lack of confidence in the Commissioners?—Well, that may be; but that is also a result of the agitation.

7150. We have had it in evidence here from the North of Ireland, from a school manager, who ought to stand between the teachers and the Board, that the attitude of the inspectors towards the teachers in his district was brusque and rude?—I would not attach much importance to that general opinion; you cannot get many managers to agree with that. I was lately in a school, when the manager was there, when I met by appointment, and after discharging our business, I went looking over the observation book, because the teachers have repeatedly written and stated that the inspectors had a carping spirit, and they never gave credit for anything, and when I completed my work the manager was standing near, and I explained to him what I was doing, and I said: "Looking over that as an unprejudiced person, would you be inclined to say that the inspector was unwilling to give praise?" "Certainly not," he said; "the conviction on my mind from reading that book, is that each one of the inspectors was only too glad to say a good word when he could do it, and that is my conviction from reading the observations."

7151. Did you not tell us that the effect of the present system was that it put the teacher and the inspector into a pit to let them fight it out?—I would say that.

7152. Does not that opinion suggest that the teacher has a very substantial grievance?—Oh, yes; but the inspectors have a grievance too.

7153. And it is the grievance that the teachers have against the inspector that I am speaking of?—I say their statements are wrong; but I quite agree that the effect of the present system is to put the two against one another, and, of course, the thing is abominable.

7154. But the teachers have objected, both to the system and also to the personality of certain inspectors?—I suppose they have.

7155. And when it is admitted that they have a grievance under one head, is it not possible that they have a genuine grievance also under the other head?—In a few cases, there may; but, as a rule, they could not have that.

7156. Mr. HENRY.—They have not attacked many inspectors?—But where they made their attack the whole body seemed to be attacked.

7157. They have concentrated upon four or five at the most?—They specially singled out a certain number.

7158. The CHAIRMAN.—How many were really attacked in Belfast?—Some excellent men were.

7159. Two or three, I think?—Mr. Kerr was singled out.

7160. And Mr. McMillan was attacked, and was not Mr. Kelly attacked?—Yes; and the curious point is that Mr. Kerr was very much appreciated by the teachers in Belfast; but the leaders of the agitation kept that in the background.

7161. Mr. HENRY.—When an inspector writes in this way:—"The fact is that over the whole circuit awards were being given for work that hardly in any other part of Ireland would earn those awards. That is the situation with which I was placed in July, 1909." Is that not one inspector attacking another?—Well, it may be so regarded.

7162. Mr. HENRY.—Of course, there are teachers also, who resemble Carlyle's "Feather Brain, whom no reasoning could reach."—That may be. There are several.

7163. But I would suggest to you that that expression does not indicate a very excellent temper?—I would not approve of it. What are you reading him?

7164. From Mr. Welpy's comments on the teacher's complaints?—If you found that observation in the observation book, or in the report, I would agree with you; but here Mr. Welpy is put in a different position. He is being attacked, and he knows very well that a lot of those charges are trumped up.

7165. Here is another sentence:—"Mr. Barry states that I am not like a man who would listen to any explanation from a teacher respecting pupils' irregular attendance or inability to learn." (That is really a point on which a teacher could give an inspector information). "This is unfortunate, and I do not know what I can do to obtain this likeness."—When a man is attacked in that way, unfairly attacked, he is not generally in a very amiable mood.

7166. My complaint is that a teacher working under an abominable system cannot be expected to be in an amiable mood either, and that wherever they complain, it is attributed to artificial agitation?—No one requires or expects a teacher to be amiable.

7167. If irritated by a bad system they are a little bit rhetorical, is it reasonable to dismiss their discontent as artificial agitation?—I would not dismiss it on that account.

7168. But were you not suggesting that to the minds of this Committee?—I do not think I was.

7169. I thought you were suggesting that?—Well, I was trying to bring out that the system was radically wrong, that the teachers had a grievance against the system, but instead of attacking the system or the Board directly, they used the inspector as a stalking horse, and attacked the inspectors. All the inspectors are not perfect, I know; but take them all round, they are a most earnest body of men, even though a few black sheep may come in amongst them. If these men do anything wrong, the teacher has a right to make an appeal, and that appeal would be heard.

7170. Mr. HENRY.—Have not appeals been refused?—What kind of appeals?

7171. An appeal against the marking?—Asking for reinspection?

7172. Yes?—I believe that has been refused in a great many cases; but remember now I am only speaking of that from hearsay. I was not dealing with them. But I have been informed that there have been a good many cases in which appeals have been refused?—There may have been nothing to justify them.

7173. How could that be determined till the appeal was heard?—But they should establish a *prima facie* case.

7174. Mr. COOPER.—Can you suggest any explanation why in this Council business a number of cases of schools were sent to you in which the teachers had not complained at all?—Were sent to me?

7175. Yes, and that a number were not sent to you in which the teachers had complained?—I explained that before; that the Resident Commissioner picked out the cases that would be most favourable to the teacher; but why the other cases were put in in which there had not been complaints, I did not know that. I do not think I observed that, and I do not know any reason for it at all.

7176. But could you suggest any reason why the Resident Commissioner did not give you the other cases?—I have told you already the reason the Resident Commissioner gave me for selecting these. He told me that he selected these because he thought they were cases in which the teachers had the strongest case.

7177. That was only five; but why did he send you a number of others in which there was no appeal?—I can only surmise what happened with respect to the

others. When the Resident Commissioner went around he probably visited these schools, and thought they were undermarked; but in the last he handed to me, I do not think Longmore was included, and I think he added that afterwards.

7178. Mr. HENRY.—There was one in which the mark was "excellent"?—And that was a school that was overmarked; but in the last he handed to me, I do not think Longmore was included, and I think he added that afterwards.

7179. Mr. KERR.—In the case of the "falsification of accounts," do you not think that is an unduly harsh term. It suggests an element of embezzlement, but I suppose there is nothing of that sort in it?—Yes, in some cases; owing to the falsification of accounts large sums of money have been paid. I think in one case it amounted to £30 or £40, and that had to be paid by the teachers owing to falsification of accounts.

7180. Falsification of the records of attendance?—Yes, of the records of attendance, running up the average fictitiously.

7181. Mr. HENRY.—Are you aware of the opinion of one of the chief inspectors that that error of £30 was a pure oversight?—I do not even know the case that you are referring to at all. I do not know as much about it as you imagine I do. I do not know the case.

7182. Mr. KERR.—Does it strike you at all as significant that in two different parts of the country, differing so much in temperament and religion, and attitude towards life, as Belfast and Tipperary, exactly the same sort of complaint should occur—does that strike you as significant?—Yes, it does.

7183. That is in spite of differences of religion and general outlook the teachers make exactly the same complaints in Clonmel that they do in Belfast?—I think I explained that before. I told you that some of the inspectors carried on the old policy of being satisfied with the very low standard that they used to have during the early days of the system, while other inspectors, keener and more alert, adopted a higher standard, and Mr. Weply was one of them.

7184. I would like to explain that I am not making any personal attack on Mr. Weply. It is a case in which we have two stories, one submitted by Mr. Weply and the other by the teachers. It is said that there are two sides to every story, and these seemed to be two sides to the story here?—I am always dissatisfied when a story is not put in proper form. I do not like people when they tell me a thing to be indulging in reckless statements, and statements about things that occurred years before, that you cannot investigate at all. Quite recently I met a teacher that I knew years ago. He has come up to Dublin to be in charge of a very important school. This question of complaints about inspectors cropped up, and I said: "Mr. so and so, you saw a lot of the inspectors. How did they deal with you?" And he said: "I have not a word to say against them myself, but Mr. so and so told me—", and I said: "There you are, give me your experience." I object to all these things being magnified and distorted.

7185. Mr. HENRY.—Did he make no complaint?—Who?

7186. The teacher that you referred to?—He did not make any complaint of anything.

7187. Did he not make a complaint against the observation of a junior inspector?—No, not that I know of; he told me nothing about it, and perhaps we are not referring to the same man at all.

7188. Mr. KERR.—You do not approve of this six-fold classification of merit marks—what would you put in the place?—It is a thing that would want great alteration. My idea is that the teachers ought to get their increments annually and automatically.

7189. Would you retain some sort of merit mark?—Teachers should get their increments automatically and annually, unless deterred by grave irregularity or inefficiency on their part. A small bonus of, say, £4 to £10, to be paid in full for high efficiency only,

and to be withheld for marked want of efficiency or for serious irregularity, would provide sufficient incentive to earnest work.

7190. Of course, that change would tend to remove some, at any rate, of the difficulties?—Practically all of them.

7191. Mr. HENRY.—You have told us that in some cases Dr. Stankie tried to influence you, at any rate, in one case?—No.

7192. He brought under your notice that a school was too highly marked?—He did not do that at all with the idea of influencing me. He said to me that that was his opinion of the schools, and he said it in a very cautious way, not in a humptious way at all. He said: "That is the impression the school gave to me, and I would like to get your opinion about." If my opinion differed from his, he would not get cross or annoyed at all about it.

7193. Did he try to get your opinion about the marking of the inspectors?—No, I do not think so. In some cases where he thought the inspector was rather slack attention was called to that, and he directed me to communicate with them; but I think of late years he has communicated with Mr. Wye.

7194. I think we have had it in evidence that the drift of the communication was to remove slackness?—Well, to a great extent, yes; but in any case he gave me a list of schools, some of which he thought were over-marked, and some under-marked.

7195. Mr. CONWAY.—You told us about those Belfast teachers being hard-headed, shrewd, good business people?—Yes.

7196. You told us later on that a teacher went round and asked them to sign the appeal, and that they signed this memorial or appeal without any grounds for it?—Yes, so I believe.

7197. Do you think that a couple of hundred teachers of Belfast would sign an appeal without having a feeling that they had a grievance?—Well, they had a grievance. A good many of them had some grievance. Every man has a grievance. I am sure you have a grievance yourself. I know I have plenty of them, and very likely if you came round to me and ask me to sign a memorial, if it was not in very extreme terms, I might sign it.

7198. I have a very high opinion of the Belfast teachers, and when I see them to the number of three, or four, or five hundred in their Association passing a resolution that they have lost confidence in their inspector, and have been treated with harshness and injustice, I cannot think they would do so without having very good grounds for it?—Well, I have gone into schools in Belfast, and they have expressed views quite different from those, and rebutting them completely.

7199. That is a charge against Belfast teachers?—Not against the body; I think they are an excellent body.

7200. Sir HENRY WILKINSON.—May I just put this to you, from a memorandum that comes from the London County Council?—Teachers who were in the service of the London Authority in March, 1904, are therefore entitled to proceed to the maximum of the scale of salaries under which they were appointed, without any restriction, except such as had been deemed guilty of grave misconduct. Do you approve of that?—Yes.

7201. "—In these cases the teacher suffered the loss of one normal increment only, and not the loss of an increment each year till the maximum was reached." You quite agree with that?—Yes, I quite agree with that.

7202. "In this connection it may be mentioned that under this regulation, very few teachers have suffered loss of increment," and I hope you would arrive at the same conclusion?—Certainly.

7203. And here is another thing that I think you will agree with, perhaps, with a slight modification, that head teachers of elementary schools proceed to the maximum of the scale without being subject to any special report on their work?—Yes.

## FIFTEENTH DAY.—THURSDAY, APRIL 17TH, 1913.

At 23, Kildare-street, Dublin.

Present:—Sir SAMUEL DILL, M.A., LL.D., LL.B. (Chairman); The Most Rev. DENIS KELLY, D.D., Bishop of Ross; Sir HIRAN SHAW WILKINSON, LL.D.; Mr. JOHN COFFEY; Mr. HENRICH E. B. HARRISON, B.A.; Mr. JEREMIAH HENLY; and

Mr. ARTHUR J. DONNELLY, M.A., B.Sc., Secretary.

Rev. J. HENRICH, M.A., D.D., Minister of Dundonald, and Convener of the Committee on Elementary Education of the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church, examined.

7204. The CHAIRMAN.—You have put in our hands a very clear statement of the evidence you propose to give, and I understand that you have a folder document, of which you wish to read portions for us?—Yes.

7205. Now, may I ask, how long have you been in your present position as Minister of Dundonald?—Thirty years.

7206. And how long have you been Convener of the General Assembly's Committee?—I have been Convener for five years. I have had experience as a manager of National schools for 38 years, and I have been for 21 years a member of the General Assembly's Committee on Elementary Education, and for five years have acted as Convener.

7207. Twenty-one years a member of the Committee?—Yes; and I may add that the substance of the evidence I am going to give was submitted to the Committee, and has its approval.

7208. That is, generally, I suppose?—Yes; I did not submit a statement verbatim to the Committee.

7209. But the evidence you are going to give represents their views?—Yes.

7210. Is that all you have to say as to your experience?—I think so.

7211. How many National schools have you had under you?—At the present time I have three.

7212. Are they rural schools?—I suppose there is one in the village of Dundonald? There are two schools, male and female, in Dundonald village, which is partly rural and partly residential.

7213. The children come from the country?—Yes, most of them do.

7214. And the others live in the village?—Yes; we have a certain proportion of people who are Belfast people, suburban people; but the majority of the children are the children of agricultural labourers, I should say.

7215. You are getting a town about you there?—Oh, yes.

7216. What is the other school?—The other school is a small school up in the hills, above Holywood.

7217. That is purely rural?—That is purely rural.

7218. What are the numbers in the male and female schools?—Well, the male and female schools have each of them on their rolls upwards of 100 pupils.

7219. And the little rural school in the hills?—Well, I cannot just give the figure, but I should say the average is about 48.

7220. And what are the grades of the teachers of the two schools?—The rank of the teachers of the two schools in Dundonald is first of first.

7221. Mr. HENLY.—Is that classification or grade?—That is both classification and grade. I believe I am correct in saying that.

7222. The CHAIRMAN.—What is the standing of the teacher of the rural school?—Well, the standing of the teacher, I think, is only third grade.

7223. I suppose the number would not allow the teacher to go higher?—No, I should think not. It is a woman teacher.

7224. The attendance is under 300?—No, it is not. I have not been very long manager of it; so I do not know the details of it quite fully.

7225. Mr. HENLY.—How long has the teacher of the small rural school been appointed?—She was appointed a good many years ago, but I am only recently the manager.

7226. The CHAIRMAN.—You do not know the school history?—I am not sure of the date of her appointment.

7227. Mr. HARRISON.—What is the size of that school?—I should say between 40 and 50.

7228. On the roll?—Yes.

7229. The CHAIRMAN.—Now, you deal with the subject of the inspection of schools, and you have a complaint to make about the notice of the inspection of a school being too short?—Yes. I desire to call attention to a matter in the inspection of schools, with which I know that a number of managers are much dissatisfied. Rule 66 is in the following terms: "When an inspector visits a school, not for a formal inspection, but with the intention of spending a considerable time therein, he should, when practicable, cause the manager to be notified of his presence. If the manager resides at such a distance that this course would present difficulty, he should receive notification of the proposed visit of the inspector, by post, on the morning of the visit." Perhaps, I could best illustrate the working of this rule by mentioning how it operated in three inspections of the three schools of which I happen to be manager. In the first instance, the inspector sent a message to me while the examination was in progress; but, as I happened to have left by an early train, I did not get the message till eight o'clock at night. In the second case a similar course was followed, and when I got the message, I was obliged to give up urgent work on a moment's notice, and go and spend some hours in the school. In the third case, where I was particularly anxious to see the inspector about some improvements that we desired to have made on his suggestion, I happened to be from home overnight, and did not get his note, which came by the morning post of the day on which he examined, till the following day. For this, I do not, of course, blame the inspectors. They were only carrying out the rules. But, surely, if a manager is entitled to notice at all, he is entitled to such notice as will give him a reasonable opportunity of being present, and of arranging to be present with the least possible inconvenience to his other duties. If a manager has a proper appreciation of his position, and a real interest in the school he manages, he will desire to be present. Rule 65 states that "The inspectors are not at liberty to give direct orders in a school, but after each visit, they should communicate personally, or in writing, with the managers, with reference to matters requiring their attention, and to the general condition of the schools, and they should make such suggestions as they deem necessary." The manager has a right to be present and see how the inspection is conducted. If the inspector desires to bring any matters connected with the condition or work of the school under his notice, it can often be best done in a personal interview, and the time of the inspection is often the most convenient for this. The reason, I presume, for such short notice is the desire to pay a surprise visit, and the fact that the manager could not be trusted to keep the information from the teacher. In what is known as the "tore circular," it is laid down that "tore" is the most important characteristic of a school, and it is largely by the tone that the value of a school as an educational institution should be ascertained. It is also stated that the formation of character, and the training in good habits, give to a school its tone, and in the production of these it is the teacher's character that has the most influence. Now, even if the manager did inform the teacher of the time of inspection, it is difficult to see how any radical change could be made in the character of the teacher, or the character and habits of the children in two or three days. Indeed, there seems to me a good

17th April, 1918.]

REV. J. BOWMAN, M.A., D.D., examined.

[Continued.]

deal to be said in favour of giving both manager and teacher proper notice of the regular inspection of the school.

7230. These remarks apply to the general inspection?—Yes, to what is known as the general inspection.

7231. Now, in spite of the shortness of notice, of which others also have made complaints before us, I suppose you have been present at inspections frequently?—Oh, yes; frequently.

7232. Under the old system and under the new?—Yes.

7233. And of recent years you found fault with the inspection, and you complain of the difficulties of inspection?—Yes.

7234. Would you develop that?—Well, in seeking to form a correct judgment upon the present system of inspection, it seems to me necessary to take into account the great change which it meant and the difficulties that it imposed on the inspectors. The old system of payment by results was very largely a mechanical one; there was a minute examination of each child, and the figure 1, 2, or 3, was assigned by the inspector, according to the quality of the answer. These figures were easily translated into money, and the amount of the payment was estimated accordingly. The new order of things inaugurated in 1900 brought a new conception of the inspector's work. He was no longer to be a mere examiner, but an inspector; mere mechanical examination was discouraged and discredited. Rule 60 states that—"Visits for the general report may, as a rule, be short, and impressions of the school should be gained by an observation chiefly of the department, address and intelligence of the pupils, together with a careful examination of the school syllabus, scheme of work and written exercises." In a circular which the Commissioners addressed to inspectors and sent to managers, they put the main stress on "tone," which the circular described as almost indefinable. In his book on "What is and What Might Be," Mr. Holmes puts great emphasis on the difficulty that English inspectors and teachers alike felt in passing from a mechanical condition of things, such as prevailed before 1900 in Ireland, to a new order of things such as obtains with us now, and he shows how they were crippled and hampered. Both inspectors and teachers in Ireland have laboured under the same difficulty, and one cannot wonder that inspectors, fairly well advanced in life, and long accustomed to the old order of things, did not easily adapt themselves to the new regime. Besides, new subjects were introduced, with which inspectors and teachers were alike unfamiliar. I am not to be taken as objecting to the abolition of the results system, I think its abolition was a step in the right direction, and I am very favourable to such subjects as object lessons, drill, kindergarten and cookery; I set great store on cookery—even quite elementary cookery. My experience as a manager is, that no difficulty is found in getting the children to bring the materials, and to teacher and children it is, perhaps, the most interesting lesson in the day's work. I ought, perhaps, to say, that in the school to which I refer, there is a separate room for the purpose, and the stove and apparatus have been provided. I think every possible facility should be given to the teachers in teaching cookery, and that they should not be asked to bear any of the expenses that are incurred. Then, again, the new system of inspection gives the inspector great power over the teacher's salary. The teacher must climb up slowly and laboriously from the bottom of the scale. He owes his promotion and his increments, in practice, solely to the report of the inspector. Then there comes into operation the fact that the period covered by the inspection varies greatly; the question of the varying social grades of the children of schools in different localities, and the awarding of a separate mark to each teacher, apart from the general work of the school. All this the inspector has got to do on the impression gained by two or three short visits at most in the year. Taking all these considerations into account, the task set the inspectors was one of great difficulty, and from some conversations I have had with inspectors, I question whether some of them have taken an adequate measure of the difficulties. That is what I have to say under the head of difficulties.

7235. That is very clear, and that is your expression of your view of the difficulties of inspectors under the system established in 1900?—Quite so.

7236. Now, when you have been present at inspections, have you noticed a thing that has been put before us very strongly by some other witnesses, that the inspectors under the new system have generally been merely critical, and that they seldom help or advise the teacher?—Yes.

7237. That their methods are rather fault finding and critical?—Yes.

7238. Then in the way of admonition or advice?—Yes. Well, I know that that charge has been made, and I think there is a good deal of justification for it.

7239. Have you heard teachers complain of that?—Oh, frequently, and I propose to deal with that later on. I propose to deal with that when I come to consider the qualifications for inspectors.

7240. Now, as to want of uniformity in the estimates of the inspectors as to the efficiency and intelligence of the work done in the school, you have something to say to that?—Yes, I just want to develop that point. I may say that I have not armed myself with a list of specific cases where grievances have arisen, nor am I prepared to enter into charges against individual inspectors, but in a query sheet that I issued to a number of Presbyterian managers, I asked, in confidence, the marks of the schools in the Belfast districts under Presbyterian management for six successive years—1904 to 1909. I got returns from 138 schools. From these returns I read out to two teachers the marks without giving the names of the schools. The teachers estimated that in 14 cases the marks had been lowered in the second triennial period as compared with the first, and in a number of instances private letters from managers accompanied the returns, complaining of the unaccountable lowering of these marks. Take one of the schools that I manage. The master is a most competent, painstaking teacher, a B.A. and an LL.B. of the Royal University. For a number of years he had an unbroken series of "very good," then the mark fell from "very good" to "good." From an intimate knowledge of the school, I know of no decline in the teaching. The only means of accounting for it was the advent of a new inspector. This case illustrates what has always seemed to me one great defect of the working of the system. It is the want of a common standard amongst inspectors. On 6th February, 1911, as appears from a pamphlet entitled "Inspection of Schools and Promotion of Teachers," a deputation of Belfast teachers waited on the Resident Commissioner, and laid before him a detailed statement of their complaints in reference to the lowering of marks in the Belfast districts. The following occurs in the reply of the Commissioner to the deputation:—"Doubtless the returns indicate that some of the inspectors now in Belfast are stricter than their predecessors. But, on the other hand, there is evidence that for five or six years subsequently to 1900 the standard of marking—at any rate in the County Down—was unduly low as compared with other parts of Ireland." Now, this seems to me clear proof, on the acknowledgment of the Commissioners themselves, that the complaint of the want of a common standard was amply justified. Avowedly, there were different standards in the County Down and the rest of Ireland, and this was allowed to continue for five or six years. How could it be expected that teachers would be content with such a state of things? Assuming that the standard was too low, the Commissioners were certainly culpable in permitting this for so long. I consider that the body of inspectors should have opportunities of conferring and discussing questions together, so as to arrive at a common standard. Secret and arbitrary instructions from the Office should be avoided, and measures should be taken to secure that this common standard would be adhered to throughout the whole country. If a common standard cannot be reached, then clearly the system is unworkable.

7241. You have mentioned, I think, or at least you have implied, that you attributed some of the want of uniformity to frequent changes of the inspectors?—Yes.

17th April, 1918.]

Rev. J. BINGHAM, M.A., D.D., examined.

[Continued.]

7242. Is it your experience that the changes are too frequent, and that an inspector is not allowed to remain long enough in a district to become acquainted with it?—Well, I could not say that from my own personal experience. That has not been so much my complaint as the fact that when that change did occur, this change of marking occurs. We have had inspectors, I think, for fairly long periods.

7243. We have had it in evidence that changes are very rapid in some places?—Yes.

7244. We had yesterday the case of a school which had been under five inspectors in five years. I thought that, perhaps, was what you referred to?—No. It was not so much that the changes were so frequent as that when the changes did occur they frequently seemed to make a change in the marking. I believe that some of the facts that have come under my notice relating to other districts would bear out what you have just suggested, that changes seemed to be very frequent.

7245. Have you, in watching the course of inspection, or in being present at an inspection, had reason to complain of the manner and tone of the inspectors?—No, I am pleased to say not. I never had a personal misunderstanding with an inspector in my life.

7246. Or in their treatment of the teachers?—Well, I could not say that.

7247. Nothing that you could find fault with?—Well, really, it is not worth mentioning, but once a very long time ago I thought an inspector was sharp, though, perhaps, not unduly sharp, with a teacher, but that was before the present system came into operation.

7248. That is the only instance you can recall?—Yes.

7249. Have you received complaints from your teachers at any time of inspectors being over critical and fault-finding?—Well, they have suggested to me that in the entry in the observation book the inspectors have been unduly critical.

7250. Have you had occasion at all to convey the complaints of teachers about their marks to the National Education Board?—No. Of course, you understand that I have prepared my evidence more in reference to the general state of things than to my own personal experience.

7251. But have you heard of such cases in talking with your colleagues?—Yes; I have heard of a number of cases where people had to complain, and as I have already mentioned that one inquiry about that I sent out brought in a number of private letters, complaining of the undue lowering of marks.

7252. Have you anything to say about the number of the marks made, six of them, as rendering anything like uniformity very difficult—have you considered that?—Yes, I have considered it to some extent, and I must say that I think it is not easy for an inspector to grade schools in that very minute way.

7253. It is not easy for two inspectors to reach the same conclusion in making these minute distinctions?—I think it is not easy. Of course, I have heard it suggested that it would be better to reduce the number.

7254. Perhaps you would like to give us your suggestions as to how greater uniformity could be reached?—I think that is, perhaps, the only suggestion that I have on that head. There is another matter to which I wish to draw attention, but I do not know whether it comes in just in that connection or not. Well, in a letter to the Belfast teachers in November, 1910, the Resident Commissioner declined "to give formal public recognition to the precise rules regulating the increment and promotion." It has also transpired that in addition to the mark of the school a personal mark is given to each teacher. This, I consider, a perfectly fair thing, but why in this mark not made known? Why was the very existence of such a mark kept for so long a secret? This economy of information is fitted to foster and deepen the spirit of suspicion and discontent. I think that a good deal of the discontent all round has been brought about by secrecy.

7255. Especially with regard to that personal mark?—Yes, with regard to that personal mark, and, in fact, in regard to a number of things. It is very

difficult to get information, and very difficult to arrive at the true condition of things.

7256. Have you any suggestions as to how to secure greater uniformity?—Well, I do not think that I have considered that point at length, beyond a suggestion which has occurred to me, that if inspectors were allowed to order more, so as to arrive at a common standard, it might meet the difficulty. I think the inspectors work separately; they work very much in watertight compartments.

7257. Do you mean a conference on a large scale, in which the inspectors of all the circuits would meet?—Yes, I think so.

7258. Because we have it in evidence that the three inspectors hold conferences in the separate circuits?—I do not think that that really meets the case, because you may have one standard here in Dublin and you may have another standard in Belfast, and another standard in the South of Ireland. I think if that system could be worked at all it ought to be possible to arrive at a common standard of marks that would prevail and obtain all over.

7259. Would you recommend a general conference of the twenty-two senior inspectors at regular intervals?—I would recommend conferences, so as to arrive at some understanding.

7260. Do you mean conferences on a large scale?—Yes.

7261. Of all the inspectors from the different districts?—I do not see why all the inspectors should not have the benefit of knowing the opinions of those, perhaps, most competent to judge, and of comparing their own with them. People engaged in a common work often meet and compare their views.

7262. Now, have you any other suggestion to make?—I do not know, but, perhaps, you would put a question to me with regard to any other.

7263. The BISHOP or BOST?—You are aware, no doubt that the Chief Inspector goes round to the eleven circuits?—Yes.

7264. With the object of taking steps to secure uniformity?—Yes.

7265. You are aware of that?—Yes.

7266. Would you like to have a national gathering at least once a year, perhaps?—Yes, I would like to have a gathering of inspectors, and I think I have heard it suggested also that some special training might be given to inspectors.

7267. The CHAIRMAN.—I was coming to that presently. Now, I wish to have your view as to the value to inspectors of practical experience of teaching in National schools such as you have mentioned?—Yes.

7268. Might I take that to imply a demand that some of the teachers put before you—that all inspectors should gain their places by promotion from the ranks of the National teachers?—No.

7269. You would not favour that?—No, I am not prepared to suggest that.

7270. You are aware that that demand has been made?—Well, I am not prepared to go so far as that.

7271. Would you explain to us what you mean by the practical experience in teaching that every inspector should have?—I would consider it a matter of great importance that inspectors should have some experience of teaching in a National school before they enter upon the duties of an inspectorate. Teachers complain of the fact that inspectors fill the observation books with defects and faults. No doubt it is necessary in some way to call attention to faults, but it would be of much greater service if an inspector could show, in practice, how these defects are to be remedied, and could give the teacher an example of the kind of teaching he recommends and expects. Now, I think anyone who has even a limited experience of teaching in a National school will say, that it gives him an insight into the nature and difficulties of the work which he can gain in no other way. I am not suggesting that the inspectorate should be recruited entirely from the ranks of teachers. I should certainly like to see a proportion of the inspectors taken from the teachers. But I believe in the value of a University career for inspectors, and if a University man has had previous experience of teaching, it should—other things being equal—be a strong point in his favour. Sir Selby Bigge, in his

evidence before the Royal Commission of Civil Service, mentions several cases of inspectors as teachers, graduates of Oxford and Cambridge who had previous experience of elementary schools, and he adds, "any number of men of that class whom we can get, I feel quite certain the Board would appoint," and speaking of those who had not such previous experience, he said: "It under any system of provisional employment, or taking them on trial either as examiners or inspectors, they could be sent out into schools to teach, or into the offices of local educational authorities to work at administration, I am sure it would be a great gain to the public service if they could serve an apprenticeship in that way. I think we would be able to combine the two qualifications of first-rate ability and experience, which it is often difficult to find in combination."

7272. That expresses your view?—That expresses my view in regard to the inspectors.

7273. You are aware, are you not, that there are twenty-two inspectors at present who have been National teachers?—I was not aware of the number.

7274. The Director or Boss.—That is roughly a third of the whole?—Yes.

7275. The CHAIRMAN.—How would you appoint an inspector—would you continue to appoint according to the present system, or would you go back to the old system of competitive examination?—I am not prepared to recommend competitive examination purely and simply as the test for the inspectors. On the other hand, I hardly like to say so much, but I am not sure that the Education Board, as it is at present, is the most competent body to appoint.

7276. Do you mean to appoint inspectors?—I do. What I would say is this. I think in England the appointment is in the hands of one or two persons, and I do think that if it were possible to get one or two thoroughly competent and thoroughly independent men to judge of the qualifications of the inspector, that would be the best way.

7277. You would not put it in the hands of one, would you?—Well, perhaps not. I think in England there is more than one concerned in the matter. I might say a small number; but if they advise, for instance, for inspectors, and say that there is to be no canvassing, that ought to be carried out.

7278. Now, you have mentioned canvassing. Do you know of the existence of that at present?—I think there has been some canvassing. I think I would be justified in saying that.

7279. Do you not regard that as a very serious criticism of the present system?—Do you mean the matter of canvassing?

7280. Yes?—Yes, I think I would regard it as such, but I do not like to make sweeping charges.

7281. That is as between the present system and competitive examination?—Yes.

7282. Do you think that the old system of appointing by competitive examination gave a better or worse type of men than the present system in your experience?—Well, that is putting me a question that I have not considered in that light. What I have to suggest, and I think is probably true, is that it is very doubtful if you can get a man to carry out the present difficult and delicate system of inspection satisfactorily with an initial salary of £150 a year.

7283. That is what they start with?—Yes. I think that is a very small salary to pay a man to discharge this duty.

7284. Would you make a definite proposal that the initial salaries of the inspectors should be raised?—I would suggest that in order to secure a better qualified candidate.

7285. Now, as to examination of the schools, do I understand that you object to the impressionist system of inspection carried to such a point as it is?—Yes, I do, and that is not only my opinion, but the opinion of a number of leading men in our Committee.

7286. That it leaves the thing far too much at the mercy of individual tastes and peculiarities?—Yes.

7287. And would you insist on a more detailed examination of the schools?—Well, a number of our managers are of opinion that a more detailed examination of our schools would enable inspectors to judge the work more accurately, and would be of real service to the schools. I am not advocating a return

to the old results system. What is suggested is, that more of the examination of individual pupils should be combined with what is best in the present system. Dr. Starke, in his inaugural address at the University Extension Lectures in Queen's University, Belfast, quotes with approval a saying of Ruskin, that "education is not teaching people to know what they do not know, but to behave as they do not behave." Surely, with all due respect to Ruskin and Dr. Starke, this is a great exaggeration of the truth. I do not yield to Dr. Starke in the store I set on good behaviour, but if knowledge is not one of the main instruments of education, what is the good of schools or the different branches of study taught in them? There are objections to examinations, but, on the other hand, I am convinced—and I know that some of the most experienced men agree in that view—that without examination the knowledge an inspector gets of a school is very superficial. Besides, when boys and girls go out into the world, there are subjects, like arithmetic, which many of them need to know. And the complaint is often heard that they are not taught these things as they used to be. Mr. Dale, in his report stated that the inspector, whose time was occupied with the holding of a detailed annual examination of every school, had little time for the work of the school. This, doubtless, was true before 1900. But it is very questionable whether, so far at least as a junior inspector is concerned, the present system is a great improvement. He has to make a multitude of queries, for which he has to make visits to distant schools. He has to fill up innumerable forms, to write innumerable letters, and to check a great number of books of record and forms in the school. In fact, his time is so much frittered away that little time is left for him for examination of schools. It would be a decided gain if the inspector could be relieved of a great deal of this routine work through the Office, or through special assistance given to him, so as to set free a larger portion of his time for inspection and examination.

7288. And the junior inspector might be set free from routine work. I was going to ask you what that really meant?—Yes.

7289. You refer to the filling up of these forms?—Well, I have quoted practically verbatim from a statement that I got from a junior inspector, in which he made a complaint that they had to do many things do—letters to write, visits to pay, and forms to check—that it absorbed a great deal of their time, and that he really would not have as much time for examining as he thought he ought to have.

7290. You know that some inspectors, even under the present system, examine a great deal more than others, and it is alleged that some of them like the old results system?—Yes, I have heard that stated. I do not think I have seen any inspector, as far as my experience extends, who goes so minutely into the work as they did under the old system, and I know that that is a complaint that is made by a good many of our managers.

7291. You have mentioned subjects that you lay stress on, the literary subjects, as you have called them. Do you think that under the present system these subjects are sufficiently taught, or that the boys go out less well prepared in reading, writing, and arithmetic than formerly?—Well, I may say that complaints have been made frequently.

7292. You have heard it?—I have heard it frequently.

7293. Would you support it yourself?—Well, personally, I am not quite so clear on the question when I take my own schools into consideration.

7294. The Dundonald Schools seem to be of a superior type. What other subjects have you there?—We have cookery, kindergarten, so far as we can go with our arrangements, drill, and singing. Mathematics, Elementary Science and French are also taught.

7295. Mr. HARRISON.—Those are extras?—Some of them are extras.

7296. Mathematics and French?—Yes.

7297. And taught out of school time?—Well, I think Mathematics is taught in school hours.

7298. The CHAIRMAN.—Have you heard of complaints in Belfast that the boys coming from Elementary

schools at 15 were really unfit for business, not knowing arithmetic?—Yes, that statement is general of late.

7209. Do you know that Mr. Forth made that charge, and that he insisted on having a preparatory school in Belfast?—Yes.

7210. The *DUNOR* or *ROSS*.—Would that affect the boys trained under the old system or those who were trained under the new—did the complaint of Mr. Forth apply to candidates who had been trained under the old system or under the new system?—I think it applied only to those under the new, because I think Mr. Forth was not in Belfast then.

7211. Mr. Forth was dealing with candidates of 16 or 18 years of age, and the question is—at what period they got their elementary education in the schools—would they have commenced to go to school somewhere about 1890 or 1892 or 1898, for he made his complaint about 1908 or 1904. The Department of Agriculture and Technical Instruction began its work on the 1st of April, 1900?—Yes.

7212. And, therefore, the first candidates that were got in were trained under the old system?—Yes.

7213. The *CHAIRMAN*.—I have just one more question. It is about the plan for a greater increase of salary in the early years of the teacher's service, and for consideration of the cases of the undergraded?—Yes. I presume there is no necessity to dwell on the very serious discouragement to teachers in the slow rate of promotion. Under the most favourable conditions a teacher must, as a rule, spend twelve years on third grade salary. It often happens that a teacher finds himself head master of a school, with several assistants, at a time of life when he ought to be in a position to get married, and on a salary of less than £100 a year. Such a condition of things cannot but create serious discontent, and deter young men from entering the teaching profession. I should also desire to call attention to the hardships of those teachers who are known as the undergraded. There must be a considerable number of teachers who had reached first class under the order of things before 1900. But because they happen to find themselves in small schools they are shut out from the hope of receiving increments or promotion. I would strongly urge their claims to increased salary and promotion where they are rendering faithful service. Perhaps I might give you this extract:—"School averages alone keep 90 per cent. of the teachers out of the highest division of the first grade, and 75 per cent. out of the second division of first grade, while those confined by averages to the third or lowest grade number upwards of 50 per cent. of the profession. As a matter of fact, owing to other conditions besides averages, the vast bulk of the profession—nearly 70 per cent.—are at present drawing salary of the very lowest grade."

7214. Have you anything further to add on these points?—I have something to say in reference to the restriction of the liberty of teachers.

7215. Sir *EMUSE WINTERSHAW*.—Just before going to the question of the restriction of the liberty of teachers. I should like to refer to the question of the appointment of inspectors. You are, no doubt, familiar with the different ways in which men are appointed to the Civil Service. There is open competition, limited competition, and unrestricted patronage. Now, limited competition covers in practice several systems, but the system I think most favoured is that in which a preliminary inquiry is made by, or on behalf of, the authority which nominates as to the qualifications of the candidates, and their suitability for the office if they should happen to be appointed. They are then subjected to a qualifying competition, and those who take first place in the competition are appointed, and the success in the competition determines the persons who are to be appointed. You are familiar with that?—Well, more or less.

7216. Now I will refer to one particular department, in which there is a Committee of the Office appointed to interview the candidates, and they are put upon a list if they satisfy the Committee, and they may be called up when a vacancy occurs and an examination is going to be held. Now, looking at the Board as it is, and with your knowledge of the department, you have suggested, as I understand, that there should be a committee of one or two persons who would

make the nomination. Would you choose them from the Board or Department, or would you have an outside committee?—Well, I think if you have a fully competent outside committee it might be best. I do not wish to reflect, you understand, upon the Board, but I am not quite clear that the Board is the most competent body for selecting inspectors. That is my candid opinion.

7217. At the present time in our Department in England, where there is a large number of persons to be appointed, and certain qualifications are required, the choosing of the candidates falls practically upon a committee drawn from the Department and from the Civil Service Commission?—From the Education Department?

7218. Well, I was speaking of another department. The Education Department is in a peculiar position of its own, but I was speaking really of the Labour Department. That is one form of a committee. Could you make any suggestion as to the choosing or the formation of a committee for this purpose who would command confidence and respect?—That is a point that has not been under consideration by me, and I would not like to offer an opinion.

7219. But do you agree generally with the suggestion that there should be limited competition, and that the persons chosen to enter the competition should only be allowed to enter that competition if the committee nominating are satisfied that each of these would be a fit person to be an inspector if he were appointed?—Generally, I think that would represent my view.

7220. And then that there should be such an examination as would, so far as competitive examinations can, lead to the appointment of the best men?—Yes. I would have a certain test, of course, in the matter of examination, but I would not put the entire stress on that.

7221. There is a point I want to make quite clear. You would not allow any choice afterwards as between the candidates except by examination, the candidates in the meantime having been nominated before the examination, and having entered into a competitive examination?—Yes; that is, they would be selected beforehand, and then they would be examined, and the best taken out then.

7222. And the appointment would always depend upon the result of the examination?—Yes, I think that would be reasonable.

7223. You can see what a grievance would arise if there were, for instance, ten inspectors to be appointed, and the first five were not appointed at all after the examination, although they had passed as the best men?—Do you mean the first men to have been tested and examined?

7224. Yes—the men who had taken the highest places at the examination?—Yes.

7225. You can understand what a grievance would be felt by those who took the higher places if men who took lower places were afterwards chosen and appointed and they were not?—Yes.

7226. The point is this, would you agree that the selection of the men should take place before the examination?—That is before the examination or after?

7227. Yes?—Well, really, all that involves details which, as I say, were not very clearly before my mind, but I agree with you in a general sort of way.

7228. I may mention that the prevailing opinion with regard to the Civil Service is, that if there is to be a limited competition, the nomination should always precede the examination, and the examination should, except in the case of a man who failed to pass the medical examination, determine the appointment?—What I am strong on is, if I may say so, that the Inspector ought to have practical experience of teaching, and I would appoint no man, I think, an Inspector who had not some practical experience of the work of a National school.

7229. And that it would be the duty of the committee who nominated the candidate to see that they fulfilled that condition?—I think it should be, certainly.

7230. Now, you have mentioned the question of the restriction of the liberty of teachers?—I just propose to give you an extract from the proceedings of the Church Body, to which I belong, to state exactly what was done, as I am speaking for them. The teachers

have often complained that their liberty is unduly restricted in the exercise of their civil rights. This question was considered by the Committee on Elementary Education in the year 1910, and their Report to the General Assembly of that year, after quoting Rules 88 (b) and 89 (a), paragraphs 1 and 2, in the consideration of the question, it was pointed out that National school teachers are not the only persons on whom restrictions have been placed in these matters. In Ireland, judges and other persons who draw their salaries from the Exchequer, are prohibited from taking any part in politics, except by voting, and clergymen of all denominations are debarred by statute from membership of County and District Councils. The Committee is of opinion that the right to take part in politics would not be likely to be abused by many of our Presbyterian teachers. But in view of the object of the National system, which is "to afford combined literary and moral and separate religious instruction to children of all persuasions as far as possible in the same school," and in view, also, of the sharp divisions and strong feeling on political questions in Ireland, the Committee regrets that in present circumstances it cannot recommend the complete removal of the restrictions which prevent teachers in general from taking an active part in political meetings. But as the prohibition of their attendance at meetings held for political purposes seems an unnecessary restriction, and has, doubtless, proved inviting to teachers, the Committee recommends that it be removed." To the Report the following amendment was moved:—"That the Report, with the omission of the paragraph beginning, 'in the consideration of the question,' under the heading, 'Civil Rights of National School Teachers,' be received and adopted, and that the Commissioners of National Education in Ireland be requested to omit Rules 88 (b) and 89 (a) from their Rules and Regulations." This amendment was carried by 184 votes to 120. I just wanted to state exactly what was done by our Church Body, and to leave the matter with you in that way.

7321. THE CHAIRMAN.—Would you mind summarising in a few words the decision arrived at?—The summary, in a few words, is just that these rules should be withdrawn, and that the teachers should have the ordinary exercise of their civil rights. I wanted just to let you know there are two sides to the question. The Committee went a certain length, and the General Assembly, by a small majority, carried an amendment.

7322. SIR HERMAN WILKINSON.—The object of the amendment being to give to the National teachers full liberty to exercise their civil rights in the same way as any other citizen might do, who has no restriction by reason of his employment with the State?—Yes, that is what it would come to.

7323. Then, with regard to the publication of the rules?—The Board of National Education, by its constitution, possesses enormous powers. Its members are appointed by the Lord Lieutenant. The public have no knowledge of how the members attend or how they vote. They have no knowledge of the proceedings of the Board, except what they can gain from the meagre and inadequate information contained in the belated Annual Reports of the Commissioners. Amongst the powers of the Board is that of changing their own rules, and every year a series of changes is made, which is indicated in the opening pages of the rules. In the last issue of the rules no less than 19 pages were occupied with these changes. The only limitations, so far as I know, of their power of rule-making, is to be found in No. 4 of "The Fundamental Principles of the System of National Education." It is as follows:—"The Commissioners do not change any fundamental rule without the express permission of His Excellency the Lord Lieutenant." Whether the Commissioners are bound to ask the consent of His Excellency, or who is to be the judge of what is a fundamental rule, I, for my part, am unable to say. In the rules for 1906-7 I find the following:—"179 (b) . . . . . Where a substantial majority of the children belong to one denomination the principal teacher must belong to that denomination. N.B.—The majority is determined by the average attendance of the preceding year." That is 179 (b); that is in the rules for 1906-7.

That rule has been blotted out. "Where a substantial majority of the children belong to a denomination different from that of the principal teacher an assistant teacher of the denomination of such minority must be appointed if the average attendance permits." I find from the minutes of the Committee at which I am the Convener that a series of resolutions was passed strongly protesting against this rule, and was forwarded to the Lord Lieutenant. The Lord Lieutenant refused his sanction to the rule and it was deleted from the rules. I take it that that principle which I have stated, about the sanction of the Lord Lieutenant, is not strictly adhered to by the Board, and even if it were adhered to, it would afford no guarantee that the public would have an opportunity of pronouncing an opinion upon a proposed change before it comes into operation. I have four suggestions to make. The first is that the attendances of each of the Commissioners for the year be recorded in the annual report of the Commissioners. 2. That an authorised Report of matters of public importance dealt with by the Board be communicated regularly to the Press. I do not go the length of suggesting that the Press should be admitted, or that everything which takes place on the Board should be made public. But it is absolutely intolerable that matters of the greatest public interest and importance should be carefully concealed, and that the Commissioners themselves should be subject to a charge of breach of faith if individually they make these matters known. I feel it to be in the nature of a humiliation to receive under the seal of secrecy what I have a right to know as a member of the community. 3. Important changes in the rules and regulations should be known to the public for a reasonable time before they come into operation. Whether by allowing the rules to lie on the table of the House of Commons for a period before they are adopted, or by publishing the proposed changes beforehand, or in some other way that this Committee may think preferable, this result ought to be accomplished. 4. During the years 1911-12 the Board invited representatives of the managers and teachers to confer with a committee of their own members on three occasions. The subjects considered were:—The proposed grant for scholarships to children of primary schools; the question of higher grade schools, and the best method of utilising the grant for dental treatment of school children. I was present as a representative of our Committee at the first two of these conferences. They impressed me as a wise and practical method of bringing the Commissioners into touch with representative men who are engaged in the work of education. I think a development of this method might be of real service to the Commissioners in shaping new rules, and in dealing with difficult questions that arise.

7324. SIR HERMAN WILKINSON.—You think that there ought to be notice of the making of new rules. You are probably aware that in the year 1896 an Act of Parliament was passed for the publication of statutory rules. This Act of Parliament is not followed by the Board, no doubt under advice that it does not apply to them, but I am going to read to you the provision which deals with the notice required for the publication of statutory rules, and to ask you whether you think that this provision, if applied to the case of the Board, would have a satisfactory effect. The first section is, that at least 40 days before making any statutory rule to which this section applies, notice of the proposed rule, and of the place where copies of the rule may be obtained, shall be published in the "London Gazette." No doubt, if that were applied here, you would ask that it should be published in the "Dublin Gazette." During those 40 days any public body might obtain copies of such draft rules on payment not exceeding 8d. per folio, and any representation or suggestion made in writing by a public body interested, to the authority proposing to make the rule, shall be taken into consideration by that authority before finally settling the rule; and on the expiration of those 40 days the rules may be made by the rule-making authority, either as originally drawn or as amended by such authority, and shall come into operation forthwith, or at such time as may be prescribed in the rules. That practically provides for 40 days' notice of the making of rules. Would that meet your views?—Well, I think that would go a long way. It would



secure that the rules would be made public, and that the public would have an opportunity of knowing.

7325. That provides that the fact of the rules being about to be made is to be notified in the "Gazette" 40 days before any rule is actually settled, and during those 40 days any public body can apply for copies of the rules, and make representation to the rule-making authority, and those representations must be taken into account in the settling of the rules.

7326. Do you think that that would meet the case?—Yes. I think that what we want is to secure that these rules should be known to the public, and I presume if they were obtained by a public body they would find their way to the Press.

7327. You think that that would meet the case? Now, would you kindly tell us what you have to say with reference to facility of appeal and access to the Board?—It must be obvious to everyone that a Board sitting for a couple of hours or so once in the fortnight cannot deal with every question that may arise in the whole field of National education. But, on the other hand, there should be no room for the allegation that matters are deliberately kept back from it. The Board should be full masters in their own house, and no one should possess, or be allowed to exercise the power of keeping back any appeal. I consider that the tendency of things is to put far too much power into the hands of the Resident Commissioner. I am also clearly of the opinion that all deputations should be received by the Board, or a Committee of the Board. I have no desire to probe old sores, but it is well known that serious complications have arisen from the Resident Commissioner alone receiving deputations, and grave allegations have been made against members of deputations. I think, of course, that the Resident Commissioner should always be present on such occasions, but other members of the Board should also be present on exactly the same footing with him. That is all I have to say on that subject.

7328. The *Bishop or Ross*.—Now evidence, Dr. Bingham, has been so clear that I have very little to ask. When you were discussing the question of the inspectors you used the term "Secret and arbitrary instructions to the inspectors." Now, an allegation has been made that in addition to the ordinary circulars sent to all inspectors, occasionally a secret instruction is sent out confidentially to the general circular. Is that what you meant by secret and arbitrary instructions?—Well, I have heard, but I did not say, that those instructions were actually given. My words were that they should be avoided, but it has been freely stated that secret instructions have been given.

7329. The *Chairman*.—You are referring to a statement made on the occasion of the Belfast deputation of teachers?—No, I do not think I had that specially in my mind.

7330. That occurred in their statement?—Yes, and it is generally believed, but my point was rather that the inspectors should decide this question of a standard amongst themselves, rather than have the standard and members of that sort dictated to them by a higher authority in the Office.

7331. The *Bishop or Ross*.—By circulars?—Yes, and by the heads that really have the control.

7332. That the inspectors' minds might be formed largely on general circulars issued to them from time to time?—I have heard it stated, for instance, in reference to that Belfast matter, that inspectors who were known to be strict and exacting men were sent down to pull things up.

7333. And that they got secret instruction for that purpose?—Yes, I assume that they did. Men of that type were selected, and they were sent on that business. The point that I was labouring was to show that there should be a common standard all round.

7334. What I wanted to know was, did you lend any countenance to this charge?—Well, it is beyond my power to prove that such instructions were actually given, but people on whose judgment I place a good deal of reliance, are of that opinion.

7335. Then you recommend individual examination of the children?—Yes, to a considerable extent.

7336. Would you have them examined in all subjects?—I would not propose to go in so minutely as they went under the old system.

7337. Would you be satisfied if the children of one class were examined in one subject, and the children

of another class in another subject, or with some general examination of that kind?—Yes. I do not think that I have actually worked out the details of it, but my friends, for whom I am speaking, are strong on this point; for instance, one manager told me that an inspector had condemned the teaching in a particular subject in which he had not examined at all.

7338. But he would hear the teacher teaching, perhaps?—The suggestion was that he had no means of knowing.

7339. If he heard the teaching, and saw how the teacher gave his instruction, and saw the method in which the children received that instruction, he would be able to form an opinion?—Of course, that may have taken place; I cannot say that that did not take place. But the suggestion or impression left on my mind was that the inspector was giving his opinion on a matter on which he had no data.

7340. Quite possibly, no data as regards the individual examination; but do you think that there were no data, though there might be no examination?—I cannot say that there were no data. I am repeating the statement substantially as I heard it.

7341. If there were a very detailed examination of all the children, would there not be a danger that the teaching would be adapted to the examination?—Yes; I think if you went into it with as great detail as under the old results system, there would be a danger of going back to that.

7342. And do you think that that would be good for education?—I think it would not, if it was so detailed.

7343. And, therefore, in the examination that you would have, you must try to steer clear of that difficulty?—Yes.

7344. The difficulty of the teachers trying to adapt their teaching, not to the general good of the children, but merely to meeting the idiosyncrasy of the examiner?—Yes.

7345. There was a great tendency, no doubt, in that direction?—Yes, I believe there was under the old system.

7346. It is part and parcel of human nature, I suppose?—Yes.

7347. Then in the examination you were endeavouring so to arrange it as not to lead the teacher back towards mechanical instruction?—Yes; I would endeavour to guard against that.

7348. And then if you found that the examination proposed would have that effect, you would not have that examination. Would you regard the general training and development of the children as more important than the mere answering of questions in an examination?—I would. I would try to get at the real estimate of the amount of work done in the schools, and for that purpose I think there ought to be more detailed examination than there is.

7349. We agree about that; but you also told me that the examination should be such as to avoid making the teaching mechanical?—Yes; I think I brought that out.

7350. Mr. *Conry*.—You have said that there were serious allegations in connection with the deputation to the Resident Commissioner. What exactly did you mean?—I meant that on one occasion when a deputation of teachers appeared before the Resident Commissioner, what had taken place emerged, and Dr. Stierle was exceedingly angry about it. There was a serious difference of opinion between him and the teachers as to what had taken place, that is, between a majority of the teachers and himself, and he maintained that some of the teachers did what was not fair, and he decided (I think I am correct in stating this) that some of the teachers in future should not be admitted on a deputation to him. I think that is an exceedingly unfortunate state of things.

7351. You think that too much power is vested in the Resident Commissioner?—I do. I think that is the tendency of things.

7352. But is the power attached to his office or handed over to him by the other Commissioners?—I think it has been gradually increased, and one member of the Board, who is not any longer alive, told me that the tendency of things was to put more power in the hands of the Resident Commissioner.

7353. Then the tendency is on the part of the Commissioners not to discharge their own duties, the duties they owe to the country?—I do not know that. It

would depend on what matters were brought before the Board. There is a variety of ways in which that could take place.

7354. What exactly would take place?—Well, it has been stated, for instance, that no cases of appeal have actually been brought before the Board at all. That is a point that occurs to my mind for the moment.

7355. But are not the Commissioners themselves responsible for that, since they passed a resolution in 1902, limiting all three cases of appeal over to one member?—I am not exonerating the Commissioners in the matter at all. They may be parties to it, and yet the thing may happen at the same time. People tell you, if you talk to them, that Dr. Starke decided this and Dr. Starke decided that, and precisely he is the one man in the whole business.

7356. The other Commissioners have equal rights with Dr. Starke; so if there has been anything in the way of making it a one-man Board, I think the Commissioners are themselves to blame?—I am not here to defend the Commissioners.

7357. There is only one other point I wish to ask you on, or perhaps two. Under the present arrangement for appointment of inspectors, you say there is something to object to. Now, while there has been a great deal of adverse criticism of the National Board of Education, would you not have great difficulty in finding any body of men in this country so competent, and who ought to be so impartial a body for the appointment of inspectors as the Commissioners of National Education?—Well, if you refer to an equally large body, I am not prepared to say that you will find that. It is not my business to say whether or not the National Board are entirely competent for their duties, but I think a Board of that sort who are not really experts in matters of the kind are not the most competent body for appointment of inspectors.

7358. Do you think that the education in the schools in the part of the country that you are particularly attached to, has been improved by the change?—Well, I think in some cases it has. I am not here to condemn the new system wholesale. I am exceedingly favourable to what you call concrete matters in education, and to me one of the virtues of the new programme is that it introduces matters of that sort, such as kindergarten.

7359. That is with respect to infants?—I am very strong on the question of the teaching of infants.

7360. But taking the subject of arithmetic, do you think are the boys and girls so well prepared in arithmetic as they were?—If you ask with regard to the business of clerks, I am afraid the education is not so good in that respect. I cannot actually give you a case, but I have heard it stated, generally speaking, as I have already mentioned, that arithmetic is not so well taught as it ought to be. In my particular school we have a very competent man, and I do not consider he would neglect the pupils.

7361. Most of the subjects introduced by the revised programme I am in sympathy with, such as ecology and singing, and so on; but do you not think that there are too many subjects, and that the result of the enlargement of the number of subjects deprives the teaching of concentration on more essential subjects?—Well, of course, I have heard that statement made.

7362. And have you formed any opinion yourself?—I would not be prepared to say, as far as my personal knowledge goes, that that has been the result. I consider matters like singing and drill and cookery as a great relief from the ordinary, or what you might call more prosaic and more abstract work in a school.

7363. Now, I am with you that they are a great relief, and that they are all very desirable in a school; but is singing so essential to success and advancement in the world as good spelling?—I think you should give me notice of that question. I like both.

7364. Mr. HARRISON.—You wish to have more detailed examination. The detailed examination you refer to, I suppose, must be conducted at any rate in the last three months of the school year to be of any use?—Yes.

7365. You would not approve of detailed examination earlier?—No; I think it would place the children and the teacher at a disadvantage.

7366. Then if a detailed examination is necessary it means that there must be varying school years, and not as at present a uniform school year, or that the detailed examination cannot be held every year, does it not?—Well, of course, I know that a good many very competent teachers say that it would be far better that each school should have its own school year.

7367. Has the body that you represent considered that carefully in all its bearings?—I cannot say that they have, but I am simply giving you some of the statements that were made to me.

7368. But would you agree with me, that if the general examination of the school is to be a detailed one, it must be conducted towards the end of the school year, and that will of necessity force a change in the school year?—Well, I have heard teachers say, for instance (I am not quite clear that I would assent to that statement), I have heard them say that all the children ought to be examined. It is complained sometimes that children come in and are only a very short time in the school, and that these may be picked out.

7369. I think we may leave out these details?—Would you mind repeating the question?

7370. Supposing you are to have a detailed examination, that examination should be conducted in the last three months of the school year, should it not?—Well, perhaps, if you went into a great deal of detail.

7371. You only want a few more tests given?—Yes, I think there should be more tests than there is. I do not say that these should be a completely detailed examination, such as we had formerly.

7372. Not a record of individual results; but when you want more details you want tests to be given to the children?—Yes.

7373. And more responsibility thrown upon the children?—Yes, I want more detailed examination.

7374. If that were to be satisfactory that ought to be at the end of the school year?—Oh, of course, you could then get a better test.

7375. And that means a change in the school year, does it not, for you cannot have a uniform school year and carry out an examination of that sort every year, can you?—Would it not be possible for the inspector to take into account the stage of the school year at which he was examining?

7376. That would be very difficult if he is to set tests?—You are taking me into a question that I have not been considering. It is more a matter for the inspector than for me.

7377. I do not want a discussion at all, but I only wanted to bring before you that there is a difficulty involved in your suggestion?—I understand.

7378. Now, are you aware of the fact that managers, by Rule 54, are expected to make arrangements for conducting examinations of their own schools?—Yes.

7379. Have you ever availed yourself of that privilege?—I have never, perhaps, conducted a full examination of the school, but I have frequently gone in and examined classes and taught classes in the school.

7380. But I refer to these periodic examinations?—Yes, and these, no doubt, are conducted largely by the teachers.

7381. Have you been present at any of these, or have you helped to organise any?—I cannot say that I have as to what I would call a detailed examination.

7382. But you yourself have often examined classes?—Frequently.

7383. Now, you recommend the abolition of Article 88b. Is it possible for a teacher to do his duty as a teacher and attend meetings of a public body?—You mean political meetings?

7384. No; I refer to the regulation by which members of District Councils, Poor Law Boards, or Town Commissioners, are not recognised as teachers. You propose to abolish that. Can a man undertake those duties and still fulfil his duty as a teacher?—I

think I am right in saying that some local bodies meet in the evening. Some of the Town Commissioners meet in the evening.

7885. What about Town Councils?—Well, Town Commissioners and Town Councils are practically the same thing.

7886. Town Commissioners, the governing bodies of small towns, do meet in the evenings in some cases?—Yes.

7887. But meetings in the evenings would not be universal?—No; but what the teachers complain of is that they are by the rules rendered ineligible for any of those positions, or for taking any part in political matters, or for attending a political meeting.

7888. I am not going into the question of 80a, but the question of 80b, of their becoming members of public bodies, and I want to know whether, in your opinion, that might not conflict with the duty as teachers?—Oh, it is very obvious, I think, that it might conflict with their duty.

7889. But the body that you represent have proposed that this regulation should be deleted entirely, have they not?—They have, but I may tell you that I am not personally responsible for that resolution, and I do not want to express any personal opinion.

7890. You said that in your opinion too much power was in the Resident Commissioner's hands. I gather that is the opinion of the body that you are representing here, is it not?—I think I would be correct in saying that. It is difficult to speak for a whole body, but you frequently hear that said. I could not say that the entire Church Body that I represent has expressed a formal judgment to that effect, but I know that a good many people share that view.

7891. Is it fair to ask you do you share it yourself?—It is fair. I do share it.

7892. Now, with regard to appeals, would it be a more satisfactory plan if appeals from teachers or managers were always heard by a certain number of the Commissioners as well as by the Resident Commissioner?—Do you say appeals?

7893. I gather that appeals are very often heard only by the Resident Commissioner?—I do not know that the Resident Commissioner hears appeals in the ordinary sense of the term "hearing appeals." I am not clear that that is exactly what he does. I think I am correct in saying that if there is an appeal, sometimes a head inspection, or sometimes a chief of inspection, is sent down.

7894. But I am speaking of appeals to the Commissioners?—What do you mean by appeals?

7895. When there is a deputation of managers or teachers, that is very often heard by the Resident Commissioner alone?—Yes, the practice is that it should be heard by the Resident Commissioner.

7896. Would it satisfy you, and the body that you represent, if a certain number of the Commissioners were present on those occasions?—I think that would be a reasonable suggestion. I could hardly expect the whole Board to attend and hear all the cases.

7897. Mr. HENRY.—You have complained that the managers get too short notice of the inspector's visit?—Yes.

7898. So that the managers cannot as a rule be present at the examination of the schools. Why do you think has that rule been made, that notice should be so short?—I am not aware of any reason except the reason that I suggested, that the managers could not be trusted to keep the secret from the teachers.

7899. And do you think it right to treat the teachers with so much distrust, that they must at all times make surprise visits to them?—Well, as I think I have already stated, there is a great deal to be said for giving them due notice of the regular examination.

7900. Have you experience of rural schools?—Yes.

7901. Of course, you know, then, that the attendance in rural schools is most irregular?—Yes.

7902. Is it fair, then, to assess a teacher's work by a surprise visit, when, perhaps, the best of the pupils might be absent?—I think that would not be fair. It might happen that the best pupils were away.

7903. Must it not happen if you are holding surprise visits?—I think it must happen occasionally, of course.

7904. Then would it not satisfy the interests of education if, since the inspector is expected to visit the school three times in the year, two of the visits were surprise visits, and the third was made a formal inspection, or general inspection, of which due notice might be given?—I think that would be a reasonable suggestion.

7905. Now, with regard to the lowering of marks, you say that out of 128 that came under your notice, or were brought under your notice, 74 were lowered?—Yes.

7906. And you infer that that would show a want of uniformity of standard?—My suggestion is, that it is an undue lowering of marks.

7907. And do you think that that could be prevented in any way by having a conference of the inspectors?—I would not suggest that as an entire remedy, but I make that suggestion as one thing that occurred to myself.

7908. Are you aware that 23 inspectors held a conference in 1905, and that one of the objects submitted to them was to get at a definite standard of what was meant by "excellent" and "very good"?—I was not aware of that.

7909. Mr. HENRY.—That is in evidence before us. That conference sat for ten days discussing that question among other matters, and the senior inspectors went back to their respective districts, and, according to the evidence of Mr. Dineen, they communicated to the justices the resolutions arrived at. Now, did that bring uniformity?—Evidently it did not.

7910. Then do you think that that suggestion would be effective now in bringing about uniformity?—I do not see why the justices should not be taken into confidence as well as the seniors, and I do not see why the whole body of inspectors should not confer, but I do not say that that is the sole remedy.

7911. If a conference would be effective in securing uniformity, would not that uniformity have been already secured, at least among the schools who have present at the conference of 1905?—Apparently, at least, one would think so.

7912. Has it had that effect?—I suspect not.

7913. Now, do you think it is possible to secure uniformity under such an artificial system of classifying schools as you have at present?—I have not thought that out fully.

7914. But you do not think it is possible to secure uniformity?—I am not prepared to say that it is impossible, but I think it is difficult.

7915. Sir HENRY WILKINSON.—You mentioned one or two things which have been before Committees of Inquiry into Education before, and I should like to draw your attention to certain conclusions arrived at, and to ask whether these would meet your views on the subject. One is with regard to the notice to managers. There is a report of P. H. Dale and S. A. Stevens on Intermediate Education, and what they say with regard to inspection would seem to be equally applicable to primary schools. In paragraph 229 they say the inspector would visit each school, sometimes without giving notice of his visit, in order to see its normal working. At other times, when a more detailed inspection was required, he would give the authority—the head master or the head mistress—notice for the purpose of a more detailed inspection. Would you agree with that view as to the visit of the inspector, that when there is going to be a detailed inspection, notice should be given, not only to the manager, but also to the head teacher himself?—Yes, I think I have suggested that. I would agree with Mr. Dale on that point.

7916. You mentioned something else with regard to the minutes of the Board?—Yes.

7917. Well, this is going back a long time. This is the report of the Foran Commission of 1870. One of the recommendations is that routine business should be taken by a Committee of the Board sitting in Dublin, whose names would be known to the public. Other questions of general policy, such as changes of rules or interpretations of rules, should be referred to the whole Board, to be specially summoned. We were speaking of appeals from teachers, but we have

been looking after appeals in a wider way than what you have mentioned. A great many of what you call appeals, appeals against the decision of an inspector, are decided in the office without any formal court or any committee of appeal, and would you agree that such things should be referred to a Committee of the Board, such as is recommended there?—I think, at all events, there should be full liberty on the part of the Board. There should be no attempt to keep back anything from the Board. I am not prepared to say that every case of appeal should actually be considered by a committee, because these gentlemen live at long distances, and I do not know that it would be practicable to bring everything before them.

7418. But would you rather have it dealt with in that way than simply by the Resident Commissioner alone?—Yes, I would rather have it that way. I would rather that the Board should be in a position to say that all difficult matters should be dealt with by themselves or by a Committee of the Board.

7419. Then you possibly may have forgotten that that Boyal Commission also, in their 128th recommendation, say that the regulations of the Board should be reviewed only once a year, and only after due notice to all the Commissioners, a majority of whom should be present at the meeting at which the alterations are to be considered; and the 129th recommendation is, that it is desirable to adopt the present practice of the Committee of Council in England, that no alteration of any rules, regulations, or by-laws should be brought into operation until such alterations should have been laid for one month before both Houses of Parliament, the alterations having been shown in distinct type. If that had been done that would have prevented a great deal of the complaints that you have referred to?—I think so.

7420. You observe that the recommendation about laying the rules before the Houses of Parliament was made in 1870, and the Act of Parliament for dealing more generally with the publication of statutory rules was made in 1893, but I suppose that either of these courses would meet the case that you put?—I think so. My object is to obtain publicity.

7421. Mr. HENLEY.—With regard to the rules relating to promotion and so forth, do you think that these should be made public?—Yes, I am disposed to have them made public.

7422. And with regard to the inspection, do you think that experience in teaching is necessary?—I do think it is necessary.

7423. Why do you think it is necessary?—The reason I think it is necessary is because I think a man who undertakes to test another man's work should have had some experience of doing it himself.

7424. Could you give us any other reason—do you think it desirable that he should be able to see practically how his suggestions should be carried out?—I think I said so in my evidence.

7425. With regard to the pupils, you think there ought to be more examination than at present?—Yes; that was what my committee thought.

7426. I have taken a note of what you said, that you thought it would be of service to the schools. Am I right in that?—Oh, yes, I think it would be of service all round.

7427. And one of the reasons you mentioned was this, that the pupils leaving school required a certain amount of knowledge?—Yes.

7428. How could it be ascertained whether the pupils have that knowledge or not—could it be ascertained by simply walking into the school and looking round?—No; of course, I do not think it could.

7429. It could only be ascertained by examination?—It could only be ascertained by examination.

7430. It has been stated by some that if you have an examination in the school the teaching will be adapted to the examination. Now, if, on the other hand, you have inspection in the school, and the inspector is known to have particular views on teaching, will not the teaching be adapted to the views of the inspector?—Yes, I think it will be, naturally. People will seem to know the views and the peculiarities of the inspector.

7431. And what influence will that have on the teachers?—Naturally they will adapt themselves to those ideas.

7432. So that if that be an objection to the examination system, is it not also an objection to the inspection system?—I think so.

7433. Now, with reference to the rules, do you think it would meet the exigencies of the case if the rules were laid on the table of the House of Commons for 40 days?—I have suggested in my evidence that they should be published or tabled in some way. I really am not quite clear on that. I think there ought to be an opportunity given to pass a judgment on them.

7434. Do you think it right to issue rules which are retrospective in their action?—Perhaps you would give me an instance?

7435. Supposing a rule were made that every teacher in the schools in Ireland was to teach Irish, that would be retrospective in its action. Would you think it right to have that?—Do you mean teachers already in the service of the Board?

7436. Yes?—I would scarcely think that a fair thing.

7437. Then, supposing we take a case which, I dare say, has been brought under your notice, the case of what is known as the Maternity Rule. I am not expressing an opinion as to the wisdom or unwisdom of that rule, but was it right, do you think, to bring in a rule of that kind, imposing the rights which the teachers had when they entered the service?—Let me clearly understand. The Maternity Rule was that the teacher should be out of the school for three months?

7438. Yes?—I understand. You are asking me was that a proper rule to make retrospective. Of course, the teacher was not anticipating that rule, and no doubt that teacher would have some ground of complaint.

7439. But apart from the wisdom or unwisdom of the rule, do you think that if teachers enter the service under certain conditions, those conditions should be altered without their consent, to the detriment of those teachers already in the service?—I think that as a general principle it would be hard upon the teachers. Of course, it would be difficult to lay down a perfectly general rule on the question. I am not prepared to say that no rule of that nature should be altered.

7440. To the detriment of those who entered the service without that rule?—I am not exactly prepared to say that there would not be circumstances under which a rule might be altered.

7441. Suppose a man enters the service at a salary which was intended to meet his requirements in the matter of income, would it be right to reduce that salary without his consent?—Well, I am sure if I were the man I would say that it would not, although some of us have had experience of that reduction.

7442. But you prefer not giving an opinion as far as the public service is concerned?—As to the reduction of a man's salary—of course, I think it is a hardship if a man's salary is reduced. Are there cases of a man's salary being reduced?

7443. I think so. With regard to this question of civil rights, you were asked this question by his Lordship—could a teacher be a member of a public body, and attend its meetings, without detriment to him as a teacher? Are you aware that they can attend at present?—Am I aware that they can attend?

7444. Yes?—I am not exactly aware of the arrangement, but I say that if such bodies met at a time when the school was in operation he could not attend without detriment as a teacher.

7445. Are you aware that they can become members of these local bodies?—That they can become.

7446. That they may become, according to the rules?—No, I am not aware.

7447. Rule 88 (b) is that members of County or Town Councils, or Boards of Poor Law Guardians, or Town Commissioners, are not recognised as teachers of National schools, unless co-opted as Councillors under section 8, and so on, so that they may become Councillors if they are co-opted?—Yes.

7448. Then if they can become Councillors when co-opted, what can be the great objection to their becoming Councillors when directed?—I thought the

17th April, 1913.]

Rev. J. BINGHAM, M.A., D.D., examined.

[Continued.]

point of his Lordship's question was whether or not, as a practical matter, they could be members of those Boards without neglecting their duties as teachers.

The CHAIRMAN.—Mr. Henly's point is, that they can become members by being co-opted, and that, therefore, that objection does not apparently lie.

7449. Mr. HENLY.—According to the rules they can if co-opted, and they cannot if elected, and I am asking you this question—if there is no objection to their acting when co-opted, why should there be an objection to their acting if elected?—I see no difference in point of principle in one case and the other.

7450. Now, you have brought out a very important thing, and that is, that 50 per cent. of the teachers are in the third or lowest grade, with no prospect of leaving it. Can you give us any suggestions on that point—we are aware of the fact, but have you any suggestions, for instance, as to the length of time necessary for promotion of those teachers who would be eligible to the higher grade?—What is the exact point?

7451. As the rule stands at present, there are two barriers in the way of promotion of those teachers. The first is, that they must have a certain average attendance in their schools (there must be an average attendance of 30 pupils to get into the second grade), and the second is the standard numbers. Now, merely breaking down the standard numbers, if such a thing were possible, is not enough?—Yes.

7452. It is necessary to deal with the question of averages as well?—Yes.

7453. Have you any practical suggestion to make with reference to that?—I would like, if it were possible, to allow the road to be open to the promotion of a larger number of teachers. I would not like to tie them down so stiffly in this matter of averages. Of course, you can recognise that in a country like this, where you have a number of very small schools, as a practical matter you could not give the same thing to a very small school as you would do to a large school. I mean that the teacher of a very small school could hardly reasonably expect to get to the top of the tree. I would be personally glad if it were possible, because I think it is a very difficult thing to teach a small school.

7454. But that does not meet the difficulty as to right. You have been a plan for greater increase of salary in the early years of service, and the abolition of standard numbers?—Yes.

7455. But you have not thought of any practical proposal for carrying out the suggestions that you have there?—I would like most rapid promotion in the early years of service.

7456. Formerly it was possible for a teacher in a small school, by good service and by scholarship, to win a higher classification, but the salary of the classification was not paid to him till he got a school in which he had the requisite average. Now, getting the classification was an advantage to him in two ways. It was an advantage in looking for a school, and it was an advantage that he could immediately draw the salary of the higher class when he got into a school with the requisite average. Now, do you think an arrangement of that kind would be possible by which those teachers in the lower grade schools might in some way qualify for the higher grade, so that if they got the requisite average the increased salary would be immediately available?—I think that would be a reasonable suggestion, and I have heard competent teachers suggesting that the examination of teachers should be an element in their promotion. I think it would be a reasonable thing to encourage teachers to study and get forward in that way.

7457. You think it is desirable to induce them to study for some time after they have taken up the work of teaching?—I do, certainly.

7458. Now you say here, with reference to appeals, that security should be taken that the Board should be informed of all cases of appeal. What do you mean by the Board—because that term has been used in a whole lot of senses here?—By the Board I mean the Commissioners.

7459. The CHAIRMAN.—The whole body of Commissioners?—Yes.

7460. Mr. HENLY.—You suggested that a Committee of the Board should be appointed for the purpose of investigating appeals?—I do not know that I quite suggested it in the case of appeals. Do you mean by appeals deputations?

7461. No, I mean appeals?—I am not clear that I suggested that.

7462. What would you suggest with regard to those appeals?—The appeals of teachers?

7463. Supposing a teacher feels himself aggrieved owing to the action of an inspector or the action of a manager, and he wishes to appeal to the Board, what procedure would you recommend in that case?—It has been stated that appeals had been kept back from the Board, that the Board in fact had not been acquainted with cases of appeal, and had not an opportunity of dealing with them. I suggested that there should be no barrier of any sort, and that ultimately the teacher should have the right of getting his case investigated by the Board.

7464. But would it not be difficult for a body of Commissioners sitting only once a fortnight to hear every appeal that would come up to them from the 8,000 schools, many of which might be on very trifling matters?—Yes, I think so.

7465. Well, if the Board, as a whole, could not investigate all these appeals, and if you think too much power has been gradually centering in the hands of the Resident Commissioner, what medium course would you recommend?—I am not sure that I have thought of a Court of Appeal. You mean something of that nature?

7466. I do?—That is a Court of Appeal. I have not considered that question.

7467. You have stated that security should be taken that the Board should be informed in all cases of appeals brought by managers and teachers?—What I meant is embodied in that statement, that there should be no barrier placed in the way of the Commissioners as regards dealing with these questions. I think it has been stated publicly by a gentleman of authority that cases were really kept back from the Board. I think I am right in saying that—that the Board had not an opportunity of considering these cases, and that as a matter of fact cases of appeal never came before the Board.

7468. As a Board of 20 Commissioners obviously cannot hear all of the appeals, and as you think it unreasonable that they should all be dealt with by one man, have you considered any intermediate course?—No, I have not considered any intermediate course. I have not gone into that matter in detail.

7469. You have said that deputations should be received by the Board?—Or by a Committee of the Board.

7470. Do you mean that any body whatever appealing to the Commissioners should be received?—I do not say that. I am simply suggesting that there was a certain number of deputations that came before the Resident Commissioner, and I suggested that a Committee of the Board should take the place of the Resident Commissioner.

7471. Would you have those interviews with deputations that might wait on the Commissioners public or private, that is, open to the press or else held in camera?—Well, I am not prepared to say that all matters should be in presence of the press. I am not prepared to open the door to the press, or to say that the press should be present on all occasions.

7472. You said in reply, I think, to some member of the Committee that you knew that some great injustice followed in the case of the reception of one of those deputations?—Yes.

7473. Would not that have been obviated had the press been present?—It might have been. Of course, the press are not infallible.

7474. But there could be no conflict of opinion as to what took place and what was said on both sides if the shorthand writers had taken it down?—Sometimes that occurs, I think. I am not prepared to lay down as a general principle, you understand, that the

17th April, 1913.]

Rev. J. BROWNE, M.A., D.D., examined.

[Continued.]

press should be present on all occasions. I think that there should be a great deal more publicity than there is at present.

7470. Now there is one item in which rules are made retrospective, which, to my mind, affects managers. When schools were taken into connection by the Board it had to be certified that the school-houses were suitable, and now some of them that are in perfect repair are declared to be unsuitable. Is not that a retrospective law, and have you had any experience of it?—I cannot say that I had.

7471. Have you had any experience of cases where you were asked to put up partitions, and divide your large school-rooms into a number of small rooms?—I have not had personal experience of that, because a few years ago we built a new school, and we have all that is required in that school.

Rev. DAVID CUMMIS, M.A., Minister of Glenties, Co. Antrim, examined.

7472. The CHAIRMAN.—You are Minister of Glenties, near Ballymena?—Yes.

7473. How long have you been in that charge?—Almost a quarter of a century.

7474. Was that your first?—Yes; I have been there all the time since I was ordained.

7475. And you are now manager of the school?—Schools.

7476. How many?—Four.

7477. All rural?—All rural schools.

7478. So then you have a considerable experience of both the old and the new systems?—I had some experience as a teacher in the early days.

7479. You were a teacher yourself?—Yes, under the old system.

7480. Now you say, "As a rule we get on well with the inspectors in the Co. Antrim." Is that your experience?—Yes.

7481. Have you found your teachers making complaints at all of late?—No; no serious complaints on the part of the teachers in our district. The Ballymena district is a large and important district. We find no serious complaints as a rule.

7482. Then the teachers in that district do not join in the complaints that are made so widely all over the rest of Ireland?—Well, they have their grievances, and we have had one of their meetings not long ago, but the difficulty is not so much with the inspectors, I think, as with certain other things, certain things under the Board's regulations—the system of the Board and some question of rights. I attended one of their meetings lately.

7483. This statement refers to the system of the Board. Does that mean the new programme, for instance?—Well, partly, and the scheme of promotion. The promotion is slower than it should be.

7484. And the rule as to attending public meetings?—Well, yes; they have a grievance there.

7485. Or sitting on certain Boards?—Yes. They think they should have more liberty.

7486. Do you know any cases of men being co-opted on these Boards?—No. Country teachers could not attend these Boards in any case. It can only apply to towns.

7487. You have not heard any complaints such as we have heard here, of inspectors confining themselves too much to fault-finding criticism, and that they do not try to assist the teacher by example, by teaching or by advising him. That has not come under your notice?—No, not very much. I think the inspectors do their best in that way by giving lessons from which the teachers might take example, and I have often heard them distinctly giving hints. Our inspectors, as a rule, are kindly and efficient gentlemen.

7488. Another matter concerning inspectors that we have heard a good deal about is the frequent change of inspectors from one district to another?—Yes.

7489. That is, that they are not allowed, of late years, to remain long in the same district. Have you any remarks about that?—That is not our experience. We have Mr. Hughes for a considerable period—I think over five years—and we have also Mr. McGuire, and I understand Mr. McGuire is well pleased with

7477. With regard to the Commissioners changing the rules, and changing all but the fundamental rules, are you aware how many of the rules now are regarded as fundamental?—I am not aware.

7478. I think I will satisfy you. It has been determined by the Commissioners themselves, and I believe not disputed, that there is only one fundamental rule, and that is "that the object of the system of National Education is to afford combined literary and moral and separate religious instruction to children of all persuasions, as far as possible, in the same school upon the fundamental principle that no attempt should be made to interfere with the peculiar religious tenets of any description of Christian people." I think you will find that that is the only fundamental rule?—Very well.

us. He is the senior inspector, and they both live in Ballymena.

7497. You have known the old results system as a teacher and as manager?—I have, yes.

7498. And do you mean to imply that, on the whole, you prefer the old results system to the new system?—No, I think not.

7499. But you seem to wish in some respects a return to the old system?—I would like to combine the two.

7500. Will you specify the points on which you would like a partial return—you would require 120 attendances in the year to qualify for this examination, which should be an individual examination of all the boys?—Yes; I have carefully thought that question out. That is one of the most important suggestions that I have. I am strongly in favour of individual examination of each child.

7501. By the inspectors?—By the inspectors. I think you will never have thorough efficiency without that.

7502. You would have that done in every school year?—Yes, I would have that done in every school year, and I would give proper notice of this examination to the manager and teacher.

7503. We have heard that at present the notice is not sufficiently long, and that it comes often when the manager is away?—Under the inspection system I do not think that of much importance. I do not mind whether I am present in the school during an inspection under this system or not. I may call in, but in my estimation it is not very important.

7504. But if you get this individual examination once a year, you might be present?—I would. I think that is the only way in which the inspector really could find out whether a subject is taught or not.

7505. Then you agree with the criticism that we have had again and again that the impressionist style of inspection may be carried too far, that is, judging of the school by what they call "tone," apart from book knowledge?—Yes, I am afraid so. I am afraid it is at the foundation of a good deal of the dissatisfaction at present. Not that I am finding fault with the inspectors. They are carrying out their instructions faithfully; still I would be inclined to think it would be well if the two things could be combined, and I would have a small results fee of a shilling upon each of the "three R's," and a fee of sixpence upon the other subjects, making the number of attendances 120 to qualify for this examination, which would not be any great hardship to us in the Co. Antrim since we have the Compulsory Attendance Act in force. I would have each child examined and put on a small fee, and have a small proportion of the teacher's salary depending on it. I would put 50 per cent. of the teacher's marks for promotion on this examination, and I would let the other 50 per cent. go to the inspection.

7506. You would give 50 per cent. on the inspection?—I would give 50 per cent. on his merits as regards promotion, and I would put the remaining 50 per cent. upon incidental visits by the inspector.

7507. Fifty per cent. of the amount?—I am not definite as to the amount of the percentage, but I would try to combine the two methods if I could.

1746 April, 1913.]

REV. DAVID CUMMERS, M.A., examined.

[Continued.]

7508. Do I understand from the way it is put on this paper, that you make this suggestion because under the new system the three R's, as we may call them, are not taught as well as they were under the old?—Reading is more intelligently taught, I believe, but arithmetic is not so well taught according to business men with whom I have been speaking, who say their boys are not well prepared in arithmetic.

7509. You have heard business men in Ballymena say that?—Oh, yes, I have heard business men in Ballymena say that, and so have inspectors, and the inspectors know it; but then, on the other hand, there are a great many other things a great deal better taught, and there are a great many improvements in the way of having the infants employed more pleasantly and agreeably, and in the teaching of cookery and laundry.

7510. These are the new subjects added since 1860?—Yes, we have all of these.

7511. Have you elementary science in your school?—We have a little elementary science, and there is a little nature study, and so forth, but I think elementary science is falling back.

7512. And you still think that the change from the results system was in fact too radical?—Yes, I think it was too radical. It was introduced too quickly, and it should have been introduced gradually.

7513. You would make a certain return to the old system?—Yes, in part I would.

7514. Now with regard to the class from whom inspectors should be drawn, you say a larger proportion of the inspectors might be drawn from the teachers. Do you know the number of inspectors at present who have been National teachers?—No.

7515. It is 22 out of 76?—Well, the inspectors that I have had any experience of, who were teachers, seem to understand the matter very well, but I would not be in favour of doing away with graduates by any means. I think they should be the main supply, but I think you might have a larger number of eminent teachers as inspectors, and I think that the others should have some experience of teaching for a short time, so that they might really understand the difficulty of teaching.

7516. That every inspector should have some experience of teaching in a school?—He should have some slight experience (it might not be long—six months, or something like that) to open his eyes a bit.

7517. Have you considered the question of the mode of appointing inspectors?—I do not know very much about that. It is a Civil Service appointment.

7518. You have not gone into that?—I have not.

7519. Have you considered uniformity of standard of inspection?—Yes, that is the difficulty, that the inspectors have very different standards.

7520. You know that from your own experience?—I have not known it to any great extent, but I understand that the teachers have a great grievance in that respect in other parts.

7521. That has seldom come under your own observation, but in your paper you seem to imply that the standard of a new inspector may vary very much from the standard of the previous inspector?—It may, and perhaps that might be obviated if you had a conference of inspectors. It is a great difficulty—arising from individual differences. For the first year or two perhaps there are difficulties with the teachers, but the teachers take to their difficulties kindly, and the managers do the same, and we fall in with the new ideas as fast as we can.

7522. Have you had frequently to write to the Board or to forward to the Board a complaint of a teacher about the marking of a school?—No, I never had. I would not encourage that unless I had a really notorious case, and our teachers, as a rule, do not want to fall foul of their inspectors.

7523. Have you any information to give us as to these six merit marks—do you regard the distinctions as too minute?—No, I think they are very fair.

7524. You think that it is a workable system?—I think it is a workable system, but there are one or two things that are not fair to the teacher. I would like those graded marks very well; but, for instance,

when an inspector comes in immediately after the opening of a school that has been closed for some time, reports on it, and perhaps lowers the teacher's mark, or does not give him a good report, I think that is scarcely fair. If the children were only a month or two at new work, and an inspector coming in makes a report on that, and probably not a good report, I think that is scarcely fair.

7525. That is when the visit is early in the school year?—Yes, I think that should be taken into account. I think if it is an important inspection the inspector should not come in immediately the school has been opened after vacation, and I know the teachers in some cases feel a grievance there.

7526. Now as to the right of teachers to take part in public life?—They are at a disadvantage. That is all I can say.

7527. You consider it a grievance of the teachers that they should not have the right as citizens to take part in civil affairs, and I believe you have a strong opinion on that?—No, not a very strong opinion.

7528. We have had before us the resolution of the General Assembly on the subject?—Yes.

7529. Do you agree with this resolution?—Well, public opinion seems to be going in that direction. No body of educated men like to be held so tightly as the Board's rules seem to hold the teachers now.

7530. You do not see any serious objection to it?—No; if they do not permanently identify themselves with it. I would have a re-wording of that rule, and give it a more liberal interpretation.

7531. You seem to suggest that you would guard the permission in some way?—I would. I would say, "The Commissioners recommend the teachers to abstain from identifying themselves prominently with party politics," and I think they might remove the pains and penalties. We have such a love of politics in Ireland that nobody likes to be excluded.

7532. Are not your own clergy, by their own will, practically excluded from politics, most of them?—No, I think not.

7533. I thought it was a thoroughly understood thing?—Well, there are districts and districts. Now, for instance, I know a district where, if the teacher were to become permanently identified with politics, it would ruin his school.

7534. Suppose a teacher were a violent Home Ruler in a strong Orange district, what would become of him?—Oh, that would not do at all. He would have no school, but at the same time while that is so, and while it should be judiciously done, I think the teachers should have a good deal of discretionary power—more than they have.

7535. Then you would abolish that prohibition and put in a recommendation to them not to take a violent part?—I would.

7536. Mr. HENRY.—Now you say the teachers complain of what is called paper-promotion, and you also complain of the fact that a large amount of money is, as you say, returned to the Treasury unused?—Yes.

7537. Are you not aware that money saved under one head by arrangement with the Treasury in the estimation cannot be expended under another head?—Yes, I am aware of that, but when you explain that to teachers they do not understand it, and I think they never will understand it.

7538. Now suppose the National Board has £15,000 unused in one year, but by the present rules it cannot spend this £15,000 on promotion to the first grade—is that how it would work?—That is the case.

7539. How would you deal with that?—Well, I am not competent to deal with that difficulty, but I think there should be some means of dealing with it. It is one of the chief sources of discontent, and surely it is not beyond the wit of man to deal with it. I think some means should be found out, by arrangement with the Treasury or some other way, by which all the money that is voted would be given to the teachers, and especially those who are promoted, for paper promotion will continue to be a source of irritation and vexation.

7540. In fact that the Commissioners should have free power to deal with the whole sum of £1,400,000?—Yes, I think so, applying it to this case at any rate.

7541. The present arrangement with the Treasury, with a certain fixed number of places in certain grades, would have to go then, because that is the cause of it?—Well, it is a source of mischief, and it should be amended if possible.

7542. The Bishop or Bosc.—In order to amend it you should change the whole Treasury system—not only in relation to National education in Ireland, but in reference to all the services—the army, the navy, and everything else. The present system is that the heads of the departments make estimates of what they want, and then those estimates are voted by Parliament. If a particular department happen to hit to the last farthing on the amount of money that that department is to spend, there is no difficulty, but you quite see that it is morally impossible for any department to estimate up to the last farthing. Then either of two difficulties arises. Either there is an over-estimate or an under-estimate. If there is an over-estimate the money is never drawn from the Treasury at all, so that it is not true to say that the money is being returned, for they never had it. It was simply estimated and voted by Parliament, but it was never paid, so it is never returned. It could have been drawn if the service wanted it. Then in case there is an under-estimate, which often happens too, the duty of the department is to make an application to the Treasury authorities, and ask them to bring in a supplementary estimate for £10,000 more or £20,000 more, or whatever they want, and until that is passed that money is not paid. So you would have to change the entire system. You could not change the system as to National education without changing the entire system for the army, the navy, the judges, and everything else?—But would it not be possible to get a supplementary estimate in case, for instance, there was £27,500 returned?

7543. It was not returned, for it was never paid. The National Board never got held of it at all. It was never in their possession. It was voted for a particular purpose, and it was not wanted for that particular purpose. They over-estimated what was required for that particular purpose, but they could not have paid that money to the teachers without getting a special vote by Parliament to pay them?—Well, it would be worth while getting a special vote of Parliament to pay them.

7544. Yes, that is a different question altogether; but then the question is this, will the Treasury propose to Parliament that special vote for you?—Well, at any rate, it is a source of discontent.

7545. Could you manage the discontent in this way—do not promote any teacher on paper until there is a vacancy for him. I think in the army they make brevet officers, but in the Church we do not promote anybody until there is a vacancy for him?—That is so.

7546. A man has to die first before you promote anybody to his place?—Yes.

7547. Suppose you allow the vacancy in the first grade to occur first, and then, when the vacancy has occurred, promote your man?—But you have certain rules as to tests, and if one of those men goes through those tests promotion is his due, his right.

7548. No, it is not. In my Church, for instance, there may be a number of men worthy to fill a parish, but no promotion is made till the parish becomes vacant?—But as to the teachers there are certain rules laid down.

7549. But can there be any promoting until a vacancy occurs—the teacher is declared qualified for promotion, but not actually promoted—is that not so (there were several questions asked in Parliament recently on the subject, and in every answer they put in that such a man was qualified for promotion)?—I thought the promotion was made, but not paid.

Mr. HENLEY.—The promotion is made.

Mr. HARRISON.—The teacher has a right to call himself promoted, even though he is not paid.

Sir HIRAM WILKINSON.—Could it be reconciled in this way, that what happens is that they are graded? You may call it promotion, or you may not, but it is very clearly laid down in the rules and everywhere

else that no man is entitled to a salary unless there is a salary for him. You may call that promotion to one-one, but it occurs in other services as well.

Mr. HENLEY.—But he has to enter in his records that he is in a new grade.

Sir HIRAM WILKINSON.—In the Consular service in China there are men who are examined as to their qualifications for interpreting when they are student-interpreters. When they are qualified they are made assistants, and there are a certain number of allowances for interpreters, and although a man has passed the qualifying examination for interpreter, if there are more passes than the number of these allowances there are men who do not get allowances. They have to wait till there is a vacancy. And it is so in other places as well. The man quite understands that. He knows that he is qualified, and wishes he had the £100 a year that goes on the qualification if there is a vacancy, but the Treasury have refused there, so they have refused here, to make a larger number of £100 a year allowances than they think right.

7550. The Bishop or Bosc.—You would not think it feasible for an unlimited number of teachers to reach the highest grade?—Of course, I would only have the highest grade for those who had proved themselves the very best teachers.

7551. Suppose in one generation you had a thousand teachers who had proved themselves qualified for that grade, would you pay those thousand teachers the maximum salary?—That would not arise.

7552. Something like it might arise. Must you not set down some limit—for instance, would you allow a number of men in the army that were very clever men all to become generals?—No, that would be impossible.

7553. But do you not think there is the same difficulty—in one generation of teachers you might have a large number of men and women who would be qualified, entirely beyond the number that you would reasonably have posts for, and in another generation the number might be small, and you might have posts for them all?—I do not think that would arise. I think the conditions are pretty much the same. You may have occasionally very distinguished men, but as a broad general rule you must have much the same variety in the ability of the different generations.

7554. Possibly not. Some people say talent goes in cycles, and there are waves of stupidity and waves of talent. I think you will agree that there must be some limit?—I would make a limit in the efficiency of the work.

7555. But we always come back to the original question of the number of posts in any service. You have a certain number of posts with a certain high salary, and other posts with lower salary, and the general body of the service in the lower positions. Will you change the number of posts with the higher salary simply and solely because you happen to have qualified men to occupy those posts, and will you abolish those posts on another occasion when you have not men to occupy them, and will your posts be constantly changing?—I think not; but the difficulty of the teachers arises from that point, whether they do not yet understand it or not; but they think that this money going back while they are not being paid is an anomaly.

7556. I think you may take it from Sir Hiram and myself that the money does not go back, and that they do not understand it. You were comparing the two systems a while ago, the old results system and the present system, and you found certain advantages in the present system and certain disadvantages, and you pointed out that one of the advantages was that you thought reading was more intelligent under the present system?—Yes.

7557. And you said you thought reading was more mechanical and less intelligent under the old system?—Yes, and one of the reasons, of course, is that there are more teachers now. The lowering of the average for an assistant in country schools and the admission of junior assistant mistresses are of great benefit to us. There is now more intelligence and more care.



7538. And do you think the system under which the teachers work will shape their teaching to a large extent—for instance, when the idea of the old results system was that the children had to pass an individual examination in each subject with a certain fee attached to each subject, was there not a temptation to the teacher so to shape his teaching as to get the child to pass that examination?—There was, but the child had the knowledge.

7539. But that was the tendency, to shape the teaching in that direction?—Yes.

7540. And then we come to the question whether that knowledge was mechanical or was intelligent, in other words, whether there was knowledge stored up in the mind of the child, or whether the knowledge was perfectly assimilated in the mind of the child so as to become part and parcel of its nature?—Where the teacher taught the subject from the beginning of his year to the children, and then, of course, made special preparation for the last two or three months, I think there was not, on the whole, much fault to be found with it.

7541. I am quite prepared to hear that a really good efficient teacher who worked all the year round had the children well taught; but there again, is there not a tendency on the part of a great many to be perfunctory in the beginning, and to put on a spurt towards the end? Was it possible for men to get the examination passed by putting on a spurt at the end?—I am sure they were never a great success.

7542. But they succeeded at the individual examinations?—Not as a rule, I think.

7543. Do you think that there would be such people?—I do.

7544. And do you think that the system permitted, and if we take into consideration what human nature is, we might almost say encouraged, that system?—Not amongst the best class of the teachers.

7545. But what about those men who were below the average?—Well, you are simply covering up other defects under this system till you examine the work.

7546. I am not, because you must remember that under this system they have to work all the year round, and they have to put forward all that is best in them. Now what is your opinion to such a case as this? Take two teachers—one is a really efficient teacher in the highest sense of the word. He brings out the mind and intellect of the child observes and trains all that is best in the child's mind. Take another man who has not that faculty (which is largely a gift of nature); and those two men are set to work. Now under the old system, as it seems to me, the man who is not gifted in the way I describe might succeed in getting a good deal of stored-up knowledge into the heads of the children, and thus succeed in the examinations; but under the present system that man, in my opinion, would have a very poor chance. Would you agree to that?—No; I would not agree to that. I think under the present system that man might get through more successfully than under the old, because a great deal of his work would not be examined. It is really inspection, but it is not examination.

7547. But it is the inspection that hits them, because the inspector comes and sees the method of the teaching and the style in which the children receive the teaching, and the way they answer to it, and he judges the responsiveness of the children to the teacher. And to a good teacher the children will be responsive. They may possibly have less knowledge, but do you not think that a good teacher may come out better under the new system than the rather dull teacher that I have described to you?—The good teacher will come out well under either system.

7548. But the system you want is a system that will draw out the children, and that will give more opportunity to the poor children to avail of the teaching. You told us that the children under the new system knew less arithmetic than under the old. I am quite prepared to agree with you there; but you did not ask those business men with regard to the capacity and capability of those boys, their aptness and their adaptability to their new business, you did not hear them express their opinion on that?—No; but arithmetic was pretty well taught under the results system.

7549. You might take a boy who could do his arithmetic very well, and who might not be so well adapted to business. He might be slow in learning methods of business. You might get him to do arithmetic excellently, and find him dull in picking up methods of business?—That does not apply. The child that does arithmetic well is generally intelligent and suited for business and keeping accounts, and everything like that.

7550. I would be glad to hear business men's views, and I would suggest inquiry about that?—I have a very high idea of mathematical knowledge, and, of course, arithmetic is a department of mathematics.

7551. And so have I, but my idea of arithmetic is that you should teach it methodically, taking up a rule, seeing that they understand all about it, and then passing to another?—But a great deal of practice is necessary—

7552. A great deal of practice in questions taken from different rules?—A great deal of practice. First each rule was taught well, and then any amount of exercises given on each rule.

7553. Was not a great deal of time spent on working out what they called those test cards?—Yes.

7554. Those test cards were of the mixed kind I describe?—Were they?

7555. And when the children were working at those they were not getting methodical instruction in any particular rule?—No, but they should have been methodically instructed first before they got those cards. They should know the rules thoroughly. That was merely practice.

7556. They should, but did they always?—I think in a good school.

7557. Mr. COOPER.—Practically every school had that knowledge before?—Yes, practically every school had that knowledge.

7558. I am glad to find that you had no complaint against any of your inspectors individually either on behalf of the managers or on behalf of the teachers; but you complained of the present system of inspection of schools?—In certain respects.

7559. And you do not seem to think that it is reasonably conceivable that a large body of men could by chance agree in appraising the work of a school on a system of impressions?—I do not.

7560. You said you liked uniformity. Now what is the advantage of this system of merit marks, excellent, very good, and so on?—Well, it seems a fair test of the work done. "Excellent," of course, is very high, and should be hard to get. Then "Very good" comes next, and then "Good," and so all the way down; and it seems a fair test of the work that the teacher does.

7561. Of what advantage would it be to you when different inspectors do it?—I have not found that they differed seriously.

7562. In your experience?—Yes. I generally find that where we get "Very good," a new inspector is slow to change the mark, and when we get "Good," he is slow to change that. There must be some falling back or a distinct advantage before a change of inspectors would interfere with the mark.

7563. Do you not think it very likely that if two equally competent and conscientious inspectors give merit marks to a school one might give it "Good" and the other "Very good"?—Yes, it might happen.

7564. Very likely?—No.

7565. On the impression system?—No; in my experience I do not think it is very likely. The inspectors agree fairly well, in my experience, as a rule.

7566. You say that reading in the schools has improved, and one of the reasons that you give is that the staffing is more adequate at present than it used to be under the results system?—Yes.

7567. Is there not another very substantial reason why the reading should at the present time be more intelligent, that is, that the subject of the reading book has been very much altered?—It has.

7568. The 6th Reader in the results days was largely made up of extracts from the highest type in English literature?—It was.

17th April, 1913.]

REV. DAVID CUSHING, M.A., examined.

[Continued.]

7589. And now the 6th Standard have books that are more suitable for boys?—Yes.

7590. Do you think that that would account for the improvement to a large extent?—More time is given to intelligent understanding of the subject.

7591. His lordship asked you whether there were not cases within your knowledge, under the results system, of men neglecting their work for a considerable part of the year, and putting on a spurt at the end of the year. Could you conceive, from your knowledge of the National Schools, any man achieving satisfactory results who did not work consistently throughout the year?—I think it would be impossible for him to obtain a high standard of efficiency except he first taught from the beginning of the year. He might get through, he might be allowed to pass on, but his school would not be ranked as a high-class school.

7592. In the present system is the cultivation of memory entirely disregarded or nearly entirely disregarded?—Well, a good deal.

7593. Do you not think that is a great mistake?—In the results system it was thought that it was overdone, that the child's memory was filled far too much.

7594. But you think it is practically not done now?—There is mental arithmetic now.

7595. That would not be memory?—Well, it receives a good deal more time and attention than it did, and I know that to be a very good thing.

7596. You say, "Rightly or wrongly there exists the feeling that the National Board means the Resident Commissioner." Will you give us a little more explanation about that statement?—Well, there is a feeling that the teachers have to-day, and the managers practically altogether, that the Resident Commissioner is in fact the Board. I have a very high appreciation of the Resident Commissioner and his work, and it is highly difficult work. I am not one of those who believe that he has failed; but I would associate a Committee with him. I would put three Commissioners to hear an appeal case, and I would give the teachers more fair play. I think in cases of appeal, where a teacher or manager would appeal against an unfair examination, such cases should be heard before three Commissioners, which would be only fair to the Resident Commissioner, I think. That is the idea I have. Of course, it is only my own idea, and you can have it for what it is worth, but I am not one of those who find fault with the Resident Commissioner. I cannot agree with him in certain things, but I think he is a very eminent educationalist.

7597. He is a very eminent scholar?—Yes.

7598. Mr. HARRISON.—Your proposal is tantamount to a return, a very long way, to the old individual examination and payment by results, is it not?—Only partly.

7599. Have you any idea how such a return would be received by the great body of teachers?—I tried to find that out. Of course, it is very hard to answer that question definitely. Perhaps the majority of teachers would agree with me, perhaps not, but I think a large proportion of the senior men would be inclined to agree with me, though I cannot say definitely.

7600. The CHAIRMAN.—The men trained under the old system?—No, not exactly that. They are now largely retired. Some of our good teachers I know would be in favour of not going back to the old system. There was too much of "results" in it.

7601. Mr. HARRISON.—Would they be in favour of going as far back on the road as you have suggested to us?—Of course, I could not answer for them.

7602. This is entirely your own idea?—That is my idea, and I have been talking with the teachers, and some of them would differ from me and some of them would not.

7603. The CHAIRMAN.—You told us that you had no complaints to make of your inspectors?—I have never had any serious complaint to make of any of our inspectors for the last 24 years, nor have my teachers had.

7604. I do not know that you could have any complaints to make. Are you aware of what is the percentage of "excellents" and "very goods" for all Ireland?—The "excellents" are about 10, I think.

7605. It is a little more than that. The percentage of "excellents" and "very goods" for all Ireland is about 35?—Oh, yes.

7606. Have you any idea of the percentage of the "excellents" and "very goods" in your district?—I do not know the figure, but I know we stand well, and deservedly.

7607. The "excellents" and "very goods" in your district make 32 per cent?—Yes.

7608. That is the percentage in Ballymena circuit?—I know the Resident Commissioner and Mr. Dillworth came amongst us not long ago (I could not say definitely the time)—about two years ago—to see our standard of marks, and saw it was higher than in most places, and I believe they agreed that we deserved it.

7609. Mr. HERRAT.—Do you consider that under the present system the schools have improved?—I think they are improved in several respects.

7610. Is that the general opinion of people about Ballymena?—I do not hear any serious complaints. They think, perhaps, in some cases that we are working the children too hard.

7611. Then would you agree with this statement in reference to Ballymena district?—"The parents within reach of an intermediate school who can pay the intermediate fees give the National School the cold shoulder"?—No.

7612. That is for the year 1910-11. Does that look like appreciation of the system?—I never found that.

7613. I have it here in print in the report of Mr. Pedlow, the senior inspector of the district?—In what way, may I ask, does he give it, for he may mean by that that they were taking the children away before they reached their highest standard. They might refer to the town. It would not refer to our country districts. It refers more to Ballymena, I suspect. I know the whole Ballymena district fairly well.

7614. In the present system has sufficient care been taken to see that the children are promoted at regular intervals?—I think so.

7615. Well here is what Mr. Pedlow says:—"Recently I examined the record book and register of a country school where two pupils had made over 600 attendances in the infant class, were advanced in years, and were not promoted. Others were kept from 4 to 6 years in the class. Such children must leave the school illiterate."?—I have heard complaints on that head. Such cases are very exceptional.

7616. When cases like that can arise, do you think that the present system makes provision to see that pupils are promoted at regular intervals?—Of course, there would be exceptional. There may be some complaints that they are not promoted fast enough, but I think the teacher ought to be the best judge in the case.

7617. Did I understand you to say that reading had improved?—I believe it has.

7618. Here is what the inspector says:—"Initiative and spontaneous reading is characteristic of the schools in the Counties of Antrim and Londonderry, and so, too, is initiative speaking"?—Of course, I agree with that. There is a difficulty very often in the inspector not understanding what the children say, and there is an equal difficulty in understanding the inspector sometimes.

7619. The BRUNER or REES.—Would you make a distinction between monotonous reading and intelligent reading (what you said was improved was intelligent reading)—is there a difference between intelligent reading and monotonous reading?—There is. By intelligent reading I mean that the child understands what it is reading. It is not so much that they read monotonously, but that they understand the thing, and I think there is an improvement in reading in that sense.

7620. Mr. HERRAT.—The inspector says, "History and geography are subjects in which the pupils display too little knowledge." Do you agree with that statement?—Well, geography has not been properly taught. In fact it was discouraged for a while, but we are getting back to it again.

7621. "And I must say that arithmetic in the senior standard has improved." I think that agrees with your own estimate?—Yes, I think so.

17th April, 1918.]

REV. DAVID CURRIE, M.A., examined.

[Continued.]

7622. And then Mr. Hughes says:—"Reading, though good in many schools, has not improved to that extent that one would expect from a zealous and hard-working teacher. Clearness of utterance is not sufficiently insisted on. History continues to make little or no progress. In composition a higher standard should be aimed at. In the junior standards arithmetic is more successfully taught than in the senior. In the latter standards the proficiency is only fair. Geography has not improved. It still remains a dry, uninteresting study, often mere map-pointing." Does that agree with your knowledge of the schools in the Ballymore circuit?—That reading has not improved to the extent that one would expect—I would agree with that. There is a difference in clearness of utterance. It partly belongs to our neighbourhood. There is a good deal of the Scotch element in Ballymore, and that is the difficulty.

7623. Then he says, "History continues to make little or no progress"?—Well I think better progress is being made in history now. It used to be the case that it was not taught at all, and the children are taking to it now.

7624. I suppose you will agree with me that the children ought to be trained in habits of neatness so far as their work in school is concerned?—Yes.

7625. I see in another section of the district, "It is seldom, and only in the very best schools, that one finds an effort made to set out the arithmetical operations in an intelligent and methodical order. Figures often appear as if they had been taken up at random and thrown at the paper." Does that look like neatness?—Well, I do not know. I am familiar with all the children's exercises, and really there is a good deal of care taken. Of course, I am not competent to give an opinion exactly on that.

7626. But you think that individual examination of the children is necessary to test the work?—Yes, I do.

7627. And you think it is the only way in which the real work of the teacher can be tested as far as the imparting of knowledge is concerned?—Yes.

7628. I will read another extract for you. Do you agree with this?—"Now it is my experience that the successful teacher under our results system is not the man who crams, who distributes his textbooks, and says, 'learn page one to-day; to-morrow learn page two,' and so on; who neglects the blackboard and hands round arithmetic cards to his class; who works on the line of the inspector's examination; in a word, who neglects method for the sake of past proficiency. On the contrary, it is the man who distributes his work evenly throughout the year, and develops his subject intelligently irrespective of the paging of text-books; who finds use for chalk and the blackboard no matter what subject he is teaching; who is able, by diagram and illustration, to catch the eye and take captive the minds of his pupils. This is the man I find who secures the best results under the present system, and it would be strange if it were otherwise. The intelligent teacher endowed with talent and taste for the work he has undertaken will teach methodically under any system, whereas, on the other hand, there will always be teachers unable to rise to the level of scientific instruction." Do you agree with that statement of an eminent educationalist?—Yes.

7629. That is by Mr. Murphy, Senior Inspector, in the appendix to the 63rd report, page 1612—I would agree with every word of that.

7630. So that under the results system regular and methodical instruction from the beginning of the year to the end of the year was necessary to secure success?—Yes.

7631. And it was impossible to be really in the true sense successful without it?—Yes.

7632. And then if the system more or less degenerated and became mechanical, so it did in some respects, was not that due to the mechanical method by which the inspector tested the pupils?—I think everyone got, in a manner, tired of it. It was too great a worry. Perhaps it developed in many cases into lines that none of us would like. I am not in favour of going back to it as it was. There was far too much money spent upon the different things.

7633. I would object to the shilling fee myself?—It is only as a small stimulus to the teacher.

7634. So, then the examinations influenced the teaching, and then, as a consequence of that, the teaching became mechanical, and the examination became mechanical?—I understand. But you could not conduct an examination without having it in some manner mechanical. How could you do arithmetic, for instance, without putting down certain questions?

7635. I would not call that mechanical at all. It might or it might not be?—Yes.

7636. Sir HIRSH WILKINSON.—Children are not received into the Intermediate schools till they are of an age at which they ought to be received?—In the Intermediate system they encourage the receiving of the child early.

7637. "Early" means 10 or 11 years old, I suppose?—I think 12.

7638. It has been pointed out by educationalists that one of the difficulties of children receiving proper Intermediate education is that some of them have been kept too long in the primary schools, and have not been able to start their development by reason of not coming into the Intermediate school at an earlier age?—We have had children that have left a National school which set up a high standard, and that have done well in the Intermediate. They had a fine training.

7639. The CHAIRMAN.—What Intermediate school have you?—We have one of the best in Ireland, Ballymena.

7640. Sir HIRSH WILKINSON.—Mr. Pedlow, in dealing with the matter of attendance, gives reasons why the attendance in some cases has fallen, and one of the reasons he gives is the early departure of pupils to the Intermediate school who could afford to go there, and properly go there at an early age, and he speaks of their giving the National school the cold shoulder; but if he means to say that they ought not to go, I take it that you would agree that he is quite wrong in suggesting that they ought not to go?—I think he is referring to the town more than to the country.

7641. But ought not the children to go to the Intermediate school before they are compelled to leave the Primary school by being too old for it?—Yes, I think there is no objection to leaving at 12 or 13.

The CHAIRMAN.—In some of the English Grammar schools it is said that if they come in at 15 nothing can be done with them.

7642. Sir HIRSH WILKINSON.—We were talking a while ago with regard to the question of returning money to the Treasury, and it has been pointed out that the reports of the Commissioners, so far as relate to the statement of accounts, lends countenance to the idea of the teachers that the Commissioners had the money and would not give it to them. Here is what is in the 76th Report of the Commissioners, page 87:—"An account showing the funds at the disposal of the Commissioners in 1908-9," and it winds up as follows:—"Balance of Parliamentary vote of 1907-8 surrendered, £15,422 2s. 3d." I think you will probably consider that a National teacher, looking at that account, would naturally consider that the Commissioners had that money at their disposal and gave it back again, without applying it as they might have applied it, to the teachers' salaries?—Yes, I think it is very hard to show the teachers that it was impossible to give them that money.

7643. But still it is explained in the 74th Report of the Commissioners. If I may say so, I think the word "surrendered" there is misleading and infelicitous. Now, in their 74th Report the Commissioners say:—"Owing to the number of men teachers who have qualified by service and efficiency for promotion to the first section of the first grade since 1900, we anticipated that we should have to defer the promotion of many highly efficient principal teachers unless the number of available places in the first and second section of first grade were at once increased. We accordingly entered into correspondence with the Treasury on the subject, calling attention to the urgent demands which had arisen for the reconsideration of the number of places available in the higher sections, and to the grave embarrassment that would ensue if the advancement of the teachers who had satisfied the

conditions of promotion were arrested. We regret to say that our representations to the Treasury have been fruitless, and we have found it necessary to issue a circular to the managers and teachers of schools explaining our difficulties with regard to the promotion of teachers. We are satisfied that our recommendations to the Treasury would not have affected materially the stability of the general scheme of payments to the National teachers, and we feel that so long as the limits of the money placed at our disposal by Parliament for primary education in Ireland are not exceeded, we should not be restrained by Treasury regulations from making such promotions of teachers as we consider right in the interests of education. Complaint is at present made of the long period of service which must necessarily be given before a teacher can reach the maximum salary in the first division of first grade, but if this period is to be further considerably lengthened, while the teacher awaits the occurrence of a vacancy in both sections of the first grade, we foresee considerable difficulty in securing the services of efficient teachers for the schools. That is a pronouncement of the Commissioners themselves on the subject, and they complain that the Treasury won't meet their wishes.—Just so.

1644. So that at a time when the teachers feel that they have a grievance against the Commissioners you, so to speak, think, as we all do, that it is highly desirable that the feeling should not be aggravated by misapprehension?—Yes.

The CHAIRMAN.—And there the Commissioners are in their right in pressing a grievance of their own against the Treasury.

1645. Sir HIRSH WILKINSON.—Have you seen that circular at all that they refer to—the circular to managers and teachers of schools, explaining their difficulties with regard to the promotion of teachers?—Oh, yes, I believe I got that circular.

1646. But that did not satisfy you?—I think I understand the difficulty that the Commissioners have, but it is hard to convince the teachers on that point.

1647. It might be well to call attention to the existence of an analogous state of things which you probably know exists in other services. A young friend of mine in the army informed me that he had just passed his examination for his majority, but that he did not expect to get it for several years. That, you see, is an analogous case?—Yes.

1648. The CHAIRMAN.—I know that a relative of mine was kept waiting for four years?—But we are losing promising young teachers at the present time because the initial salaries are too low—promising young men.

1649. We have had the matter up for discussion before, but we cannot, among our recommendations, include a recommendation that more money should be expended on National education. The question was considered from the point of view of whether the initial salary could be made higher, and yet the estimate not be exceeded. That could only be done by curtailing the increments. Do you think it would be better to raise the initial salary and curtail the increments, than to keep the increments and initial salary at the present figure?—I would rather have both if I could get them. I believe the Commissioners will not get the material that they want under the present initial salaries.

1650. But you believe that keeping within the limits of the vote and raising the initial salary, but yet not giving increments of the same amount as at present, would be an advantage?—No; I would scarcely agree with that. Of course, it means more money. But what I want to impress on the Commissioners is this—that they will not get a properly educated young man except they make the initial salary £90.

1651. But would he be content, if he got an initial salary of £90, to wait a longer time for promotion than he does at present—you know that when he takes the lower salary he can get an increment of £7 every three years?—I think he would prefer to start at £90, though it would be a little more tedious afterwards.

1652. You say that there is a difficulty now in getting young men to take up the profession?—Yes; I find intelligent young men of good character now are dissatisfied with the initial salary, and are resigning and going out to Canada and other places.

1653. The BISHOP OF ROSK.—Are they going to Canada to teach?—Yes, to teach. I find great difficulty in getting any competition for a fairly good country school.

1654. The CHAIRMAN.—Though you have a great attraction in Ballymora, which is one of the most rising towns in Ireland, with all kinds of business going on?—Yes.

1655. Sir HIRSH WILKINSON.—Are there any points that you would like to inform the Committee on that have not been asked?—Yes, there is one point. I think the inspectors' work might, with advantage, be reviewed, the way it used to be in the old system, with a head inspector going over the districts and testing the inspectors' work. That was useful. That is one point. The initial salary of the teachers, I believe, should be larger, £90 and £100, because the cost of living is increasing; and another point is notice of new rules, and I think the Commissioners might take both the teacher and manager more into confidence in the shaping of a new rule.

1656. I mentioned that there was a recommendation of the Pover Commission that rules should be laid before Parliament for a month before they came into operation. The Pover Commission was in 1870. In 1898 there was an Act passed for the publication of statutory rules, which provided for 40 days' notice of new rules, within which time anybody could make representations to the rule-making authority, and such representations were to be taken into account. Either of these conditions would, I suppose, meet your objection with regard to the want of notice?—I would give six months' notice, if possible.

1657. You think 40 days' would not be sufficient?—I do. I would give six months' notice, because in country districts and scattered districts it takes some time.

1658. The CHAIRMAN.—Would you demand six months' notice on the part of the public?—Well, I think that would be right. And also I think that the junior assistant mistresses should have the status of teachers, and I think that was a question that the Treasury agreed to; and they are very useful.

1659. Sir HIRSH WILKINSON.—That would involve an additional expenditure of money?—Oh, yes; it would.

1660. The BISHOP OF ROSK.—You would abolish the junior assistant mistresses and put assistant mistresses in their stead. It would work out that way?—No; I would not. I think the arrangement for having a junior assistant mistress with a small salary is working well in a great many instances. Where she lives at home and has a small salary she can live nicely; but they have not the status of teachers.

1661. Do you want to increase their qualifications, or would you leave their qualifications as they are?—I think they are entitled to be ranked as eligible for pension. That is one of the things that are cut off from them.

1662. Without increasing the salary, you certainly would not encourage a girl to start life on £24 a year and remain on £24 a year till she was eligible for pension?—Well, she could do that and live in her father's house in the country, upon a salary like that. Another point is that salaries might be paid directly to the teachers, instead of through the manager.

## SIXTEENTH DAY.—FRIDAY, APRIL 18TH, 1913.

At 25, Kildare-street, Dublin.

Present:—**SIR SAMUEL DILL, M.A., LL.D., LL.D. (Chairman);** The Most Rev. **DENIS KELLY, D.D., Bishop of Ross;** **SIR HIRAM SHAW WILKINSON, LL.D.;** **MR. JOHN COFFEY;** **MR. HENRAGE E. B. HARRISON, B.A.;** **MR. JEREMIAH HENLY;** **MR. THOMAS MICHAEL KETTLE, B.L.;** and

**MR. ARTHUR J. DONNELLY, M.A., B.Sc., Secretary.**

**REV. DAVID MACLAUGHLIN, B.D., Ph.D., Drumcraigs, Armagh, examined.**

7763. The CHAIRMAN.—I believe, Dr. MacLaughlin, you are minister of Drumcraigs. How long have you occupied that position?—Almost twenty years.

7764. Was that your first charge?—Yes, my only charge.

7765. And I suppose you are manager of a school or schools in the neighbourhood?—Yes, I am manager of one school, and I expected to be manager of two, but Dr. Starke thought otherwise. We had a long wrangle and fight, but he beat me.

7766. Is that a small school?—It is a very small village, perhaps 80 or 100. The pupils are, generally speaking, from the country district. There are about 60 children on the rolls, and an average of about 35 or 37.

7767. What is the staff?—The staff is two teachers, male and female.

7768. And what is the grade of those teachers?—The principal is first class—under the old system first class—and the assistant is a junior assistant mistress.

7769. He was first class before 1900. What is he now?—Well, he carries the grade salary. He has about £110, and the report for the last three years has been "good."

7770. What is his grade under the new system?—He is a first class teacher.

7771. Under the old?—Yes; he carries his grade salary with him.

7772. I know he carries the grade salary, but what is the grade under the new system, for you might be first under the old and third under the new?—He is not third.

7773. Mr. HENLY.—He would be second?—I suppose at least second. There is no reason why he should be reduced, because his report has been invariably good.

7774. The CHAIRMAN.—Now, I take the first subject, the inspection of the school, which is the principal subject we have to consider. Do you regularly attend the inspection of your school?—As a rule I do, I am sure, except I happen to be away from home.

7775. Have you any complaint to make of insufficiency of notice?—Oh, no. Generally speaking, I get notice a day or two beforehand; but it might be that I am two or three days or a week away from home. Of course, under the old system we knew exactly the day, and could be there.

7776. You have no complaint on the ground of notice?—No.

7777. You have seen a great many inspectors in your district?—A great number.

7778. Have the changes been frequent lately?—Yes. We have had the senior inspector for, I think, four years, a Mr. O'Riordan.

7779. Are the district inspectors changed frequently?—They are. We had a new inspector just a few weeks ago, a Mr. Garrell.

7780. Are they changed too frequently?—I think it would be better if the inspectors were longer in the district, that is, if they are satisfactory. Of course, if you have an unsatisfactory inspector, the shorter the time the better, for he raises mischief.

7781. You seem to disapprove of the present system of inspection as compared with the old?—I do, certainly.

7782. Will you kindly tell us what are the defects in the present system that you have noticed?—To my mind, it is impossible for an inspector to obtain an accurate idea as to the status of the school, and as to the teaching being done by making a casual visit of, perhaps, half-an-hour, and looking at the general

work going on, studying the teacher's report of progress, and, perhaps, calling out two or three pupils and testing them in one subject, or it might be two. These two pupils might be the greatest dunces of the school, and the inspector might draw a wrong conclusion as to the actual worth of the teaching.

7783. Do you want to return to the old system of individual examination of every pupil?—At least class examination. I would not like to go back to the old residue system completely, because it became a great burden on the pupils.

7784. You want class examination when there is an examination held?—Yes; I think there should be class examination at least, and a test for all subjects I have stated above.

7785. And your deliberate opinion is that one great defect of the present system is, that there is too little systematic examination of pupils?—Exactly.

7786. Is it your opinion that it is founded too much on impressions?—That is my opinion.

7787. Have you had to forward any appeals against the judgments of the inspectors on the school?—Not particularly. I have noticed this as compared with the old system, that the inspector is more apt to deal with trivial matters, that are only worrying to a good teacher.

7788. Do you find that under the present system the inspector is too much given to criticism and fault-finding, and that he does not help the teacher in attaining right methods?—Yes.

7789. Or in giving an example of teaching?—Yes; as a rule we only expect faults. They generally look for faults. There have been exceptions. There was Mr. Worsley who, I greatly regret, is dead. He, to my mind, was an ideal inspector. He would spend a couple or three hours in the school, and he would carefully watch the teacher, and if he saw a defect he would point out how it could be remedied, and in every way he would try to encourage the teacher.

7790. And he would advise him?—Yes.

7791. Has your teacher complained to you that he was not on those occasions getting the help from the inspector that he might expect?—The opinion of my principal is that the present system is bad compared with the old, and really that the inspector's help to the teacher is counted as being of little value just now.

7792. Are the relations between you and the inspector, and between the teacher and the inspector, on the whole satisfactory?—Yes, on the whole, most harmonious.

7793. You have no complaint to make of the manner of the inspectors to you or the teacher?—No. Their manner is all that could be desired towards me. General speaking, they call at my house when they come to visit, and we discuss matters quietly, and so far as I see the methods of the inspectors, they are gentlemen of culture and good breeding to all concerned. We have had an inspector who afterwards went down to Limerick and raised tremendous rows there. It was not with me alone, but he had rows with the Roman Catholic clergymen, and fought them as fiercely as myself, so that it was not my fault; and I learned afterwards of the mischief done in Limerick, where the majority are Roman Catholics. But he fought straight.

7794. Now, you have promised us suggestions for getting a more efficient system of elementary education in Ireland?—Yes.

7795. Give us as shortly as possible any suggestions that you have to lay before us, and, first, give us a general idea of what your suggestions are?—My opinion is that we should all go back to the fundamental

principles or rule of the National Education system, which is united secular and moral education.

7796. You are there entering on a subject that we have no right to deal with?—I beg your pardon. Well, next to that, I would suggest that we should have school areas appointed, school districts. We are supposed to have compulsory education, but it is a dead letter. Now, school areas would end that. If a child has been in irregular attendance at my school it takes about four or five months to get the child's parents under control. What they do is to send the child to another school, and get him enrolled there, and it takes five months longer to get the law in operation there, and then perhaps the child may come back. Now, if you had a district marked out for each school you would have this child under control, just as the Board System is in England and Scotland.

7797. Supposing a child lived on the edge of a district you would not let him go to the next district?—Not except under special circumstances. There might be special circumstances.

7798. The Rector or Rouse.—How would you solve the problem if the children wanted to go to the Church School or Roman Catholic School?—That is where the trouble comes in, and that is why we want united moral and secular education. Of course, I would not be prepared to state that every National school should be upheld for religious instruction for every child.

7799. The CHAIRMAN.—Please go on to the next point?—The next matter would not, I presume, cause great difficulty in working these rural schools in the country. I would place one school no further away than a mile and a half from another for all children under 12. I would appoint female teachers of these schools for children under 12 years, and then I would have a higher grade school, such as the Model, or, perhaps, the Model remodelled.

7800. For children from 12 up to 15, 16 or 17?—Yes, at a distance of about three miles for children from 12 up to 15, 16 or 17, where they would get instruction somewhat similar to that in the higher grade schools in England and Scotland, and so, more or less, lead the child onward to higher education, either professional or university, as the case might be, or technical, and in that way I would conduct the child gradually from the lower to the higher. And these model schools might be made the training ground for teachers for the rural schools.

7801. Now, taking the present system in its main lines as established at present, would you tell us how you would improve that system? What you are proposing is a revolutionary system, which it would take some time to realise, but could you tell us how you would improve the present system?—Well, I would go back to the old annual examination of the school.

7802. And would that take in every pupil?—Yes, every pupil.

7803. And that would be once a year?—Once a year, and I would make it pretty thorough, but I would not restore the results' system again under any circumstances.

7804. You would not have payment for any subject? No, but I would make that examination tell on the teacher's salary.

7805. By report?—By report. Just as the inspector's report does at the present time.

7806. Would you have an annual examination of every pupil and make the report up on that examination have an effect on the teacher's salary—is that what you say?—Yes.

7807. Have you any other suggestion for improving the system as it is in the main lines? How do you regard the new programme introduced in 1907?—I entirely disagree with it.

7808. In what respects do you disagree with it?—It is not suitable to our schools.

7809. That is, the additional subjects are not?—Yes, and it is lowering the educational status of our country.

7810. Do you mean owing to the introduction of these. You would confine it to three or four elementary subjects?—Yes, the elementary subjects, and it has become a practical matter in my district in this respect that shopkeepers and business people cannot get assistants and apprentices having that amount of literary education to qualify them for those posts.

7811. Under the word "literary" you include all the elementary subjects, such as reading, writing and arithmetic?—And, of course, grammar and geography.

7812. These boys, you say, under the new system are so defectively educated that business people do not like to take them?—In fact, they are of no value to them. I know a large draper in Armagh city who told me that he had six boys in succession tested and they were of no use. In my own school I never permitted that system to be introduced—I had more or less that power—and I kept as near as I possibly could to the old system.

7813. You have to teach some of those additional subjects, of course?—Yes; of course, some of them are desirable.

7814. Which of them?—I did not introduce cookery, and I had a hard fight on that point.

7815. Have you elementary science?—I have; but we have an excellent teacher and it is made interesting. I would agree with that, because the subject is most very interesting to the pupils and it helps to break the monotony.

7816. And you have drill and singing?—We have drill and singing.

7817. Have you had any trouble in the teaching of singing?—Well, it is very difficult to get a teacher who understands it. That is just the difficulty.

7818. Have you ever had complaints to make about the want of uniformity of standard in the marking of the teachers?—Yes. For example, in my school, the senior inspector found fault with the reading, and the teacher was not at all satisfied with that, because he rather prided himself on his success in teaching reading, and the next inspector came round and found the reading to be excellent. Of course, it may have been that a special effort was made to improve it.

7819. What was the interval?—It would be five or six months, perhaps.

7820. Mr. CORRY.—You entirely express my views as to the necessity for an examination?—I thoroughly believe in that. I have had experience of the old system and the new, and I think I am able to judge pretty fairly.

7821. Do you believe that this system of merit marks, labelling schools as "excellent" and "very good," and so on, is a reliable system?—I do not think it is. I think it can be abused; but, at the same time, to a conscientious inspector it is sometimes a matter of very great difficulty. For example, Mr. Worsley, whom I named a while ago, was a most conscientious gentleman, and he found the greatest difficulty in deciding whether he should mark the school "very good" or "good."

7822. Taking all the inspectors as conscientious gentlemen, and I believe they are, do you not think they would have very great difficulty agreeing as to whether a school should be marked "very good" or "good"?—I believe so. I would not like to have to do it myself. I generally examine this school myself.

7823. The CHAIRMAN.—I intended to ask you this. It is in the Board's rules that they advise the manager to institute examinations under his own control?—Yes.

7824. Either by himself or by the teachers. You have got that in your school?—Yes. I generally do that; but in the last three years I have allowed the teacher to do it.

7825. Mr. CORRY.—What were the complaints that the teacher and manager had to make of the inspector who you have told the Committee created considerable trouble?—I may just tell you my own trouble. It was this. It arose in relation to the office connected with my school. Before building the school I showed the inspector the plan, and we went on building this school room and the necessary offices. Before we removed the pupils from the temporary building he approved of the whole arrangement, so that the matter went on for about ten months or so, when, to my amazement, I got a report from the Board, apparently a copy of the inspector's report, stating that the offices were only temporary wooden structures, and that they were far too close to the main building, and so on. Well, of course, I replied to that, pointing out that they were not wooden structures, that they were, as a matter of fact, built of lime and brick, with a roof of corrugated iron, and finished off as carefully as they

1885 April, 1913.]

REV. DAVID MACLACHLAN, B.D., Ph.D., examined.

[Continued.]

could be, and that I certainly objected to his report; and they tried to sustain the report and the fight went on.

7826. Had you a correspondence with the Board?—With the Board all the time.

7827. And how did it end?—Well, it ended that I won the victory that time, but a severe victory.

7828. But you would not call that a fight with the inspectors?—I mean that I put this inspector in fault. I felt that he was inclined to find fault. I knew it to be a fact. I know the Catholic clergymen in adjoining schools had to insist on another inspector being sent to examine the school, and I had to get that done myself.

7829. To get what?—Other inspectors.

7830. How did you get the other inspectors?—I simply wrote to the Board and stated that I would not accept this gentleman's continuation, and I asked them to send another inspector, as I had known that to be done before, and they did so.

7831. Mr. HAMILTON.—When did they send?—An inspector from another district. I forget the name of the gentleman now; but we had a different inspector for three or four years.

7832. The KEEPER or ROSE.—While this little dispute you refer to remained a man came from the outside to examine in four successive years?—Yes.

7833. Mr. COFFEY.—Did you get a reply from the Board to your application for a new inspector?—No, I did not. I got my letter acknowledged in the usual way; but the inspector came all right, the different inspectors.

7834. The CHAIRMAN.—Quite another?—Yes.

7835. Mr. COFFEY.—Is it not possible he was an inspector that came on relief duty or something of that kind?—He came in the senior inspector's place; you mean?

7836. Yes?—No, I think he was brought from another district.

7837. And returned to his own district?—Yes.

7838. Do you know the names?—No, it is a good while ago; I built the school in 1898, and it was a short time after that that the trouble arose.

7839. How long after?—It might be 15 or 18 months.

7840. The CHAIRMAN.—In 1900?—Yes, 1900 or 1901.

7841. And the gentleman simply appeared and examined your school in another man's district, and then went away back to his own?—Yes; it may have been that the inspector came from another part of the same district. We have three inspectors, junior inspectors, and it may have been that one of these came. I do not recollect now.

7842. One of the inspectors of that circuit?—I got what I wanted. I got another inspector. He may have been from outside the circuit; I could not say. What I wanted was another inspector, and I got it.

7843. Mr. HAMILTON.—In the same year?—Well, at the next inspection that came round. All I was concerned with was to get another inspector. Of course, I made no inquiries.

7844. You hold a strong view, I think, that the Commissioners should give notice of any change they make in their rules, or that they propose to make in their rules?—Certainly.

7845. In order that the public should be acquainted with the matter?—Yes. I found this, that when I was contending for what I thought to be justice, to my astonishment, at the next issue of the rules, I found a new rule inserted that simply put me out.

7846. In fact, you think it necessary that whenever any change in the rules of the Commissioners was to be made, notice should be given to the public?—Certainly.

7847. And to Parliament?—And to Parliament. I only wish that the Board could be brought more under the control of Parliament. I think that is the all-important matter, if by some legislation the Board could be made directly responsible to Parliament, for it is not, and they have boasted in a public Court that they could close every school in Ireland in six months or three months, if they liked.

7848. Where did they boast that?—In the Recorder's Court, in Dublin, when I brought up the Commissioners; but, at any rate, that shows you how free they are. They are too free.

7849. Sir HIRSH WILKINSON.—You said that while a matter in which you were interested, and the result of which depended on a rule of the Board, was under discussion, a new rule was made, which altered your rights?—Yes, my position.

7850. Would you refer us to that particular rule?—I shall. It is rule 93. This is, I think, the 1899 edition that I have here, but it illustrates the fact; that is: "As a condition of aid, the Commissioners must be satisfied," and so on. Now, while my application was pending, and when I was contending that I had fulfilled their requirements, a, b, c, d, a new clause was inserted, so that the rule read as follows: "As conditions of aid the Commissioners, as a rule, must be satisfied that the school is in actual operation, that the case is deserving of assistance," and so on. Now, the addition they made to the rule was this. As first it read: "That as a condition of aid the Commissioners must be satisfied"; the change is: "As a condition of aid the Commissioners, as a rule, must be satisfied."

7851. Mr. COFFEY.—When was the rule changed?—I think it was the next issue.

7852. The CHAIRMAN.—Have you a copy in your hand where the new words are introduced in that rule?—I have the issue of 1905. My trouble went on for over nine years. My application for the salary was lodged in 1900, and it was under that batch of rules I applied in December, 1899, and, of course, my application really came up in 1900, and this was in operation; this was the latest issue then.

7853. The CHAIRMAN.—Without the words that you told us were introduced?—Without the words.

7854. When were those words introduced?—I cannot say exactly just now, but they were introduced when my claim was pending, and I am positive of that.

7855. Mr. HAMILTON.—How did that prejudice your claim?—In this way: I pointed out that I had observed all the rules.

7856. The CHAIRMAN.—But this change affected your claim?—I pointed out to the Board that I had observed all the requirements, and I reminded them that in a certain application they themselves had recognised a school that had practically violated all their rules, and I thought that an injustice to me, for I kept their rules, and therefore my claim should be recognised.

7857. Sir HIRSH WILKINSON.—You were asked whether you thought that there was too much of the marking of the schools founded on impression. There might be an insufficient examination or an impressionist inspection solely. I take it that what you have spoken of is the sampling of a class, and that you object to having a class examined by sample, that is, two or three of the pupils taken out?—It is not so much the class examined by sample as the school.

7858. You object to the school being examined by sample?—Yes; two or three pupils taken out and the whole school judged by their answering.

7859. You speak of the inspectors actually sampling the school?—Yes.

7860. And that the result is founded too much on deduction from insufficient premises?—That is about the logical conclusion, I think.

7861. Mr. HAMILTON.—Can you give us, from your own observation, any details of an inspector's method of procedure?—Well, he comes into the school and observes—

7862. I am talking of the full examination, and I want to get your opinion of the general examination, not of the short visits. Have you been present throughout at one of these general examinations?—Yes, and it is not a sufficient test.

7863. Can you give us any details?—Well, for example, the inspector does not test the knowledge of the children, say, in regard to arithmetic. It may be that he will examine one class, say, in geography, another class in arithmetic, and perhaps in the case of another class he will look through their compositions. He will judge it in that way, and from that will take a general impression of the school.

7864. In that partial examination has he condemned any subject?—Yes.

7865. To your knowledge has he condemned the subject of arithmetic in that way—would he examine one, or at the most two, classes?—He has, for example, in the case of reading.

7896. But I want arithmetic?—I cannot remember in regard to arithmetic, but reading, for example, was about the latest that we have had.

7897. Are you certain that he only tested one or two classes?—Yes, he only tested, generally speaking.

7898. I want the particulars of the examination with full details?—The inspector does not examine the school in full.

7899. The BISHOP or ROES.—On that particular occasion when he tried the reading of the school, how far did he carry his examination?—He called up one section and he heard them read.

7900. Mr. HARRISON.—Are you sure that was all he did?—Yes, and he condemned the reading in that senior section.

7901. Did he condemn the reading generally?—No, he did not; but in the junior division reading does not count for very much.

7902. Does not count for very much in what respect?—Well, the reading in the infants' class—you cannot expect much from them.

7903. You would still expect them to be well taught, I presume?—Yes.

7904. Did he test that?—No, he did not test that.

7905. You said that he selected two or three children only to answer, and they might be the worst?—Yes.

7906. Can you give me any facts bearing upon that?—I have known, for example, about the time of our last general examination, he brought up a boy who had not been at school for three months and tested him. He tested three or four and that boy was among the three or four tested.

7907. Did the teacher point out to him that the boy had been absent?—I believe he did.

7908. And he still continued to examine him?—Yes.

7909. Do you know how much importance he attached to the performance of the boy?—Of course, I could not tell that, it would be for himself to tell that.

7910. Now, you mention that you had not adopted the new programme in its entirety?—Yes.

7911. Are the children in your school more successful in securing business posts than those that come from neighbouring schools?—They are, certainly. I have no difficulty. I have always made it a point when my boys get advanced to try and get them into situations, and I have no difficulty.

7912. And you maintain that there is a distinct difference in the success of your boys in obtaining business posts as compared with the boys of neighbouring schools, where the full programme has been adopted?—I believe it would work out in that way.

7913. You cannot give me any facts?—I am never in a difficulty; I am never refused a boy. When I send a boy in that I think is qualified, and when I know of a vacancy in a shop—

7914. But you cannot give me any facts?—For example, about three weeks ago a boy in the sixth class was appointed without any difficulty whatever in a shop in Armagh.

7915. The CHAIRMAN.—You told me that under the present system there was the greatest difficulty in boys getting places in Armagh, owing to their ignorance of the literary branches. Do I understand now that that did not apply to your school?—No, it did not apply to my school, but in general. I did not allow my principal to limit himself to the programme. I insisted on his going beyond the programme, and in that way I think I did right.

7916. Mr. HARRISON.—Can you give us any facts that bear on that?—Well, what I have mentioned.

7917. The BISHOP or ROES.—But you know that boys sent by other clergymen were refused?—Certainly. This gentleman told me that he had six in succession; they were all from National schools in the district, and not one of them was qualified.

7918. But if you had had these six boys in your school, you might send every one of them forward?—Well, say, four or five, and one would stay at home.

7919. But the boy you sent in a few weeks ago you had made up your mind about him, you knew all about him, and knew that he would be received?—Yes.

7920. And as to those other six boys who were sent in, and were refused, have you any notion or idea

whether you would have sent them on yourself?—Oh, I could not answer that. Of course, they were strangers; but it was in the course of conversation that this gentleman mentioned that to me.

7921. Mr. HARRISON.—I only wanted to know could you give us any facts which would bear upon the general statement that you have made, that your boys are more successful than other boys in obtaining business posts?—Well, we had an Irish week in Armagh in January, and three children out of my school won the highest places in the different competitions—in writing, in geography of the county, and in composition.

7922. The CHAIRMAN.—Three of your children?—Three out of my school, and I do not say that they are more than ordinary children; but they are carefully taught, and I attribute it to the system that we do not confine ourselves to the low programme provided at present in literary subjects.

7923. You mentioned that you wished to have school areas. I suppose that school areas must be under local control with local rates?—I do not see that there would be any necessity for that. I have thought about that.

7924. You do not think that that would necessarily involve what I have said?—I do not see that there is any need for that. Of course, that would be the case in England; but I do not see any need that we should have it.

7925. What would you gain by having school areas? Regular attendance.

7926. Then the school area would simply mean a school area for securing attendance?—Yes.

7927. Sir HERALD WILKINSON.—There would be a difficulty, of course, where there would be only one school in a place, it being a school to which some of the children would not go; but you have mentioned the case of having schools at limited distances which would offer an option to the scholars, so that they could go to either one school or the other. I presume that would be an absolute necessity if we are to insist on religious differences; but I am speaking of what you complained of, namely, scholars going from one school to another. They go to schools in which there is no difficulty of any sort about choosing one school or the other, and we know that in places in the country there are some schools within a mile or so of each other offering the same advantages, and presenting the same absence of difficulty. Now, under your proposed system of areas, taking a school at village A and a school at village B, and suppose the pupils in one or the other are living between them, sometimes the A scholars would like to go to B, and sometimes the B scholars would like to go to A; but the point which you refer to is a serious one, that is to say, the breaking up of the school year by scholars being sent from one to the other, in order to avoid the penalties for non-attendance?—Yes.

7928. And what I was going to ask was whether, without assigning distinct school areas, some remedy could not be devised by which scholars having entered in one school would be prevented from going to another, except upon the joint permission of the managers or the principals of the two schools?—That might be done. Possibly it might; but something ought to be done in my opinion, because that is how it works out, practically as I have told you; so that it is really a waste of money that we expend on so-called compulsory education.

7929. There is no doubt that there is a difficulty to be met?—Yes.

7930. And you think that something of that sort might be devised? It possibly could be arranged that no scholar should be received in the school year from another school without the assent of the teacher of the school which he leaves, subject to an appeal, say, to the Board?—Yes, something of that kind might do as well. My object is to end that system if possible, and, of course, we have too much competition in country places for scholars, and if that could be put an end to, I think it would be well. My idea was to end it by school areas.

7931. And do you think my suggestion a feasible one?—It would certainly help.

7932. Mr. HENRY.—In reference to the school area, I understand you to mean by that that all pupils within



a certain area should be compelled to attend a central school?—Yes, a central school.

7903. Would not that be an unnecessary restriction of the liberty of the parent?—Well, some parents use their liberty for license. I think there should be restrictions in that case.

7904. But what would be the parents' view?—The parents' view in country places is that a good many of them would keep the children at home as far as possible, and unfortunately the children suffer by that.

7905. And if there were a good teacher in an adjoining district, would he prevent the children attending his school, when the school in their own district might not be efficient?—It ought not to be so.

7906. But it often is the case?—But still that could be remedied. We should have a certain minimum standard, and if that is not reached, the teacher is not efficient, and let that be the end of it.

7907. But is not competition a good thing, even among schools?—I do not think so; I do not agree with that. Competition to draw scholars away is not good.

7908. Why?—Because it starts an unhealthy competition, and often ends in jealousy and ill-feeling between teachers.

7909. Is it not one of the stimuli for keeping a teacher active and up to his work?—Well, if I am a teacher, and my salary is dependent on my school average keeping up to 80, or say 85, and there are a number of children belonging to parents who are utterly indifferent, and who take a delight in defeating the law (that is, the attendance officer), and take them from one school to another, I think competition in that case is most undesirable.

7910. But surely that is not the state of things among the parents in Armagh?—A good deal of it.

7911. I worked in the adjoining county of Tyrone, and I found both parents and children very keen and anxious to learn?—Yes, the majority are; but there are always those who are not. I know that there are parents such as I mention in my own congregation, and I only wish that there was some power that would compel them. They are utterly indifferent.

7912. Carry yourself back to your boyhood. Would you like to be compelled to attend a school when there would be what you would consider a better school within reach of you?—Well, of course, the difficulty is the inefficient school, but that should not be so.

7913. I asked you a plain question. Would you like in your own case to be compelled to attend that school?—Well, of course, I might not like it; but there should be another method of curing that school's inefficiency. There should be an appeal.

7914. Would you suggest the establishment of higher grade schools?—I certainly would.

7915. And as the Commissioners have been asking for that, and have been refused again and again, would it not be better to try and make the best of the schools that we have?—Possibly it might; but why should the other be impossible? They have the secondary or higher grade schools in England, as well as in Scotland, and I do not see why Ireland should be anything poorer in that way.

7916. But they have heavy rates there. You think, however, that there should be an examination every year?—Yes, an annual examination.

7917. Why?—I believe it would help even to interest the parents, and to get the parents to take a better interest in their children's education. If they knew that an examination was appointed, they would be more careful to send their children more regularly. Parents took far more interest in their children's attendance in the days of the routine examinations than they do at present, so far as my experience goes.

7918. What effect do you think it would have on the education of the pupils?—A good effect, because it would afford a stimulus.

7919. Do you think they are properly tested at present?—I do not think so.

7920. In what subjects?—In literary subjects.

7921. What do you mean by literary subjects?—

Reading, writing, spelling, arithmetic, grammar, Geography—those are the literary subjects.

7922. Would you agree with this statement of Mr. Kelly, an inspector in Belfast. He gives an account of an experiment which I need not occupy time with; but he says: "It convinced me, among other things, that progress in arithmetic cannot be gauged by inspection."—I would not agree with it.

7923. You would not agree with that?—No.

7924. Then you think that progress in arithmetic can be gauged by inspection?—Not by mere inspection or examination of the children's work that they have done. That is not a great test. The proper test is to put them down and give them certain work to do, and give them time to do it.

7925. But that is what Mr. Kelly accuses?—I understood Mr. Kelly to mean looking through their year's work and seeing that work.

7926. So he does; but he says that progress in arithmetic cannot be gauged by mere inspection?—I beg your pardon, I did not understand what you said. I do not think it could be gauged by inspection.

7927. Now, can proficiency in reading be gauged by inspection?—Better, I suppose, that is, if the children are tested; but that is not inspection, of course.

7928. But I am asking you can it be gauged by inspection?—The inspector comes in and perhaps hears the class reading.

7929. Excuse me. If he gets the class to read one by one, that is examination; but if he merely looks round the school, and perhaps hears some of the pupils read without testing the whole class, that is inspection?—Yes.

7930. I am asking you is that test of inspection satisfactory so far as the elementary subjects are concerned?—I do not think it is. I do not agree with it.

7931. Now, when an examination would be held do you think the inspector should have before him the attendance of each pupil for the previous twelve months?—Yes, he should have the attendance and the progress book to enable him to come to a general conclusion on the matter.

7932. So that, to sum it up, you think that there ought to be a complete examination of every school once a year?—Yes, and my experience in Scotland is that they have a general examination too. I cannot speak for English schools; but I was present on one occasion in a country school.

7933. The CHAIRMAN.—When was that?—About three years ago; and there was a general examination of the school, a very high report—an excellent report. It was a country school of about 60 boys and girls.

7934. The BANNER OF ROSS.—You live in a country district?—Yes.

7935. Can you give me any idea of what proportion of the pupils of your school would go into business or clerkships, and what proportion of them would follow the footsteps of their fathers in tilling the soil?—The majority, my lord, would go into business, and the minority would follow in their fathers' footsteps.

7936. Supposing that were done over the whole country, is it a possibility for the majority of the children of Ireland to go into business or clerkships, and the minority of the children of Ireland to work by their hands—for remember, we are discussing a system of education for the whole country?—Yes, and I would much rather, my lord, see our children kept at home, winning positions in our country, and making progress commercially and otherwise, and I believe that there would be poets for them.

7937. It is not a question of what there would be, but what there is, and I put the question as to what there is at the present time?—I would much rather see them tested in that way for civil service employment than going away to America.

7938. But that is not an answer to my question?—I am trying to answer it, and I believe there were no difficulties before; and I have marked the splendid success of our Irish boys and girls at examinations for the Civil Service.

Mr. T. P. GILL, Secretary of the Department of Agriculture and Technical Instruction for Ireland, examined.

7939. The CHAIRMAN.—I may tell you in a few words that there is one question on which you may possibly be able to give us some assistance. One of the most

difficult questions before us is as to the system of inspection, whether uniformity is secured, and if it is not, how it can be secured. It is a question of exten-

18th April, 1918.]

Mr. T. J. Gutz, examined.

[Continued.]

ordinary difficulty under the present system of the National Board, and if you like, I will let you tell as your experience in obtaining uniformity under your own system?—It is a very complex position, and I am bound to say first, that I think there is a great difficulty in instituting a comparison between our system and that of the National Board, because the difficulties that we have to deal with are in many respects different from those of the National Board. We have available in our system certain checks and counter-checks which are not so readily available in the case of the National system; and, moreover, we deal with different types of schools and different types of teachers, and perhaps it would be well if I should mention the types of schools and of teachers that we have to deal with. On the one side there is our technical instruction branch, and on the other side the agricultural branch. These are the two main divisions into which our educational work is classified. Under the technical instruction branch there come the following types of schools. There are first of all the technical institutes and technical schools, ranging from the big institutions in Belfast, with which you are familiar, Sir Samuel, down to the small technical schools in country towns. Next there are technical classes mostly organised in counties by itinerant teachers; and then there are the secondary schools, in which the programme of experimental science, drawing, and manual instruction is carried out.

7940. Under the Intermediate Board—in co-operation with the Intermediate Board, I understand, there are a certain number of primary schools that are not under the National Board, mostly set out by the Christian Brothers, which receive some grants from us for the subjects of drawing and manual instruction. They are not a large number, and the amount of grants that they receive is not very big, about £100. This is the technical instruction division. Then on the other side there is our agricultural branch, and under that division there are first the agricultural colleges and schools, from the Albert College at Glenties down to schools such as that at Clonliffity, with all kind of ship, the Bishop, is especially teacher, and at Ballylone, Athlone, and elsewhere; and the school of Forestry at Avondale, Rathfriland. Secondly there are the agricultural similar classes—first classes given at winter time at certain centres in each county by the agricultural teacher. Next, there are a series of rural domestic economy schools for girls in different parts of the country, and then there are a number of itinerant classes, as there are on the technical side, in various subjects of agriculture and horticulture. These are the main forms in which our educational work is conducted. For the purpose of inspecting that work, we have a staff of agricultural and technical inspectors.

7941. May I ask what is the number of inspectors that you have?—We have on the technical instruction side 17 inspectors, and on the agricultural side 19 inspectors, including the technical assistants.

7942. They are not all of the same grade—are there any of superior rank?—There are some of superior rank, but they are all included in the same educational qualifications.

7943. Has any of them controlling powers?—Certainly, there is a chief inspector in each branch, and there are senior inspectors who have first and last authority over the junior inspectors.

7944. You have three official grades?—We have practically three official grades among the inspectors—the chief inspector, the full inspector, and the junior inspector.

7945. Are these three chief responsibilities in the work of the men below them?—They are. The chief inspector in each branch is responsible for the whole staff of inspectors, and part of his duty is to superintend their work, both as it comes into the office and as it is done in the country. Amongst the teachers that we are inspecting—I should point out that there is a great variety, from technical teachers of the grade of those who are employed in technical institutes like those of Belfast and Dublin, or Cork, down to the itinerant instructors in manual instruction, in domestic economy, and in the agricultural side.

7946. Might I suggest that in the inspection of scientific and technical subjects in co-operation with the

Intermediate Board you have, I think, the closest analogy to the system we are investigating as regards examination?—I think so.

7947. Would you mind developing the system of examination under that head?—Very well; but let me preface it by saying that so far as a comparison with your system goes I should like to emphasise this, that I do not like drawing a comparison that even remotely might seem to have an injurious character, when I say that we are dealing in the secondary schools with very different conditions, from those in the primary schools. We have a higher educational type of men and institution to deal with. Moreover, you know a secondary school has usually an organised body with a head master and a corps of teachers under him, sometimes a governing body like the Academic Institution in Belfast, with a reputation to maintain, or it is managed by an Order like the Christian Brothers or Jesuits, or like one of the Convent teaching Orders, who also have a high reputation to maintain; and that is a different type of institution from the remote primary school under a single teacher and a single manager. Now, our system of dealing with these schools in reference to the inspection grant for science, drawing, and so forth, which they receive from us is largely this. The schools are regularly visited by our inspectors. If a school is doing thoroughly well, the inspector being well acquainted in the past with its record and its methods, and having no misgivings about how its work is being done, the inspection is necessarily less frequent than in the case of a school which has not got such a good record.

7948. That is the case under the National Board too?—It is obvious; and some schools are visited many times a year, and not by one inspector alone, but by several inspectors. The inspector on visiting the school sees the head master, listens to the teaching, and examines the pupils. I should say that the spirit in which he goes into the school, and in which the school receives him, is that of counsellor and friend. That spirit is impressed on the inspector in the Department constantly, though it is now so much of a matter of course that there is no need to take special measures to impress it, and I think it has established itself as a tradition in the schools.

7949. Then you have no difficulty as to complaints such as have come before us, that the inspector is often too much given to fault-finding, and too little to helping the teachers?—On the contrary. I have had very little time to get any materials for you here this morning; but if I had, I could gather up plenty of testimony, such as letters from schools and teachers asking us to visit, and complaining that they have not had a visit from an inspector for a long time, and asking when is Mr. So-and-so coming. That is simply their natural desire. But one thing I did turn up here was the minutes of one of our conferences with the Committee of Heads of Secondary Schools. This is a Committee which the Department appointed from the beginning as a consultative body for the purpose of any educational programmes or work that they were doing in secondary schools. I just happen to remember one of these cases, a demand being formally brought up by the head masters asking that the number of the Department's inspectors should be increased. In fact, that question came up more than once at these conferences.

7950. With a view to having more frequent visits?—With a view to more frequent visits. Here is an extract from the said minutes: "Mr. Moore" (he is the representative on the committee of the Macaulay Boys' School) "asked whether it would not be possible to have a larger number of inspectors; the visits of the Department's inspectors were always a help and assistance." The Rev. Dr. Barrett, who is representative of the Convent Schools Committee on this committee, and who is the head of St. Colman's College, Ferny, and Miss Thompson, who is representative of the Schoolmistresses' Association, are mentioned in the minutes as supporting Mr. Moore's statement, and saying the schools were anxious to meet the inspectors more frequently; and then on behalf of the Department Mr. Fletcher (who is head of the technical instruction branch) said he was deeply grateful for this expression of opinion, and so forth. That sort of thing I just

18th April, 1913.]

Mr. T. P. GUZ, examined.

[Continued.]

happened to think of a few minutes before coming in, and that is a commonplace, that attitude of the schools and of teachers of all kinds towards our inspectors.

7961. I was going to suggest that there was just a sufficient analogy between the examinations of those secondary and primary schools to make it desirable perhaps that I should ask you to tell me the steps you take to secure a tolerably uniform judgment of the schools doing practically the same work—for I suppose most of the secondary schools are doing very much the same work?—Yes.

7962. And you try to get a pretty uniform standard of judgment?—We do. I should tell you, perhaps, that one of the administrative measures I find of the greatest importance in the Department is conferences with our inspectors. That applies both to the agricultural side and to the technical side. We have a meeting of the whole body of inspectors.

7963. Of the seventeen?—Of the seventeen inspectors on a stated day, and we ask them to send up their notes and any matters that they wish particularly discussed, and we have a list of agenda compiled.

7964. And you take the chair?—I take the chair on the occasions when I attend, and Mr. Fletcher will take the chair when I am not there, or Mr. Campbell on the agricultural side. There are many matters of detail that perhaps we would not wait to see thrashed out, and then the chief inspector will take the chair. By that means a common policy and point of view is kept clearly before the minds of the inspectors. It constantly happens that an inspector will bring up a case in which he had some doubts what he should do—that a teacher said something or did something, or that some little problem turned up in his experience that he had some doubt about, and on which he reserved action until he came up to this meeting. Another inspector would probably say: "I have met with a similar case, and what I thought best to do was this," and a discussion takes place on that problem, and afterwards it is thrashed out; and we try to lay down a decision as to the proper mode of dealing with that type of case when it arises. Now, questions of that kind, as well as questions of educational policy, are discussed in that way at these conferences, and I regard that as one of the most valuable proceedings that takes place in our administrative system.

7965. And these conferences are held at regular times?—They are held frequently, so frequently as we can manage consistently with avoiding unnecessarily taking the men from their work in the country; and it not only secures that there is a uniform standard before the minds of the inspectors, and a uniform mode of action in dealing with inevitable questions that arise, but it keeps the inspectors constantly filled, if I may so put it, with inspiration from the top, with leadership and guidance, and stimulation, as to the general policy which it is desired to have carried out. I regard that as of much value too.

7966. Might I put it in this way, with reference to my particular point. I suppose your inspectors often change their districts?—We arrange that as a regular system. We send the inspectors into each other's districts.

7967. They have a district assigned?—They have a district assigned; and in order that the inspectors may have a general knowledge of what is going on in other schools in other parts of the country, we arrange for inspectors to serve with other inspectors in each other's districts.

7968. Have you ever encountered such a case as this, which has sometimes occurred under the National system, that when an inspector has come for the first time after a change, to examine a school, the standard of examination is seriously altered?—That could hardly happen with us at all. I cannot conceive it happening; because all these proceedings are taken to see that there is not this diversity.

7969. You have such precautions that it is impossible in your system?—I think it is practically speaking impossible.

7970. The Boshor or Boss.—At least it has not happened?—It has not happened. It is a system under which there would be no possibility of the man going down, as it were, raw to a district, on the heels of another, who had been a long time in it. The second

man would have a considerable acquaintance with the methods and work of the first man.

7971. The CHAIRMAN.—And do you attribute that largely to the conferences?—To the conferences and to the interchange of those visits to each other's districts.

7972. The Member or Boss.—When one inspector goes into the other inspector's district, does he take the place of the inspector down there, or does he join him?

—The visitor joins the other, and will not go into the schools in the absence of the other.

7973. They go together?—Yes.

7974. The CHAIRMAN.—And is the principal examination of the year in the intermediate schools conducted by two always?—What happens with the schools is this, that there are a series of inspections throughout the year for the one school, and there is a final inspection at the end before the grants are assessed.

7975. Does that final inspection determine the grant?—The record of the whole year. I have brought with me here just four sample cases, and, perhaps, if I tell you about them, it might make the matter clearer. I ought to premise this, that if a school is reported on as doing particularly well in a given subject, the normal grant that would be earned on that subject is raised by a tenth. If, on the contrary, it does very badly in that subject, that normal grant is reduced by one-tenth. Now, I will take a good type of secondary school. I had better not mention names. I have here the inspector's report before me.

7976. Have you short merit marks for schools or for teachers?—We classify them. There is a report here on various points; first, as to the equipment of the schools: are there suitable school-rooms and laboratories, and are they well lighted and well heated and well ventilated, and so on. Then: is due provision made in the laboratories for experimental work in particular courses, and is the teaching staff sufficient, and so on. In this case, the report is "excellent" for four of the staff, and "very good" for two.

7977. Are there any scale of marks?—No; no scale of marks. The report of this school is signed by four inspectors who visited the school throughout the year. We have the dates of their visits here, with the initials opposite. As to the efficiency of the work, there is the report of these four inspectors that comes up to the office. It is invariably examined by the chief inspector.

7978. He reads the reports?—Yes, and initials them. If it is a report which is unsatisfactory, which is to result in reducing a grant by one-tenth, then that is invariably referred to the Assistant Secretary in respect of Technical Instruction.

7979. That is a case initiated by yourself?—Yes. In the case of an unsatisfactory report that would result in the reduction of the normal grant by one-tenth. The report, before being sent to the school, is referred to the head of the branch, the Assistant Secretary in respect of Technical Instruction. He is the next in authority, as a permanent official, to myself, as permanent head of the department.

7981. Now, how would you proceed?—He revises that report, and, if he approves of it, it goes. He puts his initials to it.

7982. It goes to the school?—It goes to the school. Here I have a report of that kind in my hand, and there are the initials of the assistant secretary.

7983. If he approves of the adverse criticism it goes back to the school?—Yes, and he may revise and edit the report, because we do not invariably allow reports to go out in the language employed by the inspectors, nor do we invariably send what the inspector sends us. It might be undesirable for various reasons, and the reports are revised from that point of view in the first place by the chief inspector, and in the second place by the head of the branch. In the case of technical schools (I mention this in parenthesis for a moment) it may happen that the Committee are involved, and the operations of the Committee may be criticised as well as the work of the teacher.

7984. In regard to imperfect equipment, I suppose?—A good deal depends on the interest that the Committee take. The Bishop of Ross is a member of one of the local Committees, and he knows how much depends on the interest taken by the local Committee, and if the interest is slack it can be improved. Now, sending back to the secondary schools, the

18th April, 1913.]

Mr. T. F. GALT, examined.

(Continued.)

same thing applies. That report is a confidential document in this sense. It is sent to the manager of the schools, or in the case of a technical school, to the secretary of the Committee. Well, the manager of the school is at liberty to do what he wishes with it. He can publish it if he likes, or he can withhold it from publication.

7975. Have remonstrances ever come to you about those unfavourable reports?—Yes; we get them from time to time, of course. They will come before me, and perhaps I ought also to mention this, that in addition to the inspection by an inspector, the assistant secretaries themselves, and also myself, visit the schools and committees as often as we can, and that is one of the means by which we keep in touch with the work in the most direct fashion. Usually in the winter I go as often as I can to the Technical Instruction Committees on the occasion of their prize distributions. They usually invite me to go down there, and one meets the whole committee and staff of the school, one meets the committee after after or before the public business in the evening, and questions such as remonstrances and any difficulties of that sort, I deal with on the spot.

7976. Might I ask you this? Are your visits to the schools in the nature of an inspection?—No, not in the nature of a formal recorded inspection. They are, though, inspection in one sense, for they are for the purpose of forming one's own opinion on the school, and getting direct knowledge of the staff and acquaintance with the work, and enabling the schools and committees to come into close relations with ourselves in dealing with the work; and it gives confidence to the committees, and it smooths away numbers of difficulties. The effect of a personal interview, as distinct from correspondence, is wonderful.

7977. You think it is more effective?—I do.

7978. The Bismor or Ross.—Usually your inspectors have been received by the schools as counsellors and friends?—Undoubtedly.

7979. And I might say, apparently, that the heads of the branches seem to be received in a similar spirit?—I think we are. The committees are very kind and friendly in their disposition. They are always inviting us down to take part in these functions.

7980. Mr. Casser.—Are they generally looking for more money?—No; that is, of course, a common place; but they know pretty well they cannot get any more money from us. They have a fixed grant coming from the Board of Technical Instruction, which is distributed every year, and they know that they cannot get any more than that, except some very small amounts here and there that we may have in hand.

7981. The Bismor or Ross.—In the early years you could increase the money; but for several years past the money has been distributed, and they have no more to get?—Yes, and they have large sums, quite as large as were given in the shape of our direct grants, which are now earned in the form of capitation grants, and these moneys are assessed purely on the result of the work done.

7982. Sir HIRSH WILKINSON.—You were saying just now that the capitation grant was assessed on the work done. Would you kindly explain that?—Well, in the case of the secondary schools it is a capitation grant, and I was describing how that grant was assessed as the result of inspection; that is, when a school was "very good," the total of the grant was increased by a tenth, and if it is unsatisfactory the grant is reduced by a tenth.

7983. The point about capitation grant which just occurred to me was this, that the capitation grant is made upon the numbers in the schools?—The numbers in the schools. All three points are taken into consideration.

7984. The Bismor or Ross.—You take a certain number of hours' attendance?—The number of hours given to the teaching and the actual registered attendance in the schools. These are taken into account. Perhaps I should also emphasize another point, that these grants are not payable save when teaching is done by teachers whose qualifications are proved by the Department.

7985. Sir HIRSH WILKINSON.—Yes, and the word "results," I thought, might lead to a little ambiguity, and I wanted to make sure that the results did not depend upon the individual examination of the pupil?—Oh, no; but on the character of the whole work done.

7986. The Bismor or Ross.—In fact, the worst pupil might earn the most money, suppose the worst pupil in the school made the most regular attendance?—Not only in that so, but our principle is to make sure to reward the work done on backward pupils. When an inspector comes to a school and meets a new class, he realises at once that there is a certain number of backward pupils in that class, and when he comes during the year, he is able to compare the quality of the work of these backward pupils with the quality of the work that the teacher has succeeded in bringing them to, and he will attach even more importance to that work than to the brilliant work done by a brilliant pupil. That is for the purpose of encouraging real teaching and real care of all pupils, without distinction as to the ability of the pupils. There is another point that should have special mention. Of course, it is such a vast and complex subject that one cannot deal with it in exact logical order; but this is a relevant point, I think. One condition of the grant that we pay is aimed at removing from the teacher's mind a necessary mode of looking at his work. That is, it shall be a condition of the grant being made that, save in the case of teachers who give their services gratuitously, such as members of a religious Order, a fixed salary shall be paid to the teachers of the schools, either in respect of those classes or of their work in the school as a whole. Further, a reasonable sum of money must be provided for the upkeep of the premises, and grants obtained must be paid into the school account and be used for improving the efficiency of the schools. No bonus goes to a teacher for the work he has done. If a teacher in a particular school has done good work (and this is a circumstance that often arises)—a teacher may have done such good work that the committee are full of admiration for him and want to give him a bonus. His work has been so good in attracting pupils, and in obtaining these satisfactory reports, and the capitation grant has gone up very high. In such a case, the committee have often wanted to give a bonus, and they apply to the Department to allow them to do so, but we have invariably refused to approve of that. What we say in such a case is: "If this teacher is particularly meritorious, and if we are satisfied that that is so, then we will approve of your permanently increasing his salary; but there must be no idea before his mind that either in a particular class, or in case of a particular pupil, he is going to get a special bonus for doing his best. He should be doing his best all through."

7987. You make it a condition for steady improvement in the teacher's position?—Yes; this tenth up and tenth down is a very important stimulus to the teacher, because a tenth down is a very bad record.

7988. Whether he is employed by the committee or the local master, neither will be pleased then?—Neither will be pleased, but they have their remedy. It is the moral effect of this grant, rather than the financial effect, that does the good. I would like to understate that, because the financial effect is not really very large. I will illustrate. Here is a school, one of the best in the country, which usually got a tenth up in a number of its subjects. It was entitled last year to a normal grant of £960. This is one of the very best schools in the country. Now, in the case of that school a tenth up was recommended for first year's science, first year's drawing, second year's drawing, third year's drawing; for their first year's manual instruction, second year manual instruction, third year manual instruction, and third year physics—that is, for all subjects in the school, save two. Now, the total amount of the tenth up was £94 9s. 7d., so it brought up the total amount of their grant from £960 to £1054. It is the moral effect of having a record like that, and the teachers' feeling that they have won that for their school, that we lay stress on. Here is another school getting a tenth down, a very much smaller school. They get a tenth down in first year's science, second year's drawing, third year's chemistry, and third year's drawing. The normal grant of this school would have been £90 8s. 6d. The amount of the tenth down is £6 8s. 6d., so that the net grant that the school received was £84 0s. 0d. That is not a very heavy penalty in point of money; but the moral effect is what we regard as important. Now, you ask me about how the capitation grant is determined in other cases be-

sides secondary schools. Well, in practice, it is the same way in technical schools. That part of the work which is paid for by capitation grant receives a tenth up or a tenth down, according to the report made, and the reports of inspection are dealt with in the same way as I have described in the case of the secondary schools. Perhaps it might interest you if I mentioned the amount of money represented by these capitation grants. First of all, the amount of money going under the head of technical instruction administered by the Board of Technical Instruction and going to technical schools and classes, an endowment as distinguished from capitation, is £55,000 a year. The capitation grant (without giving the evening technical schools) is about £28,000, and there is another category of these grants paid on single subjects which go to technical and agricultural classes, and this year that would amount to £10,000, and we expect that it will be more in future years. The amount of the capitation grants that go to the intermediate or secondary schools for science, drawing, and so forth, is £28,000, and to these primary schools the capitation grant amounted to £1,900. The total of these capitation grants is £67,900. All these grants, I should say, come direct from the Imperial Exchequer. They were originally under the head of science and art grants administered by South Kensington. When the administration was transferred to us, the total amounted to between £8,000 and £4,000, and it has been increased by the system I described to £67,900 on the present year, and I expect it will go to £70,000.

7989. Mr. HANCOCK.—May I ask, with reference to that last statement, whether the Treasury make an objection to those yearly increases in the total amount of grants?—No; all of those grants are administered by regulations which are approved by the Treasury.

7990. And which allow of natural expansion?—Certainly, and they correspond, let me say, with similar grants applicable in England and Scotland of a far larger size.

7991. How often are reports made—are they annual?—Of the schools?

7992. Yes?—They must be annual.

7993. Are tests given to the pupils regularly?—Yes, the inspector visits the school, listens to the teaching, and examines the pupils.

7994. Orally?—Orally.

7995. Any on paper?—Not in the form of issuing a number of examination papers, save where it is a question of honours for the Intermediate Board. I will explain that in a moment if you wish, but I want to make clear what the ordinary course is. In all these subjects of science, drawing, and so forth, there is a record of work done by the pupil himself in the form of notes in note-books. These are a very important part of the test, and, of course, in the case of drawing and manual instruction, there the work is done.

7996. Are grants ever refused altogether?—They are. Last year we stopped a grant amounting to over £1,000, which would have been due to an important Technical School. That was a capitation grant.

7997. Refused?—Entirely. Because they did not fulfil the conditions.

7998. Are they ever refused for inefficiency?—Entirely?

7999. Yes?—It rarely happens that an entire grant is stopped. I do not know of any instance except the one that I mention. I cannot call to mind any other.

8000. That was for not fulfilling the conditions?—Yes, for wilfully not fulfilling the conditions.

8001. Is it a part of your inspector's duty to examine the register of scholars and the record of attendance?—Certainly. The numbers of hours that they attend is part of the material on which the capitation is fixed.

8002. And they have to test whether these registers are being properly and accurately kept?—Most decidedly.

8003. Does any friction ever arise over that?—It has sometimes arisen.

8004. But not commonly?—No, not commonly, but there have been instances in which it has occurred.

8005. Of course, no teacher has any inducement whatever to make a wrong return under your system?—No teacher, but, of course, the school, if the attendances were better what they ought to be.

8006. Now, in visits of the official to the school, would they ever override the verdict of the inspector?—Well, of course, that is an administrative question that arises at every turn where authority has to be exercised, and the same principle that would govern the action of a Chief in deferring the action of the subordinate would come into play there, and he would be a very poor administrator who gave away his subordinate, save upon the most compelling evidence, and in the case of a glaring fault.

8007. It would be contrary to the ordinary traditions of your office that such a thing would be done?—Certainly. We have had, of course, complaints of inspection. You cannot administer a large system without questions of that sort cropping up, and we seek to give every school and teacher concerned the fullest assurance that the case is looked into.

8008. Suppose you had a complaint of an inspector you would deal with it through the chief inspector, I presume?—Certainly.

8009. You would not deal with it by visiting the school yourself, to test whether he was right or not?—Well, I do not know any case of the kind that has arisen. We have had complaints of inspectors by schools, or some little friction has taken place with the teachers. We had some sharp instances of that kind that have all come before myself, but they have come through the proper official hierarchy, and we have cleared about them in the office, and seen the inspector himself.

8010. But in that case you would think it was inadvisable to visit the school and decide the matter yourself?—Well, if it became absolutely necessary to look into it on the spot, of course one might do that, but there has never been a case of overruling the opinion of an inspector in that peculiar way.

8011. Your visits, of course, are in order to gain local knowledge, and to get into close relations with the committees?—Quite so, with the committees and managers of the schools. I should mention that the recommendations of the inspectors are not invariably carried out.

8012. That is a different thing, of course. They recommend certain methods or certain apparatus which would not receive the approval of the local office?—Yes.

8013. Now, you mention that every teacher had to be approved by you?—Yes.

8014. Is that approval ever withdrawn when once it has been given?—Yes. It would be withdrawn if the teacher did not turn out satisfactory.

8015. Mr. HANCOCK.—You told us that the work of revising reports is entrusted to a chief inspector in the office?—Yes, they all come to him.

8016. When an inspector goes to a school to test the pupils does he not from time to time give them actual examinations to work?—He does, of course.

8017. So that in addition to the note-books and the inspection of the classes, there is the actual examination of the pupils?—There is. I may say that, taking the numbers of inspections that are given throughout the year, every pupil has passed under the test of an inspector, and I should say that, so far as the examination of the individual pupil goes, the individual pupil is subjected to twice examination and testing by this plan than he is by the plan of an ordinary written examination.

8018. Well, in the case of an informality in the register what is the mode of procedure?—The school is communicated with, and the informality brought to their attention, and they are asked for an explanation.

8019. And if the explanation is not satisfactory you cancel the grant altogether?—It would depend on the nature of their regularity.

8020. And you have had cases in which the grants have been cancelled owing to informality in the register?—At the moment I cannot recall them, but it has not occurred very often. It has occurred that the grants have been stopped, not merely for these irregularities, but for frauds.

8021. Now, you mentioned one case, without mentioning the name, in which a grant was refused. Can you tell us why the grant was refused?—Amongst other reasons, the grant was to have been given on a scheme which should have been submitted for the whole administration of the school, and that scheme was to include the teachers employed on it.

18th April, 1918.]

Mr. T. P. Goss, examined.

[Continued.]

and to include certain administrative provisions. That scheme was not submitted. The committee refused to submit it; they practically defied the Department. They got an opinion from a legal gentleman to the effect that they could, and that proved to be quite wrong. They deliberately refused to fulfil the conditions, and, therefore, they did not earn the grant, and it was stopped.

8021. You require them to submit the scheme early in the year, and get the scheme approved before it is put into operation?—Yes.

8022. And they did not do that?—No.

8023. The Bazaar or Bazaar.—I think you said, in reply to Mr. Harrison, that no teacher has any inducement to tamper with the register. It seems to me that that is not quite so, because if you take the case of a teacher in a school, if he has a larger number of pupils on the register, or if these pupils attend a larger number of hours, the amount of the grant will be increased?—Yes.

8024. And that teacher will rank higher in the estimation of the School Committee?—Yes, that is true.

8025. So there is an inducement?—There is an inducement.

8026. Now, Mr. Healy asked you about the register. Suppose a teacher neglected the register, and that it was not written up for two or three weeks, would you stand that?—If he had not written it up to date, certainly not.

8027. What would you do with a man of that sort?—We would take very sharp measures. The grant would not be paid on a register like that.

8028. You would not allow him to go on tampering with the register?—Certainly not.

8029. Would you dismiss him?—We should withdraw our approval of him. If there was but one instance, and it was not a serious irregularity, that might probably be overlooked.

Mr. FRANCIS MILLER, Principal Teacher, Tobemore National School, County Derry, examined.

8031. The CHAIRMAN.—How long have you been principal of the Tobemore School?—Eight years, from the 1st of April, 1905.

8032. And where were you before that?—Ennis.

8033. How long were you there?—Six months.

8034. Were you principal of that?—Principal.

8035. And before that?—Clovenaden, County Armagh.

8036. And how long were you at Clovenaden?—Five years.

8037. And before that?—Tullisnall, County Armagh.

8038. Were you principal there?—Principal there.

8039. And then before that?—College Street National School, Armagh.

8040. Principal of that?—Principal for some years, three months.

8041. Does that exhaust the list?—No.

8042. What were you before?—Before that I was in McQuiston National Schools, Donegall Pass, Belfast, as assistant.

8043. After leaving that you got trained?—Yes.

8044. In which College?—Marlborough Street; but that even does not exhaust my service. Before that I was in Welsh Street National School in Belfast as principal for three years, and before that four years assistant in Currie Male School, Belfast. I was monitor there. I was appointed monitor on 1st of January, 1882.

8045. That is thirty-one years?—Thirty-one years.

8046. Your principal grievances seems to be in a general way as regards the merit marks on the annual inspection?—Yes; I do not like the system of merit marking as it is. I think it acts injuriously against the principal teachers and their school.

8047. Are there too many of these marks?—There are too many of the merit marks.

8048. What would you reduce them to?—Bad, good, and excellent.

8049. You would have three, excellent, good, and bad. Have you anything more to say about the

Mr. HENRY.—The Register of the Department is the same as the Roll Book in the National school. The Register is the record of attendance in the case of the Department, with a mark for those that are present, and a mark for those that are absent, and that is done in the case of the Roll Book in the National school, which is, of course, posted from day to day, and must be closed before 10.30, while the Department's Register must close within ten minutes of the opening of the school.

8050. In the National school it is called the roll and in the Technical school it is called the register?—There is another point I should like to mention about our inspectors. We take a good deal of trouble to keep the inspectors, and also the teachers, who are engaged upon our work, up to the level of developments that may arise. We have our teachers frequently up for lectures and conferences and summer courses, and on our agricultural side the teachers and inspectors frequently confer. Only yesterday, for example, I had a talk with our Chief Agricultural Inspector who had just come from a conference with a number of agricultural teachers, who happened to be up for the Spring Show. They throw out a considerable number of questions between them. Our teachers and inspectors work together, and, moreover, there would be a certain number of the teachers whom we encourage to carry out some research experiments. We endeavour to get our agricultural teachers to keep on the alert with regard to scientific matters, and we encourage them to take up independent lines of research the inquiry. The chief inspector, for example, arranged with six of these men yesterday to carry out a number of such experiments, and he mentioned to me as an illustration of their interest that he only asked them to deal with one experiment each, but that they all insisted on being allowed to deal with two apiece.

working of this system as it affects the interests of the teachers?—Do you mean the system of merit marks as regards promotion?

8050. Yes?—Yes; that is in addition to what I have put down there in my notes. My inspector has been round since, and he has told me that if the recommendations as regards the whitening of the school and the clearing of the classroom are not carried out I will lose my increment.

8051. When did he tell you that?—On the 3rd of April at an examination.

8052. Did he not say anything about that to the manager at the same time?—No, the manager was not present.

8053. Did he not say anything about that to the manager?—The manager was not present, but I know that the manager got a letter from him stating that the recommendation regarding the building should be carried out. I do not believe that he said anything about my increment in that. He did not say my increments, he said increments will be stopped. I have an assistant, who is eligible for increments, too, and it would mean that her increment would be stopped as well as mine.

8054. Did you ever know before that your increments depended on the state of the premises?—No, at least I imagined so. I did not know.

8055. Did you think that the state of the premises might reduce your increments?—No, I did not.

8056. You did not ever think of that?—No.

8057. What was your idea as to the effect of the premises and their equipment on your status under the Board?—The Board do not allow teachers to lay out or to expend money on their schools, and if teachers are not permitted to spend money on their schools I consider it a very great grievance that they should be fined for not having it done.

8058. Have you ever known this done before by an inspector?—I have heard of it being done, but I could not state definitely that it has been done. I have no proof of it.

8059. Have you heard of it occurring more than

18th April, 1913.]

Mr. FRANCES MILLER, examined.

[Continued.]

once?—Yes, I have heard of it occurring more than once.

8066. That the inspector would stop the increments?—Yes.

8067. That is, you would receive a demerit report on the ground of the premises not satisfying him?—Yes.

8068. Well, have you had any experience of great variations in your mark?—I have had "very good." For the last eight years I have had nothing below "good." I had "very good" in the years 1911 and 1909.

8069. You say, "In my case, 1909, 'very good'; 1910, 'good'; 1911, 'very good'; 1912, 'good.'" Is that what you wanted to convey?—Yes.

8070. Were those marks given by different inspectors?—Four of them have been given by the same inspector, and the last mark is by a different inspector.

8071. And the other men gave you two "very goods"?—Yes, and my own personal mark was "very good" when the school was "good" in 1910.

8072. Well, had you suffered in any material way by those marks?—I have.

8073. In what way?—A "good" coming in the middle of two "very goods" would prevent me getting a special promotion.

8074. What grade do you belong to now?—Second.

8075. And a series of "very goods" would give you promotion?—Yes.

8076. "Very good," "good," and "very good" would not?—No.

8077. You want "very goods" to get into the first of first?—To get into the first grade.

8078. Into the first grade at all?—I might need more. I might need five. I applied to the Commissioners to get into the first grade, and I was told that a "good" in the middle of my two "very goods" would condemn me. I never knew what my own personal mark was in my life except on one occasion.

8079. How did you get to know that?—An inspector told it to me.

8080. You had no other way of ascertaining this?—That is the only way, and I did not know any personal mark that I had, nor have I known teachers that ever knew their personal mark.

8081. You never knew a teacher to know his personal mark?—Never.

8082. You believe that there is a very different standard adopted by different inspectors?—There is bound to be. There could not possibly be the same standard adopted by different men.

8083. And see the teachers in your neighbourhood generally convinced that that is so?—The teachers all over Ireland are most opposed to the merit mark. You see what we object to is that the mark must be either progressive or of a very high standard. If you ask me how I would distinguish between the merit marks "bad," "good," and "excellent," I would make it, that provided a man gets "good," he should receive no drawbacks at all as far as increments are concerned. I would make them depend on the "good," but to every man who got "good," or above it, I would give his increments automatically.

8084. Mr. KERRIE.—What would you use the "excellent" for?—For a very superior standard.

8085. The CHAIRMAN.—Would you be inclined to have a higher initial salary?—No, I think the initial salary is fairly good, but the increments are too slow, and not only are they too slow, but the teachers do not get what they ought to get. When grade was substituted for class the class teacher had certain rights. Those certain rights were ability to reach first class, and get first of first class pay. Not only were they allowed to do that, but they were to get result fees, and in addition they had a class salary. Those were their rights. Dr. Stankie stated that those rights would not be interfered with, that the existing teachers would suffer nothing by the change. But here is what we find. We find that there is an arrangement by which personal grievances can be submitted, and that that would get over the difficulty. He admits that there are cases in which the new rule would set inequally against classed teachers, and he says that these would be considered.

8086. Where does he admit that?—There was a list

of supplementary rules issued at the time. Here they are.

8087. Was that in the year 1907?—Yes, 1906. On page 7, Section 43, 1904, New Rules and Regulations.—"Cases in which, in the judgment of the Commissioners, any of the rules in Section 3 would operate inequally, will be specially considered." Now, these existing rights were class salary and result fees and capitation. In Tobemore school the last result fees were £47 10s. to the principal. The school has increased in numbers and (I have it here from the Education Office) in efficiency, and, therefore, I have no right to go below £47 10s. for result fees. And I would have been entitled to £52 10s. as salary, and I would have been entitled to £15 as capitation. Instead of that my whole money was £84 when I took charge.

8088. What would that total be that you say you ought to have?—£52 10s., and £15, and £47 10s.—it would be £115 6s.

8089. You say in your paper £111?—I got fuller information since. I say there "approximately." These are the exact figures.

8090. You say that, as you would have had that under the old system, it ought to be guaranteed to you under the new?—Certainly.

8091. What did you get under the new?—£67 and £15; that was £82.

8092. Did you make a representation under that rule that you have read?—I did not make any representation under that rule.

8093. What did you do then?—I asked my manager to write, asking that I should be promoted on account of being promoted to a large school; because it says again, "teachers of large and important schools will receive special consideration," that is, that they could be promoted rapidly, and I claimed to be promoted under Rule 104 (a).—Promotions from a lower to a higher grade, and from the second to the first section of first grade, depend on training, position in school, ability, general attainments, good service, and seniority. I asked to be promoted on that rule.

8094. What were the numbers of your school as Tobemore when you went there?—Eighty-two.

8095. That was under the new system since 1907?—Yes.

8096. What rank would that have secured to you?—That would secure to me almost the height of second grade salary.

8097. What would that be—£107, and £15?—No, it would not have secured me the height, because the total must be £115.

8098. You said that you would have had £115 under the old system?—Yes.

8099. And that you only got £82?—Well that would have landed me above that, so it would have given me promotion near the height I would have gone into that.

8100. Then the promotion that you say was your right would have given you an income equal to your previous income?—Had I happened to be in the second grade it would have given me almost the height of the second grade.

8101. What is your grade now?—Second only from the 1st of April, 1913.

8102. Mr. KERRIE.—If you take the last year of the old system, and compare your total salary for the last year with the first year of the new system, what are the two figures?—The last year would be 1899. In 1899 my figure would have been £115 6s. In 1909 my figure would have been exactly the same. They would have made an average of the salary for 1899, 1906, and 1907, and they would have given me the average for the three years.

8103. I want to know what you actually did receive?—But I was not in Tobemore then, in 1900.

8104. The CHAIRMAN.—What did you receive in the school you were in under the new system for the first five years. You say it was calculated on the average of the last three years of the old system?—Yes.

8105. Did you actually receive that average up to 1905 when you went to Tobemore?—I received the £52 10s., that is the fixed salary, but I did not receive the £47 10s., because that was result, and depended on the size of the school.

18th April, 1913.]

Mr. FRANCIS MILNER, examined.

[Continued.]

8100. The BISHOP or BARR.—You were not in Tobernmore at that time?—No.

8101. The CHAIRMAN.—We want to know what did you get in the first five years of the new system?—I received £52 10s. salary. I could not give you the figures for 1897, because although I wrote for particulars of my own school quite recently, they did not send me all the particulars. They have omitted some entries. But I can tell you for 1898 and 1899.

8102. Give us the totals, not the items?—£91 5s. in 1899.

8103. Is that everything?—That is everything.

8104. 1898?—£77 1s. 6d.

8105. For 1897 you have not particulars?—I have not particulars. 1899 was an advance on 1898. I was only there three years. My first year's results were received in the next year, though they had been earned for the last year, and that was only £15, and my second year in the same school was £19, and that was showing progress.

8106. Mr. KERRIE.—Then in 1900?—Then in 1900 they dropped off from 1899, and what I am doing is. I am giving you the results for 1897 along with 1898, because that was not received until then, and they have omitted to send me the results for 1899; but I take it for granted that it could not have been less than £19.

8107. The CHAIRMAN.—We want to know what you got after the introduction of the new system in the first five years?—These are the three years.

8108. But that is before the new system?—Yes.

8109. We want to know what followed the introduction of the new system?—Well, they fixed my salary on the three years' average.

8110. Mr. KERRIE.—What did it come to?—£67.

8111. That was the total amount you received in 1900?—£67, the average for 1897, 1898, and 1899.

8112. Mr. HENRY.—So what you got was £67 and £15?—No, I got the £67 and portion of the £15. I am averaging that. The £15 depends upon average attendance. That £15 is not fixed. If I have not 60 I will not get the £15. If I have 45 children I only get £11 12s.

8113. Mr. KERRIE.—You had been teaching under the old system, and improving in efficiency, and we want to know whether, when the new system was introduced, your income rose or fell?—I do not know personally that I lost anything, for this reason—

8114. The CHAIRMAN.—You do not know that you personally lost anything in salary on the change to the new system?—Yes, because I was in a small school. Had I changed to a large school I would have, and must necessarily have lost.

8115. But in the small school you admit that you did not lose on your previous salary?—No.

8116. You admit that?—Yes.

8117. The BISHOP or BARR.—When you went to Tobernmore you went in under the new system?—I was under the new system before I went to Tobernmore.

8118. And you went to Tobernmore under the new system?—Under the new system.

8119. So that you had no vested rights in Tobernmore under the old system?—No. Well, I got vested rights in this way. I had vested rights because those vested rights are considered like this—

8120. Is it to the school the vested rights attach or to the person?—To the person.

8121. Now, were your personal vested rights in any way interfered with when you went to Tobernmore?—They were.

8122. How?—I should have got what I did not get.

8123. That is to say, that the emoluments were attached to the school, but not to the person?—Not by any means. It is to the person that is in the school, but it is to the person, not to the school.

8124. But you admit that the rights were not attached to the school. You went into Tobernmore, and there were no rights attached to it when you got there; you did not carry any rights with you in there except to this lower salary. Where did your right come from then to the higher salary you claim?—When the Royal University became extinct the students got leave to finish in another University. That was their right.

8125. But according to your theory, in a thousand years' time, if the present system went on, a man

going into Tobernmore School would have the rights that existed in 1900 in Tobernmore School?—If he were an existing teacher. If a man were an existing teacher at the time that the class was made into grade he had the right of the class, and the right of the class was to go to the highest and to earn that salary. He had a right to get his results free of a school that he would be in.

8126. No matter at what period later on he went to that school those rights would revive for him though they never existed?—Supposing those rights are not granted here is the result of it. Supposing I was a teacher in a large school at that time, and I got a large salary, and that my school was cut down to 25, the result would be that on that 25 I would have the salary that I would have with 82. I have a case here where there is a female teacher, who got £138 salary with an average attendance of 25, whereas I have £39 on an average of 60.

8127. Mr. KERRIE.—What is your present salary?—My present salary is £169.

8128. The BISHOP or BARR.—Is it your case that the female's salary should be cut down?—No, but that mine should be raised up.

8129. I think it is after all true that the rights were personal, and not attached to the school, because there is this lady who has personal right, independently of her school going down. She had her personal rights, and you carried with you your personal rights into Tobernmore, and you claim that because you went into Tobernmore School rights should start up for you there?—No, but rights of greater labour. A man won't manage a school of 90 with the same ease as if it was a school of 25. It is a question of labour. If a person has got £138 with a school of 25, why would he try to obtain a school with an average of 60 for the salary of £99?

The BISHOP or BARR.—That is a sum in proportion.

8130. Mr. KERRIE.—I understand your point to be this, that your prospect of promotion, and your right to attain a class that would lead to promotion under the old system, were better than under the new. Is that right?—Yes.

8131. And you would have risen more rapidly than under the new?—Yes.

8132. Sir HENRY WILKINSON.—Just tell us what your salary would be now, having got into Tobernmore School, if your salary were to be determined under the old rules, in view of the fact of your having got into Tobernmore School?—It could not have been less than £115.

8133. Tell us how you work that out?—Well, £52 10s. would be my salary, even if I hadn't got into the higher class at all, plus £47 10s. results and £15 capitulation.

8134. According to Rule 202 of the old Rules what position were you in?—Second class.

8135. What was then called in the second class first of second division?—Yes.

8136. With £44 and £9 18s., that was £52 18s.?—Yes.

8137. That is the salary you were entitled to at that time?—Yes.

8138. Well, in addition to the £52 18s., you were entitled to results fees?—Yes.

8139. Take the result fees in Clonsilla. How much would that be?—I had no result fees in Clonsilla any more than in Tobernmore.

8140. There were result fees before you changed?—Yes.

8141. Would you tell us how much those result fees were?—I got £19 in a small school with 33 of an average.

8142. £19 of result fees?—Yes, £19 5s. 8d.

8143. That is £72 1s. 6d.?—Then I would be entitled to 5s. a head on the average per annum.

8144. But that was all you would be entitled to?—Yes, that is all.

8145. £72 1s. 6d. at Clonsilla?—Plus capitulation.

8146. Even before the new rules came in?—Yes, capitulation was in advance of grading.

8147. How much would that come to?—On 30 pupils.

8148. That is £20 5s. 6d., that you were entitled to as teacher of Clonsilla?—As teacher of Tallinnvill. I never had any result fees in Clonsilla.



1894 April, 1913.]

Mr. FRANCIS MILLER, continued.

[Continued.]

8146. I ask you what you were entitled to in Clevenodon if you had stayed in Clevenodon. You were in Clevenodon in 1897—I was not. I was in Clevenodon on the 1st of January, 1900. That was the day on which I took charge under the new system. Well, the new system did not begin till the 1st of April in that year.

8150. Then you were in Clevenodon when the new system came in?—Yes.

8151. Now, under the old system, while you were in Clevenodon, you had £32 10s., in consequence of your class?—Yes.

8152. Now, in addition to the £32 10s., what had you in Clevenodon?—I had 5s. on the average of the attendance.

8153. On the 387?—No, I hadn't 38 in Clevenodon; 24 in 1901, say 20 children; that would be £5.

8154. Then you had £37 10s. if this new rule had not come in at all. Would you have had in addition under the old rules any other fees, for the point we want to settle is just what you would have had if the new rule had not come in?—In Clevenodon?

8155. We went Clevenodon first, and then to go on. So, is the capitulation grant?—Yes, so, is the capitulation grant, and I would have had what you have put down, plus results.

8156. And how much results?—I could not say that.

8157. On the average would you have £137?—About that, about £12 or £13 in Clevenodon.

8158. We will say £12 6s., so that in Clevenodon, with results and all, you would have about £109?—About that.

8159. Suppose that new rule had not come in at all, you had been transferred from Clevenodon to Tobermore, and that Tobermore had the attendance that it has at present?—I would have gone up with a leap to that £115.

8160. How would that have come about?—By the £32 10s., plus results and capitulation.

8161. Would you still have 47?—Yes; provided I had no promotion at all, I would have had the £32 10s., and I would have had not less than £47 10s. results.

8162. The CHAIRMAN.—From what number of pupils; would you say 957?—82 of an average attendance gave that, or about 82; and now I have more than that.

8163. Sir HENRY WILKINSON.—That is £47 10s.?—Yes.

8164. And capitulation?—£15.

8165. That is you would have had £115 if the change had not been made?

The CHAIRMAN.—Without any promotion?—No promotion at all, just what I was, without any promotion.

8166. Sir HENRY WILKINSON.—You were in the second class?—The second class.

8167. And in consequence of the new rules were you put into third grade?—Yes.

8168. You still remained in Clevenodon at the change?—Yes.

8169. And how much do you say your first salary was under the new rule?—£67, plus capitulation, whatever the capitulation might be.

8170. The CHAIRMAN.—That was obtained by taking the average?—By taking the average for the three years of results and class salary.

8171. Sir HENRY WILKINSON.—That is to say, that you started with £67?—£67.

8172. Mr. HENLEY.—Were not the salaries originally fixed at a different figure from the £67 and £137?—We did not get the capitulation at once; it was called residual school grant, and 8s. was allowed at the beginning, but they found that they could not pay 8s., and they lowered it to 6s. It was estimated at 6s., and whatever was over was then distributed among the principal teachers at that time, but that would not amount to more than 1s. 3d. per annum per pupil.

8173. But it was not the intention of the Commissioners at first to give any capitulation grant?—No, they gave what was called the supplementary school grant.

8174. Sir HENRY WILKINSON.—Will you tell us what your salary is and what increments you get?—Yes, when I came there on the 1st of April I got promotion after six months; that was £7 a year.

8175. You got £7?—That made £74.

8176. That was after you came to Tobermore?—Yes. In the next 3½ years I got an increment of £3—that

is in 3½ years—that makes £77, and after 3 years I got £10 of an increment; that was £87. My salary now stands at £87, plus £15 plus £7. The £7 is the Residual Grant.

8177. That is £100?—£100.

8178. And in the ordinary course?—I would have got £115 in the ordinary course at one jump without waiting those 10 years at all.

8179. That is you would have got that amount from the 1st of April, 1903?—Yes.

8180. When you went in?—Yes.

8181. That is what you would have got under the old system?—Yes.

8182. I see that you speak of 3½ years?—Yes. The rule says not less than three years, or "as a rule three years."

8183. Would you refer me to the rule?—I am speaking now of the new Rules and Regulations that you referred to?—It is in Rule 105 (3): "Teachers must, as a rule, remain three years at the maximum rate of salary before promotion to a higher grade."

8184. I want you if you can to refer to this new Rule 105, and say what they promise?—They promise, "Cases in which, in the judgment of the Commissioners any of the Rules in Section 3 would operate inequitably, will be specially considered."

8185. Then the question is, how the rule in Section 3 affected you inequitably? You simply rely upon the fact that under the old rules, if you had remained under them when you came into Tobermore in April, 1903, your salary would have risen up to £109?—To £115.

8186. I thought it would be £87, £15 and £7?—That is my present salary. What I am saying is what I would have received under the old rules.

8187. On the 1st of April, 1903, you would have got £115 6s.?—I may tell you that Dr. Starke has admitted every word I am saying as regards the inequitable working of these rules, for I have it from the Education Office.

8188. You see the only way in which we can receive your evidence is in illustration of the rules, and when we ask you to tell us how the rules really operate inequitably a mere admission that they do so does not help us. What I want to know is if you can point out to us how that rule has operated inequitably. I take it that you simply say that you would have had £115 instead of £87, and you would have had an opportunity of rising to a higher class?—No, I would have £115 for the last nine years.

8189. You would have been entitled before you came to Tobermore to the £115?—No.

8190. Well, I take it that you say that you would have been entitled under the old rule to £115 6s., instead of £87, from the 1st of April, 1903?—Yes, but I had not 90 on the 1st of April, 1903.

8191. Suppose you have had £115 on the 1st of April, 1903, under the old rule, and then came under the new rules—I think that is your supposition?—I do not follow you.

8192. Mr. KERR.—What increments did you get since 1905?—£7, £3, and £10.

8193. That is £20?—Yes.

8194. So that if you had got only the same amount of increments you would have had £135?—I would have £135.

8195. That is your point?—Yes.

8196. That is that you have actually £100 and if you had started with £115 in 1903 you would now have £135?—Yes, not less than £135.

8197. Sir HENRY WILKINSON.—That is in the past eight years you would have earned approximately £94 8s., whereas under the present circumstances you earn £74, that is sustaining a loss of £20?—It would be a great deal more. Here is how I make it out, and perhaps you will understand it more clearly.

8198. Please give us the total sum, not the details?—The difference that it has been to me is not less than £120 10s. The sum total is not less than £120.

8199. Mr. HENLEY.—What was your average salary for the last three years ending 1907?—The Board say it was £67, plus capitulation.

8200. That makes £82?—If you had only ten pupils it would only amount to £2. The capitulation is a variable amount on the number of pupils attending your school.

18th April, 1913.]

Mr. FRANCIS MILLER, examined.

[Continued.]

8201. Mr. KETTER.—And if you changed from one school to another the change affected you?—Yes, the change affected me.

8202. Mr. HENLY.—What was the actual money that you received?—In the first year of the new system I got £27, and whatever capitation was given to me.

8203. Give me the sum total of money that you received from the Commissioners?

Mr. KETTER.—You probably have not a record of it?—How could I?

8204. The capitation is variable from year to year?—Yes.

8205. Mr. HENLY.—The capitation does not vary?—Do you mean that I am getting the same capitation now at £15 a year that I got at Clarendon School?

8206. But you get a capitation grant on 60 pupils?—Yes, now I do, and for the last eight years.

8207. And no matter what the attendance is you get the capitation grant on 60 pupils?—Yes.

8208. So that is a fixed sum so long as you have 60 pupils?—Yes.

8209. And is not that fixed?—No, because the appointments suffer. The capitation does vary.

8210. Mr. KETTER.—You say that you calculate that you have lost at least £130 10s.?—Yes, at the very lowest.

8211. Mr. HENLY.—Your average salary, if I understood you aright, up to 1900 for the previous three years, was £23?—Yes.

8212. And under the new system you commenced with a salary, including capitation, of £27?—Excuse me. You say that I started with £22. I say that I started with £27 and capitation.

8213. You received £27 and £15 capitation?—I did not receive £15.

8214. Mr. KETTER.—Mr. Miller's point is perfectly clear. When you came over under the new system, Mr. Miller, you had not got 60. You had a school with an average, I think, of 33?—Of 30.

8215. And the capitation grant was not £15?—It was only £4.

8216. Mr. HENLY.—You were in a small school in 1900. Is that so?—Yes.

8217. What salary was fixed for you in 1900 in that small school?—£27, plus capitation.

8218. And your average salary you told us for the three years previously was £23?—I did not say anything of the sort. I said it was £27 (and I do not question it) from the Commissioners.

8219. But £27 was the amount of your average salary for the previous three years?—I do not question it.

8220. And that statement, that where the rule operated inequitably you would get special consideration did not apply in your case?—Why not; it did.

8221. At that time?—It did.

8222. Well, in what way?—What time do you refer to?

8223. 1900?—No, it did not act inequitably in 1900. I did not ask for promotion in 1900.

8224. That clause that you are referring to about special consideration being given in cases in which the rule would act inequitably referred to cases like those in which a man might go into a new school in which the attendance and emoluments had been increasing for the preceding three years, for instance, it might be £40 the first year, and £20 the next, and £100 the next. In that case it certainly would not act equitably, but in your case, if I understand it aright, the average salary for the preceding three years was practically a fixed quantity?—It is just the difference between the meaning that I take out of "inequitably" and you. I take this meaning out of "inequitably" what would pull my salary down.

8225. Was not the salary given to you in the preceding three years the average salary pretty much what it had been from year to year, with no great increase in one year?—No.

8226. And in the way in which that rule was understood, and intended to be understood, it did not act inequitably?—It did not act inequitably.

8227. Now, had the old system continued in operation what emoluments could you be in receipt of now? £115 10s. in all, plus the increments for the last nine years.

8228. I am supposing the grading system was never introduced?—£115 10s.

8229. That is all you could have got?—Yes.

8230. Now, would it not be possible for a teacher, having good work and having the necessary qualifications, to rise to first of first?—Yes.

8231. What would be the salary for that?—I do not know. It would be about £25 more.

8232. Surely that is one of the things you are looking for that you might then attain to?—Yes, but I did not put a price on, say £20, or so much more. I did not say anything about that.

8233. You did not contemplate rising to first of first?—I did, because a man who is going in for his degree is not going to stay as a teacher in second class.

8234. There was £27 10s. of result fees that you would have got?—Yes.

8235. What other emoluments could you have got?—That would be the difference between £24 and £20.

8236. £24, £27 10s., and £15, that is £146 10s.?—That is what I would have been receiving.

8237. You were then in second class?—Yes.

8238. And in order to get that salary you would have to keep your school up to the standard required for first class teachers in order to be admitted to the examination for the lowest division of the first class?—Yes.

8239. And you would have to pass that examination?—Yes. I have passed harder ones.

8240. And you would require now at the same time an average attendance of 55 pupils?—Yes.

8241. Had you that average at the time?—No.

8242. So that the fact that you had a low average at that time would have prevented you sitting for that examination while you were in a small school?—No, it would not, because I was admitted to the examination, but owing to illness in my family on the day that the examination was to have been held I did not go. I was, however, admitted to the examination.

8243. Supposing you were admitted and got in you could have got no salary?—I would have got a salary.

8244. How?—You would then require three years in that class before you would be admitted to the next step?—As a matter of fact, I would have preceded second of first by passing that examination, and if I had got a higher percentage than 57, I would have gone first of first class straight off.

8245. By what rule?—By length of service only.

8246. And then that rule to £146 10s. was a problematical thing?—Only partly problematical, but I have got my present school, so I have got the problematical part now solved. I have now attained to the school that would have given me the problematical part.

8247. Provided all the other conditions were fulfilled?—But the other conditions were easy conditions.

8248. But after the period required of efficient service the teacher at the end of that time would be required to show an exceptional report?—Well, I have got an exceptional report for that time, "very good."

8249. But you have mentioned here that in one case your school was lowered to "good"?—Yes, and I hold that it should not have been lowered to "good." It was lowered twice to "good," but my own personal mark was "very good."

8250. But I cannot see, with every desire to see, and looking at it in the most lenient way I can, how your transfer from the class system to the grade system has affected you, except in this way, that it has affected every teacher in the class by lengthening the time required for rising to the top and by the imposition of the standard numbers.

8251. Sir EDWARD WILKINSON.—Have you a letter from the Board in which they state their view of the case?—Yes. I will read it:—

"OFFICE OF NATIONAL EDUCATION,  
"MANCHESTER STREET, DUBLIN."

"CO. DERRY. TOBERMORE NATIONAL  
"SCHOOL. ROLL No. 6192."

"The adequacy of Mr. Francis Miller's salary was considered in connection with his appointment as Principal of the Tobermore National School, when it was decided that he was not eligible for special promotion to the Second Grade, because (1) he had received no 'very good' reports, and (2) the average attendance at his school (81) did not warrant it at the time."

1896 April, 1913.]

Mr. FRANCIS MILLER, examined.

[Continued.]

"This teacher's salary, fixed at £67 in 1904, was based on the average of his earnings in the Clovenodon National School, Co. Armagh, of which he was the principal, for the three years ended the 31st March, 1900." This was a small school with a diminishing average attendance.

"Mr. Miller's claim to be paid on an improved scale of salary upon appointment to the larger school cannot be admitted. Under the rules sanctioned by the Treasury in 1900, principal teachers transferred from one school to another are only entitled to carry with them their actual salary, further improvements being provided for by the award of increments or promotions in accordance with the authorized scales. As an exceptional matter the Commissioners may specially promote a teacher who has shown marked skill in his profession, and is in charge of a large and important school. The average attendance at Tobermore National School has now reached 102. The reports on the school, however, do not show a sufficiently high standard of merit to warrant Mr. Miller's special promotion at present. In the reports for 1906, 1907, 1908 the school was classified 'good'; this classification has been raised to 'very good' in the report for 1909.

"Mr. Miller received an increment of continued good service salary on the 1st October last; this raised his salary to the maximum fixed for the Third Grade. The terms of Rule 105 require that a teacher must, as a rule, remain three years on the maximum of a grade before becoming eligible for promotion to a higher grade.

"With regard to the increment of £3 granted from the 1st October to the amount of which exception is taken, it is to be observed that the maximum fixed for salary payable to teachers in the Third Grade is £77; and as Mr. Miller's salary previous to the granting of this increment was £74, a larger award than £3 could not be made.

"3rd September, 1909."

That is what they state, and I made another appeal in 1911, and they state the same thing; but I find that I was not three years in Clovenodon school in 1897, 1898, and 1899, for I took charge of Clovenodon school on the 1st January, 1900; so that part of their statement is wrong, and they have fixed my salary on Clovenodon school. But they have no right to fix it in Clovenodon school, they should have fixed it on Tullinavall school.

8252. What difference would that have made in the salary?—It would have made a difference of three or four pounds ever since.

8253. Tullinavall was a better school?—A better school than Clovenodon and the three years' salary to be taken on that?—Yes.

8254. Mr. HENRY.—Were you not asked in 1909 to give the actual salary that you received in each of the preceding three years?—I do not know that I was. I am not saying I was not.

8255. And was not the average salary fixed by the Commissioners based upon your own return?—Their own words are that it was based on Clovenodon school, and I was not in Clovenodon those three years at all.

8256. It was based on your return, and then it being based on your return, if they made a wrong estimate, why did you not object in 1909?—Because I never was eligible for promotion until I got to Tobermore; that was five years afterwards.

8257. The question is simply this, what was the salary you were entitled to, and was it not based on the average of the three years preceding?

Sir HIRSH WILKINSON.—Have you ever called their attention to the fact that you were not in Clovenodon?—I have not. Well, I have in this way, that I have stated to the Board through my manager that parts of the replies are incorrect. I have stated that.

8258. Mr. CORRY.—There is just only one point really within our terms of reference, that Mr. Miller was denied a "very good" report through the school house not being whitewashed.

The CHAIRMAN.—I fail to see what we are able to do with these other matters at all. I do not think they come within the terms of reference whether they have been relevant or not up to now, I think we ought not to go further with them.

8259. Mr. HENRY.—You mention that the inspector had informed you that unless the walls were whitened?—Whitened outside and inside.

8260. The increments might be stopped?—Yes.

8261. What year was that?—That was the 3rd of April this year.

8262. That is to say that your increments, according to the inspector, were to depend upon the condition of the school building?—The coming increments, to be more correct.

8263. That they were dependent upon the condition of the school building?—Yes.

8264. And your point is that the teacher is precluded by the rules from spending any money of his own in improving the character of the school building?—Yes.

8265. Is that so?—Yes.

8266. And you conceive the situation in which you are placed to be an injustice?—Yes.

8267. Mr. HENRY.—Did the inspector tell you or tell your assistant that?—He told me.

8268. Mr. KITTLE.—Then your experience with regard to the general system is that there is a lack of uniformity of standard as between the inspectors?—Yes, and, if I might be permitted to say so, that that lack is caused by different men looking at it in different ways; not that I would find fault with them for that reason.

8269. But there is a lack of uniformity?—Yes, and there is a lack of uniformity in this way, that even inspectors do not always take the circulars they get in the same way. They might take a different meaning from us out of a circular; that is common to them and us.

8270. Can you mention a concrete matter in which there was a difference of interpretation between you and your inspector?—My inspector, according to this circular, should not change a mark without the sanction of his superior, without a report being made that this mark was the joint mark of the two. Now, I did not receive that joint mark and my manager did not receive it, and it must have gone to the office. If that joint mark has to go to the office it does not affect me at all, so far as telling me to improve or do anything else. It does not affect me, as I know nothing at all about it.

8271. You told the Committee that only on one occasion you had communicated to you your personal merit mark?—Yes.

8272. And with regard to that matter of promotion, you suggested that it was the lack of uniformity that was responsible for reducing you from the "very good" to "good"?—Oh, yes.

8273. And that stopped your promotion?—Yes, and not only so, but there was this point there, that my assistant was absent for three months. The Commissioners state that if the mark is to be lowered, it is to be on account of the moral of the school, or the tone of the school going down, and they want that mark to become permanent. Now, as a matter of fact, my mark has changed five times in five years, which is not permanent by any means, and therefore it goes to show that the inspectors are not reading out of it what the instructions are.

8274. Although the efficiency of the school is the same as ever?—Yes, the same as ever; and supposing that a school was not so efficient, if the case was not permanent it should not have been lowered, even if the school was down, and I got no credit whatever for my assistant being away and a new substitute in her place.

8275. Mr. HENRY.—You would like to see the number of merit marks reduced from six to three. Is it necessary to have any merit marks at all?—If there were merit marks at all, the number should be much less. I did not mean to say that there should be a merit mark.

8276. But on what ground would you reduce them to three?—On the ground that there must be some appreciation of schools.

8277. But why should you reduce them to three rather than keep them at six?—Because the distinction between the marks is too fine and the progress from one to another is so gradual that what one man would call one thing the next would call another.

8278. And you think it would tend to uniformity to reduce the number?—Yes, it would tend to uniformity.

8279. I understood you to say that you would prefer that the whole system of merit marking should be abolished?—Yes; you see in what you have there before you that I say:—why should a man be considered less efficient as he becomes more experienced? The Commissioners seem to go on that assumption, when they require a merit mark every year.

8280. I suppose you recognise this fact, that the question of uniformity presents a very serious difficulty to the inspectors, and that they may differ with the best intentions in the world in arriving at a standard?—Yes.

8281. You quite recognise that?—I quite recognise that.

8282. Do you not think that it does impose a very serious task on the inspectors, besides being very unpopular and distasteful to teachers?—Yes.

8283. Sir HIRSH WILKINSON.—There were other subjects that you mentioned in the statement that you sent in. One was with regard to the dinner roll. You say that there are some children who are permitted to go to dinner and some who are not?—Yes.

8284. And that in the case of the children who are allowed to go to dinner or lunch you have to mark two attendances, if they are to have a full day.

8285. And that for children who are not allowed to go to lunch there is only one attendance to mark?—Yes.

8286. And if they leave the school before the final closing hour, you are not allowed to give them credit for any time at all?—None.

8287. While the child who is authorised to go to lunch gets half attendance if he does not return after lunch?—Yes.

8288. Would your suggestion be that all children who stayed half a day should get half a day's attendance mark?—Yes.

8289. That is your proposal?—Yes, and that the dinner roll should not be in operation at all, that it is useless.

8290. In what way?—It acts unfairly in the way that I have stated there now. It requires a great deal of time to make it up and to keep it, and it amounts to nothing. It seems unnecessary.

8291. It amounts to nothing?—Only worry on the part of the principal teacher in keeping it.

8292. But in the case of a scholar who is allowed to go to lunch, you would not cancel the permission to go, would you?—Oh, no.

8293. You would allow him to go?—Yes.

8294. That is, if you entered the name in the morning, how would you deal with the child in case he comes back in the afternoon?—In case he comes back you do not require to call the roll after dinner, and that is where the advantage would be.

8295. You suggested that it should not be necessary in the case of children allowed to go to lunch to call the roll after lunch at all?—You might not call the roll, but you would have to see that every child is back.

8296. Without calling the roll?—Yes, without calling the roll.

8297. And then suppose that the child does not come back, you would give him half attendance?—Yes, I would give him half attendance.

8298. And in the case of a child who took that for some reason or other he ought to go home at lunch time or after lunch time, you would give him half attendance too?—If he stayed in school up to lunch time, half attendance, and if he goes away before three o'clock or before the time of closing the school, half attendance, provided he stays to lunch time.

8299. Mr. HARRISON.—Would not that increase the amount of registration required from the teacher?—No; the truth is that at the present time I have two separate rolls to make out, I call the roll for every child in the school. There are 140 or so on the rolls, I think it is 67 that go to dinner, and those 67 are included in that 140, and I must call the 67 a second time, and put a half mark down for a half day, although they are marked previously.

8300. What your proposals amount to is this, that there should be two attendances in the day. It would

come to that, would it not, morning and afternoon?—Yes, it would come to that.

8301. Mr. HIRSH.—Have you tried the two attendances, which you were at liberty to do with the approval of your manager?—That is, have I tried to let all the children home to their lunch?

8302. But you could have the two attendances, and then you need not have a dinner roll?—But I would have two rolls. One would be the morning roll, and the other would be the afternoon roll.

8303. You could have that, but you could give credit for half attendance?—Then I would require a greater time for lunch, and then it would occupy a greater time of the day, and it would be most unpopular in the district, and the school would not close till four o'clock in the evening.

8304. Sir HIRSH WILKINSON.—And you would call the roll in the morning, and those children who were not in in the afternoon would be marked with half attendance instead of a whole attendance?—Yes.

8305. Without calling the whole roll?—Without calling the whole roll.

8306. Then you refer to the maternity rule?—Yes.

8307. And you say that keeping a teacher three months from work, and placing a substitute to do the work, tends to lower the efficiency of the school?—Yes.

8308. But we can scarcely enter into a discussion as to the propriety of the woman remaining away?—Oh, no.

8309. We cannot question that?—No.

8310. But what you complain of is that when a case of that sort occurs you are compelled to have another assistant, and that allowance is not made in your merit mark for the fact of your having another assistant instead of your first assistant?—Yes; and not only that allowance is not made, but there was a concrete case in my own school.

8311. Your mark was lowered unduly by reason of consideration not having been given to this circumstance?—Well, I do not know that I can put it that way, Sir HIRSH.

8312. That is what I take it to be?—I held that my mark was unduly reduced, that even from the body of my report I should have got "very good" for the body of my report that year was no worse than the year I got "very good."

8313. Well, now, that is important, that the summary of the report, or the extracts from the report, that have been sent to you for those two years showed no difference, practically?—Showed no difference, practically. The one was as good as the other.

8314. And although, according to the summary, the state of the school in each case was practically the same, the merit mark differed?—Yes, and I have those reports here (reports handed in.)

8315. One is 12th June, 1911, and the other is 11th June, 1907?—This is the one I was reduced on (witness hands in another report.)

8316. This is June, 1907 (reads report). It is "very good"?—Excuse me. There is a case where the inspector does not attend to the requirements of Dr. Starkie. He says accuracy in arithmetic is not required.

8317. Now, the report of June, 1910 gives the mark as "good" (reads report)?—That is the same inspector and that is the year in which my own personal mark was "very good."

8318. The CHAIRMAN.—You got "very good"?—I got "v.g." on that report.

8319. Sir HIRSH WILKINSON.—Now I read the report of 1911.—"The teachers of this school have worked earnestly and successfully during the past year, and the pupils have made good progress. The proficiency is generally good or very good. The order and discipline are excellent. The schoolroom is kept clean and tidy, etc., and the mark is 'very good.'" Now I come to 1912.—"The school is efficiently conducted by a staff of industrious teachers" (reads report). The mark there is "good," that is a reduction?—It is by another inspector.

The CHAIRMAN.—Is there a new inspector in 1912?

Sir HIRSH WILKINSON.—There is a new inspector in 1912, and the mark is reduced.

## SEVENTEENTH DAY.—TUESDAY, APRIL 29TH, 1913.

At 23, Kildare-street, Dublin.

Present:—Sir SAMUEL DILL, M.A., LL.D., LL.D. (Chairman); The Most Rev. DENIS KELLY, D.D., Bishop of Ross; Sir HERMAN SHAW WILKINSON, LL.D.; Mr. JOHN COFFEY; Mr. HENRAGE; E. B. HARRISON, B.A.; Mr. JEREMIAH HENLY; Mr. WALTER MCMURROUGH KAVANAGH, D.L.; Mr. THOMAS MICHAEL KETTLER, B.L.; and

Mr. ARTHUR J. DONNELLY, M.A., B.Sc., Secretary.

Rev. GILBERT MARAFTY, M.A., Canon of Christ Church, and a member of the Board of Education of the Synod of the Church of Ireland, examined.

8320. The CHAIRMAN.—You come with Canon Tristram as representatives of the Educational Board of the General Synod. In the same way we have had Archbishop Pooler and others as representatives of the Northern Association of Church of Ireland School Managers. Now does this paper that you have kindly given us represent the general views of your association?—Yes, I think it does. With regard to details I have to observe that I have not been able to make the preparations for this day that I should have made, as I am leaving my parish and going to another.

8321. What is your parish?—St. Peter's, Dublin.

8322. How long have you been there?—Seventeen years.

8323. And I suppose you are yourself manager of the school?—Five schools.

8324. You have very large experience?—I am school manager for twenty-seven years besides assisting for many years previously.

8324a. Are those schools that you have under your management now town schools?—Yes, they are.

8325. And formerly were you living in the country?—I have been mostly a town worker, but I have been in the country.

8326. So you know town schools and rural schools?—Yes, but I was only two years in the country.

8327. I think you say that you have been twenty-seven years a manager of schools?—Yes.

8328. That goes back a good way, so that you are well acquainted with the old system of payment by results?—It goes back much longer than that.

8329. You knew the system before that?—I came to work in Dublin in the year 1875 as curate. I was curate of the present Archbishop, and had the experience of putting schools under the Board when I was his curate in St. George's Parish, Dublin, and then we went to Moolstown, and put schools there under the Board; I have managed schools in St. Paul's Parish, and St. Mary's Parish, and St. Peter's Parish, in Dublin. I was also Honorary Secretary of the Church of Ireland School Managers' Association, and later on, if you will permit me, I would like to read some resolutions of that body bearing on some points that we discussed.

8330. Now you have seen primary schools under three different systems?—Yes.

8331. Has your association formed any decided opinion as to the relative merits of the present system and the system that existed from 1874 till 1907?—Of course, there are strong points and weak points in the present system. For myself, I am a good deal disappointed with the present system of inspection, especially in this way, that it has broken the contact between us as managers and the inspectors, and therefore we have not been able to know so well their views on the work of the schools.

8332. I should be very glad if you would develop that, and now may I ask you this? do you get proper notice of the visits of an inspector?—Well, I get a notice in the morning of inspection when I have my day's programme made out, so I feel that I have lost the support of the inspectors, that I have lost touch with them to a large extent. When I do meet them or communicate with them, I find them most friendly. I have worked along with such inspectors as Mr. John Molloy, Mr. William Molloy, Dr. Stronge and Dr. Browne. I learned most of what I have ever

learned of school management from communication with them, and it was of priceless value to me in my own school work.

8333. But at present you do not communicate with the inspectors?—Seldom with the inspectors. They are quite courteous in sending notice on the morning of the inspection, but sometimes it arrives when I have gone out and not come in till the evening.

8334. But I suppose occasionally you are able to make be present?—Yes, I do what I can.

8335. What is your impression roughly as to the present mode of inspection?—I do not think it at all as thorough or promotive of as thorough an education as the former one, and I do not think it leaves it clear to teachers on what ground they have been condemned if they are condemned.

8336. Does that imply that there is not enough examination of the pupils?—I think there ought to be more examination of the pupils, and I think the pupils like it. They used to like the examination, and the stimulus was good.

8337. And there is too little examination now in your experience?—I think so. Of course, in the results examination there was extreme pressure put upon the teachers, and no one advocates a return to that, and the tremendous issues that there were on the day of results examination, but I think a combination of the examination with what is called inspection would be better.

8338. Now under the second head you refer to the qualification and training of inspectors. Do you think that the newer type of inspector is as well qualified for his work as the old?—Well, those that I have been working with have been mostly inspectors of the older type, because they bring their very best inspectors to Dublin, but I may say that I have had, on the whole, a very pleasing experience of inspectors. I have never once had to report anything to the Board with regard to an inspector. My intercourse with them has been of the most favourable kind. Then again, when I see inspectors in the schools I endeavour to make them understand the difficulty of the schools where there are difficulties. I may say that the lady inspector appointed by the Board is, I think, one of the best I have ever met. She has been a practical teacher, and knows the work of the schools from top to bottom.

8339. And you go on to add that you desire practical experience of teaching?—Yes.

8340. And you would have that in every inspector?—Yes, I do not see how they are to understand the difficulties of the schools otherwise. Now, for instance, suppose you take a school such as you would have in the poorer districts in Belfast, and such as are in Dublin, where children that are practically street-boys are hunted in from the street. It is an enormous difficulty to bring those children into shape as pupils. An inspector with a high idea of discipline comes into that school, and he sees some of the children restless, and he does not realise the difficulties of that school because he has never tried what it is to knock those boys into shape as pupils. There must be consideration for peculiar types of schools. I was Chairman of one of the School Attendance Committees for three years, and I remember pressing the respected Administrator of St. Andrew's, Westland Row, to get a separate room for those slum

\* Vide Appendix XXII.

children, so that the inspector coming in there should not expect the same discipline as there would be in the ordinary class of boys. A person that has not taught himself cannot make sufficient allowance in a case of that sort.

8341. Is it chiefly with regard to discipline that you would value the training of an inspector?—That should be a part, but he should have ability to convey instruction also; and he would be more patient with methods that differed from his own if he had tried himself and found how ineffective his own methods sometimes would be.

8342. You have not seen enough of them to know whether they help the teacher by advice?—Well, the inspectors we have had are mostly of the kind that do. I have not come much into contact with the younger inspectors. I have seen the best of them. They send us very good inspectors in Dublin. But that is what is needed, sympathetic encouragement. If the teacher thinks that his work has not been fairly tested, he goes to the new year's work disheartened, and a great deal depends on the spirit in which the teacher has to do the work. If he thinks that nothing he can do will please the inspectors, he has not the same heart for it.

8343. Have you anything to say under that head as to the training of inspectors?—Nothing, except that I agree with my brethren that the inspectors ought to have some practical teaching experience either before or after their appointment.

8344. I understand that, but do you mean anything more than that in the training of inspectors, do you mean any special training of inspectors?—Well, I suppose they all do get a sort of training under older men. They certainly ought not to be sent out to inspect in their calf stage.

8345. They do get some training with the senior inspectors for six months, I think, or even a year?—Well, one of the ways is to turn them into schools, and I suppose the senior inspector might take them with him, but I have often seen young men come into the schools (I suppose it is part of their training) just to look round them.

8346. But how would you give a University graduate the opportunity of acquiring a knowledge of teaching, for I suppose you would desire that as many as possible of them should be graduates of University?—Yes, my brethren were very strong about that.

8347. How would you give the University graduate a chance of getting experience, would you turn him into a National School for six months?—I think so. If he was going to be a doctor he has to do the very commonest things.

8348. Every inspector perhaps in his first year ought to spend some time in a National School as teacher?—I think so. He cannot properly criticise work that he has never tried to do.

8349. Now has the inspector troubled you much with extravagant structural requirements?—I have not had any personal trouble, but I remember some years ago at a meeting of our School Managers' Association the subject was mentioned, and this resolution was passed:—"That while it is incumbent upon school-managers to use their utmost endeavours to secure that school-rooms, with their furniture and appliances, shall be well fitted to promote the health of the children and the efficiency of the school, it is important that the demands of the National Board officers for structural alterations be limited to such changes as experience has shown to be absolutely necessary." I believe in some cases they have been making demands that the people of the locality are utterly unable to comply with through poverty. Schools are established and started, many a one, by a clergyman at the cost of his own income.

8350. I suppose that resolution applies more to rural schools than to town schools?—Yes.

8351. I suppose there is not much trouble about structural requirements in town schools?—Not very much, except that in some cases they have called upon us to divide our school-rooms to a degree that we cannot afford to do.

8352. Have you come across any cases in which a teacher has been required, out of his own pocket or

out of his own time, to do cleaning work, for instance, that ought to devolve upon the manager?—You see, formerly school-houses were parochial institutions with a residence attached, and the person who lived in the residence had the care of the school-house, and the teachers were mostly quite willing to occupy the residence on those terms. As a manager I feel very strongly that the teacher should not have one shilling to spend for the upkeep of the school-house.

8353. But are there any cases where he has to do that?—I believe there are cases, but it is mostly on the lines I speak of, where he has a residence which is a sort of compensation. A person who has a residence in a place is supposed to keep the place right.

8354. Then if an even has to pay a certain amount towards these expenses it would be a kind of rent for that house?—I suppose it would.

8355. It would be a compensation?—I am not favourable to allowing teachers to have any expense. I do not allow teachers in my own school to spend any money for school appliances.

8356. And is the cleaning in all the urban schools done at the expense of the manager?—I think so, as far as I know. When we had a resident school-master in our best school he was allowed 5/- or 6/- a week for a servant, and we paid for all the brushes and that sort of things that were used. In none of our schools has a teacher any responsibility, except the same sort of responsibility that I have about my church. If I see anything wrong about my church, I insist on somebody setting it right. The town schools, as far as I know, are fairly kept.

8357. Now as to the methods of inspection, your association makes certain suggestions here about more efficient tests and more thorough examination?—Yes.

8358. To what extent would you carry that, would you make it as complete as under the old results system without payment of results?—Well, I am sure that would be a good thing if it was done.

8359. Do you mean that the inspector should examine every child individually?—Not every child individually through the whole school in all subjects, but in certain subjects.

8360. In some subjects every child ought to be examined in the year by the inspector?—Yes, and there are certain of the more vital subjects in which I think every child's work should be tested.

8361. Elementary subjects?—Elementary subjects.

8362. The three R's?—Yes.

8363. Is it your impression (and we have had a good deal of evidence on it on both sides) that children are not trained in these elementary subjects as well as they were?—I do not think the teaching of those subjects is as thorough as it was some years ago. One reason is that they have so many other things to do, but I am sure that reading is better, on the whole, than it was.

8364. It is more intelligent?—More intelligent. I think much more intelligent than it was, and with less of the gross faults that were noticeable, especially in our Northern schools.

8365. Sir HERMAN WILKINSON.—In the Northern schools?—Yes. I think that the faults are not as gross as they were when I was working in the North. I am a Northern man myself, and I did not like the reading in our Northern schools, but I think it has improved.

8366. The CHAIRMAN.—And about arithmetic?—I do not think it is as solid as it was.

8367. I suppose your boys go to business in many cases in Dublin?—They do.

8368. Have you had complaints from merchants that they come not properly prepared?—Not as to boys from my schools. My teachers have preserved, as far as possible, what was good in the old system. They have been very conservative. They have accommodated themselves as much as possible to the new requirements, but they have preserved all that they could of the old tradition, and my boys' school is particularly efficient in arithmetic and mathematics.

8369. I suppose your teachers are compelled by circumstances to look to the boys' future in the shops and warehouses?—Yes.

8370. They must think of that?—Yes.

29th April, 1913.]

REV. CAESAR HANFITT, M.A., examined.

[Continued.]

8871. And complying as far as possible with the rules of the Board, they must have that practical object in view?—Certainly. We cannot keep our boys in the school, they are untaught up so readily, and the same is true of our girls.

8872. What do the girls do when they leave?—Some are employed in Grafton Street shops as assistants.

8873. How about English composition—that is one subject in which it is claimed that they have made a great improvement in the last twelve years?—I think they have.

8874. The boys express themselves more clearly and in better form?—Yes, and, no doubt, though it is rather a tedious process, the answering in complete sentences has some effect in teaching composition.

8875. Oral composition?—Oral composition.

8876. That is insisted on more than it used to be?—Oh, yes.

8877. Giving the answers in complete well-formed sentences?—Yes; of course, it is an enormously difficult thing to do, and it takes a great deal of time, and I suppose in the end we may get good results from it, though I am not sure.

8878. I do not understand your last clause, "For the rest class examination;" will you kindly explain that?—That is just what we suggested before, that it will not be necessary to examine individually every child in every subject, but that there are these essential ones that they must be examined in individually, and the rest taken as class subjects.

8879. I suppose your schools are large?—Fairly large; some are small.

8880. I suppose you seldom have complaints as to insufficient staffing?—No.

8881. You have teachers enough for the boys and girls?—Yes, I think we have. You see there is a great improvement in comparison with what used to be in my time. It used to be 70 for the first assistant, and now it is 50, which is a great difference; and the junior assistant mistresses, I think, are useful.

8882. There has been a difference of opinion expressed on this point. I was going to ask you what was your opinion of the value of junior assistant mistresses?—I think they are useful. I was greatly grieved when the monitorial system was broken up, because though I did not regard it as a perfect method of training teachers, it was to my mind invaluable in the way of keeping the older pupils in the school.

8883. The monitors were a part of the teaching staff, and it was very important to have thoroughly clever monitors?—Yes, it was. The presence of a monitor or two remaining on to an older age raised their companions to remain on too, and the practical abolition of the monitorial system was followed by a fall, a very pronounced fall, in the number of children over 14. That was also brought about to some extent by the School Attendance clauses.

8884. Will you develop that?—There were about 8,000 monitors at one time, and the reduction in the number caused a lessening of the number of children of older ages in the schools. That is my impression. That reduction was also caused by the operation of the School Attendance clauses when put in force, because inasmuch as they named the fourteenth birthday as a limit, many of the children were very punctual in leaving on that day.

8885. Might I assume that your opinion is that the abolition of the monitorial system has injured the quality of the schools?—I believe it has. It was a great gain in my judgment to have monitors in the schools. It raised the tone of teaching in the higher classes, and it made the class of older children learn to teach the others, which is the most effective way of getting hold of a subject themselves.

8886. Do you find that your teachers under the present system are students at all out of school hours?—I do not think so. The abolition of the teacher's classification has done that, I think.

8887. Do you think that the examination for promotion should be restored?—I do, most decidedly. The time the change was made in the mode of paying the teachers I had a long discussion with the late Lord Justice Fitzgibbon over it, and we agreed to retain

some stimulus for the teachers. My scheme was this—to let the teacher's payment be a two-fold payment, one part personal to himself, no matter where he went, and capable of improvement according as he advanced himself, whether by examination or any other way, and the other part special to the school; in other words, that the schools should be graded, carefully graded, liable to degenerate if they become bad, and capable of being promoted to a higher classification if they were exceptionally efficient. My idea was that by means of due care and with sufficiently reliable inspectors, the schools should be graded, and that they should be capable of advancement to a higher level and higher payment if they got to be fit for it. The result would have been that the teacher's salary would have consisted of the two parts, one personal to himself and the other attached to his school. In the case of a comparatively young teacher who had been appointed to a large school, his personal salary would have been smaller on account of his shorter years, but he would have had the advantage of having a better income from his large school. But now there is very little encouragement, for so matter how a teacher works his progress must be very slow, and it is discouraging.

8888. Do you know how long it takes a man under the present system to rise to be first of first?—I do not know, but I remember calculating that it would take thirty-six years before he could reach the maximum unless he was passed over the heads of other teachers, which would be a discouragement and unfair to them. It would take him thirty-six years to obtain the highest salary.

8889. What is the total income of the best principal teacher that you have?—His income from the Board, with capitation, is a little over £200 a year. It is a school with an average of 124, I think.

8890. He is first of first?—First of first.

8891. And what would his assistants have?—One has about £90.

8892. His principal assistant has about £80?—About £80.

8893. How is he classed or graded?—He is only third. He can be nothing more.

8894. He cannot rise beyond £80?—I do not think so. That includes a share of the capitation. He gets £84, and then he has 48 12s., the highest amount of capitation he can get. As you have touched the point of assistant, I would like to say that one of the hardships of the present system of inspection seems to be this, that a principal of the very best type may be damaged throughout the whole of his school life by the accident of having had a bad assistant under him—an assistant who may have been appointed without his having any voice in the matter. He cannot get the assistant removed, while the bad work of the assistant may get the principal of the school a bad report, and the whole of his career for the future may have a heavy line on it. I think that is a cruel result of the present system.

8895. The Honor or Rank.—How would you reconcile that last point with what you said a few minutes ago about the grading of the schools, and attaching a salary for the principal to the graded school?—Well, I did not work that out any further than just to sketch it, because I found it was not welcome to the teachers, so I stopped consideration of that proposal, but I do wish to arrive at something of the kind.

8896. But do you see that there would be a certain inconsistency?—Yes.

8897. You would find it difficult to secure justice to the principal teacher in your graded school?—As much, do you think, as at present?

8898. When you go to grade the school you must have to take into consideration not only the principal, but all the assistants in the school?—I do not think it is fair to the principal teacher to give the assistants security of tenure with the result of damaging the principal teacher's whole career.

8899. Can you grade the school without taking the work of the assistant into account?—I suppose it would come in, but I did not get as far as considering that. Nothing came of my proposal.

8400. The CHAIRMAN.—Now as to the impossibility of summing up the merits of the teacher or the school in one word?—I think it is a most monstrous attempt to allocate salaries on the chance choice of a word in that way.

8401. You refer to all those six merit marks from "excellent" down to "bad"?—It is unfair to the inspector, and it puts on him a most painful responsibility, and it is unfair to the teacher; and even supposing that it turned out to be, on the whole, a just mark, the teacher is not impressed with the justice of it, because there has not been, as far as he can see, a sufficient testing of the school to show whether the mark was just or not. If you are going to have a contented body of teachers they must necessarily be dealt with justly, and in such a way that they can see fairly that it is just, but if you find a man coming in, and, after making what appears to the teacher no sufficient testing of his work, pronouncing an opinion of his work in the school, *grish* means a serious loss to the teacher, the teacher cannot consider that judgment fair, because he has not seen his work tested.

8402. You think that there is discontent with these six merit marks?—I think there is, and I have always disliked the system from the very first. I thought it was the weakest point in the changes that were made.

8403. Then you suggest that it would be better to have a general report, and that the increments should be given as a matter of course in case the report was satisfactory. We have had that suggestion here before, but could you develop it in any way?—I would like to see that. In the Civil Service they get their promotion, I may say, automatically if they are up to a reasonable level, in the absence of anything to the contrary.

8404. They get their promotion in the absence of an unfavourable report?—Yes.

8405. And you think the teacher should get his increments regularly?—I think he ought.

8406. That has been criticised as not furnishing a sufficient stimulus?—I do not know. The present system affords depression and disheartenment.

8407. It has been suggested that a system of automatic increments would, in fact, leave room for slackness?—Of course, it would need a more strict testing of the work than at present, because an inspector could not, by the present mode of testing, that is, by a mere impression of the work in the school, judge of the teacher's work fairly.

8408. Would you mind expanding that a little? I think you refer to what is called the impressionist system of inspection?—Yes.

8409. Do you mean to criticise that?—Yes. I am glad to say that we have not had any of it in my own schools. We have had the inspectors taking sufficient interest in the work of the schools and examining a good deal, and putting questions pretty closely, but I know that it has been the case in other places that the inspectors have judged by the general appearance of the room, and by other things that catch the eye more than by trying the real work of the school.

8410. You have had no personal experience of the impressionist system yourself?—No personal experience.

8411. But you have heard complaints about it from your brethren, I suppose?—I have, indeed.

8412. Very frequently?—And if they go into a school determined to find something to criticise, of course they are sure to find something. It seems to me very unfair that the teacher should be penalised because a manager like myself has not done all that he ought to have the room nice or to have it ornamented.

8413. Do you know cases where the teacher has suffered in his pocket?—Well, I understand that that may be so from the principles that have been laid down, that part of the testing relates to the general appearance of the schoolroom and other things that really do not come under the teacher's direct control, but yet are subject to criticism.

8414. Do I understand you to say that for want of things that ought to be provided by the manager the

teacher is penalised sometimes?—I think so. I could not name a definite case, but that is the impression produced on my mind from what I have heard. Of course, I am sure managers are sometimes very much to blame for not having their schools in proper condition, but a teacher ought not to be held accountable for that.

8415. Now as to plans for securing uniformity of inspection. You have heard complaints about absence of uniformity?—Yes, I have.

8416. Among your brother managers?—I have. It struck me from what I heard only casually that perhaps it referred to some extent to the extra subjects that are taught, that one inspector might examine very severely, and give an examination that would be fitter for a University class, and that there was not the same uniformity in distributing the credit for work in such subjects as mathematics and some extra subjects.

8417. Do you think that this absence of uniformity is due to a large extent to the number of merit marks and the minute divisions into which they are separated, and the difficulty of 60 or 70 men awarding these marks in a fairly even way?—I hardly know how it is to be done, except that there are officers over the inspectors, chief inspectors. I always thought it was their business as far as possible to act in a judicial capacity, and to judge whether the work in different parts of the country was being reasonably tested according to an understood standard.

8418. Do the chief inspectors, in your experience, do that now?—I do not know whether they are allowed to do it. It was, we used to understand, to be their duty to be a sort of Court of Appeal, and to see that reasonable standards were being adopted throughout the country. It is very hard to make a number of men throughout the country follow the same line; an inspector may raise or lower the mark according to the neighbourhood he is in. A person who examines a school, for instance, will be conscious that where the school is uncommonly well taught, if he comes on a bad pupil he is inclined to mark more severely than if he is in a school where the answering is not so good, and I am sure that that tendency will affect an inspector in a backward district. I do not see how you are to guide it unless you have the chief inspectors free to go through the country to oversee the work of inspection, and give some sort of guarantee that it is fairly even. If they have not a suitable person to do it at present then somebody ought to do it.

8419. And then you go on to say that at present different inspectors recommend different methods?—That goes without saying.

8420. You have had no complaints yourself to make apparently in Dublin?—No, we are getting on pretty well, but some eleven years ago inspectors were termed loose upon us very rapidly, and at last I had to protect my teachers by writing a minute. I had adopted the English system of having a log-book, and I wrote a minute in the log-book to the effect that the teachers were to listen with great respect to all suggestions from the inspectors, and to place them before the manager, who would, if necessary, confer with the Board; for we got so many suggestions at that time that it was impossible to carry them out. I protected my teachers in that way, by putting myself between them and the inspectors, and saying that where an inspector recommended something that was a contradiction upon what had been recommended before they would inform me, and, if necessary, I would report to the Board. I never had occasion but once for such intervention. I had to seek authority from the higher officials to excuse a teacher from teaching tables to the junior infants.

8421. The present system, it is claimed, encourages individual methods?—I do not think it does. Of course, if there is a sensible inspector it will, I saw some time ago an ideal report on one of my schools. I simply call it an ideal report. The inspector reports that, "Some of the methods pursued in this school are educationally indefensible, but in view of the excellent results attained, I do not propose to suggest any alteration." I think that was the report of a



truly intelligent inspector. The teacher was one brought up under the old system, but she had adopted everything fresh as far as possible, and her school has been pronounced excellent by every inspector who goes to it, and that inspector was very just-minded. He could not suggest any alteration as the results were so excellent.

8422. You say that full notice should be given of the changes in the rules?—Yes.

8423. You object to rules being sprung upon you without warning?—Yes, it is not fair. I spend a good deal of time myself studying the alterations each year when the rules come out, but it takes some time to do it, and you sometimes do not catch what the effect of them is, and an "and" or an "or" will sometimes make a very great difference in the effect of the rules.

8424. Would you wish the rules or the proposed changes in the rules to be published in some way some months before the change takes place, so as to allow of remembrance or criticism?—It would be well if it could be done. I suppose there would be a good deal of remembrance sometimes.

8425. That is what you mean by "full notice"?—Yes, we ought to have an opportunity. Sometimes things have been changed quite suddenly, and very far-reaching changes have been sprung upon us without notice.

8426. Have come upon you all at once without warning?—Yes.

8427. And that is a very general feeling on the part of managers?—It is. It began with the late changes about a dozen years ago. One thing that was sprung upon us by a couple of lines in a circular was the abolition of the attendance obligation. Luckily we were able to fight it in Parliament and to defeat it.

8428. You heard of it in time, or the rule did not take effect before you could stop it?—No, it did not take effect. We stopped it.

8429. The Bramor or Boss.—You told us that you would wish that the inspectors should have some practice and experience in teaching?—Yes.

8430. And that in that way they would be able to judge better of the difficulties the teacher had to meet?—Yes.

8431. Are you in favour of promoting teachers themselves to be inspectors?—There are teachers and teachers, and some of them might be very good inspectors and some of them might not. I would not be in favour of a wholesale promotion of teachers. I remember being told at the Education Office nearly 30 years ago that the persons who gave the most severe reports on the teachers were the inspectors who had been teachers themselves.

8432. The present propositions amongst the inspectors of those who had been National teachers and those who had not been National teachers are that one-third had been teachers and two-thirds never had been teachers. Would you consider that a fair proportion?—I think it would not be an unfair proportion. Of course, if they find by experience that they can get as good inspectors among the teachers, well and good, and I have no doubt that one effect of such appointments would be to encourage men to remain in the profession who are leaving it at present.

8433. I gather that you would be in favour of having a reasonable number of University men and men from outside?—Yes, but they might have a larger proportion of teachers than they have at present. There are many exceedingly able men among the teachers who do not get the recognition they deserve.

8434. You told us that you thought under the new system the reading was more intelligent than it had been under the old system?—Yes.

8435. In the matter of reading, will you consider it from two points of view. One point of view is that of the understanding of the subject matter?—Yes.

8436. And the other point of view is that of reading in the sense of reading pleasantly, or of good elocution, if I may use the word. I suspect that when you spoke of the reading in the North of Ireland you referred rather to the elocution?—Well, a good deal of it was mere utterance of the words without much

regard to the meaning of them. I think children are learning better the meaning of the words now than they used to.

8437. It seems to me that a person might read unpleasantly, and still understand very well the subject matter of what he was reading?—Perhaps so, but I do not think it is likely. If they do not utter the words carefully the way they would utter them naturally, I think they defeat their own intelligence, they are so concerned with the actual recognition of the words.

8438. With regard to the understanding of what they read, you are clear that there has been an improvement in that respect?—I think so.

8439. And do you think also that there has been an improvement in the style of the reading, the pleasantness of it and the intonation and emphasis, and so on?—Well, I think there is a decided improvement there.

8440. But would you wish for a good deal more improvement in that way?—I think there is still some room for improvement, but I am afraid that the teachers would not have time to give to it. I think there is a considerable tax upon their time in cultivation of tone.

8441. You desire an individual examination of each pupil in composition. What exactly do you mean by that?—Is it that the inspector then and there should set a subject for composition, and that the children in his presence should write that composition, and that he then should take these compositions and examine them?—Yes. I think he could judge from a very few lines of composition whether the children were able to convey the sense intelligently.

8442. Do children write compositions throughout the year?—Yes.

8443. A good deal of these are preserved in their exercise books?—Yes.

8444. And would it not be a good plan that the inspector should examine these compositions that they had written during the year?—Yes, I think it is a valuable aid to the teacher, because the teacher would know that these must pass the inspector, and he would therefore attach more importance to them.

8445. Would you think the examination of the children's compositions during the year a better test than the mere composition that they would write then and then in the presence of the inspector for a few minutes?—Yes, I suppose so, if you were certain that these compositions were as they wrote them.

8446. But they could hardly take those for the entire school year?—Well, what is done sometimes is that the teacher makes them write them over again. He corrects the mistakes made in one book, and then it is written in a fresh book. That would not be just the same work after the spelling and grammar were corrected.

8447. But at least that teacher would have shown a great deal of industry?—Many of them do that, and it is quite honest, too.

8448. You have told us that some years ago there were as many as 8,000 monitors in the service?—Yes.

8449. And you also gave substantial reasons to show that the service they did was good in improving the tone of the school and keeping the older children at school for a longer time?—Yes.

8450. But there is another side to the picture, and it is a point of view that I spent some years of my life considering and discussing, that is, attracting youth into wrong channels, into what is called blind-alley employment. There is a good deal of trouble in England over this. The Post Office in England has got into considerable trouble by taking up messenger boys and telegraph boys, and all that sort of thing?—Yes.

8451. And I think it is generally agreed at present that it is a most undesirable thing for the welfare of the country to place youth in any channel or any groove in which they cannot persevere. Now, when these 8,000 monitors were there, of course not 1,000 out of the 8,000 could become teachers?—No.

8452. About 800 in the year may be taken into the training colleges, and then it is a two-years' course, so what becomes of the great bulk of them?—A very large number of them never completed five years of

mentorship, but left the school. Of course, they understood well enough that only a few of them could become teachers. To my mind it served as a sort of "exhibition." It enabled children to be kept a year or two longer at school. Of course, if those monitors had to do a good deal of teaching, and did not get proper instruction themselves, that would not do them much good. There is a movement now to have the school attendance age made 15 instead of 14.

8433. You are looking at it from the managers' point of view, but now will you look at it from the supposed public point of view. Would you approve of keeping a child longer at school if you were satisfied that it was not for the benefit of the country as a whole?—Oh, no.

8434. I put the question hypothetically. Now did not those monitors and their parents expect or hope that they would succeed in becoming teachers?—They may have. I am not familiar so much with the question in the country. I am more familiar with it as a city question, and many of them do not become teachers at all. They have not the patience to stay, and there are so many other occupations open to them that city children do not want to become teachers.

8435. But a great many of the 8,000 monitors were country children?—That maximum was reduced, and they went down to 5,000. At the time the change came I think there were only about 5,000 or even 4,600 of them.

8436. I read a report of Dr. Wilkinson, who had been head inspector, which was made before the change of 1900, and in it he animadverted very strongly on this point of the number of monitors, and the injury to the children themselves, and to their parents, and to the country generally, of starting them on a career that they did not pursue?—But most people did not regard it as a career for them.

8437. But they regarded it themselves, and their parents regarded it, and they were disappointed, and I can tell you as a matter of personal knowledge that numbers of them never did any good afterwards; they were disappointed in life and failures?—That may be.

8438. I suppose you will agree with the political economists that it is a very bad thing to have children going into blind-alley employment?—Yes, but a child does not usually choose an employment till after the school age, and I would like them to get time to grow physically.

8439. Monitors remain on from 13 to 18, I think—five years?—Yes.

8440. Now do you not think that in the sixteenth and seventeenth and eighteenth years the monitors and monitoresses were walking in a blind-alley?—Well, I once had the figures (I have not got them now) to show how comparatively small the number was of those who remained on for the fourth and fifth years of mentorship.

8441. Now would you put the advantages you were discussing a while ago of a large number of monitors being there against the disadvantages. Would you regard the advantages as counterbalancing the disadvantages of blind-alley employment?—I could not really say. It was the practical abolition of monitors and monitoresses in the main that made it necessary to give us the junior assistant mistress. But I am not quite satisfied with things as they are. You get a great number of people for teachers now who never have taught, and nobody knows, except that they are well trained in the training colleges, whether they are going to be good teachers or not. Many of them years ago, who were monitors, got tired of teaching; some of them had not the desire for it, and dropped it. There may be a teacher who likes books, but does not love children.

8442. But those persons who now come into the training colleges, who never have been monitors, are persons who have taken up teaching as a career?—Yes.

8443. And they have got themselves specially prepared?—Yes.

8444. And numbers of them have been prepared by Intermediate Schools?—Yes.

8445. And some of them have been even through the University—a few of them are graduates, and not a small percentage of them are undergraduates, so that the teaching profession has apparently become attractive?—The teaching profession ought to consist of people who can teach, not merely people who know.

8446. But has not the teaching profession become more attractive?—Well, it has.

8447. It has attracted those that it did not attract before?—I do not know that we are on our side getting quite as good a type as we got a dozen years ago.

8448. That is quite possible, but at least we are getting people who are supposed to have a little higher culture than the old monitor system gave them?—My experience is that the teacher I like best was one who had been two years a pupil teacher in a model school, and had passed the examination. That seemed to be a fair test of both things—how much they had learned and whether they could teach.

I think the great difficulty is (and I feel strongly on it because I have spent four years in considering this question) the starting of people on a career that they cannot proceed in.

8449. Mr. HARRISON.—What proportion of the monitors are boys, and what proportion girls?—There would be a considerably larger proportion of girls, I think.

Mr. HURST.—I fancy that the proportion would be 2 to 1.

Mr. HARRISON.—The blind-alley would not come in so much in the case of girls.

The BRANCH OF ROSE.—More. They would have nothing to do.

8450. Mr. HARRISON.—You remarked that you thought that the chief inspectors should be an agency for keeping uniformity among the inspectors?—Yes.

8451. And I gather from you that you seem to think that their time should be spent a good deal up and down the country amongst schools and inspectors?—Yes.

8452. Trying to keep up uniformity in the country?—Yes.

8453. Are you not aware that those officials spend more of their time in the country now than they did under the old system, and that under the old system they spent more of their time in the office in Dublin and a great deal less in the country?—I am glad to hear that that is so.

I think that is so certainly, but you are glad to hear it because that is their proper function.

8454. Mr. KAVANAGH.—You were speaking about the small schools?—Yes.

8455. And you say that pressure was brought upon the inspectors to try and close the small schools?—Yes.

8456. Pressure by whom?—I suppose it is the general policy of the National Board that when schools become below a certain attendance of children to close them?—Yes, that is the truth. It is the policy of the Education Office, and we feel it very keenly, because we have a very large number of small schools.

8457. And, of course, the managers, and everybody associated with them, do not like to see them close?—That is so.

8458. But from the educational point of view, do you think a very small school is advisable?—You will hear more about that from Canon Tristram when he comes, because he has more experience of what is happening through the country than I have; but we have been most deeply concerned in recent years for our small schools, because we represent a population necessarily scattered and small in many parts of the country, and we feel that the breaking up of the small schools is doing a good deal towards driving the people into the towns. If you would permit me, I will read a couple of resolutions on the subject that were passed by our School Managers' Association:—"That, while we are prepared to co-operate in promoting a combination of small Protestant schools in areas where this will contribute to efficiency without seriously increasing the difficulty of school attendance, we claim on behalf of our people in country parishes the continuance of the educational facilities which were provided for them in the past by the enlightened policy of the Government and the Commissioners of National Education. That in our experience one of the most frequent causes of the

removal of working class families from the country parts of Ireland is the difficulty caused by the distance of suitable schools, and we are convinced that the present movement for closing of small schools will hasten the removal of the rural population, which is so much to be deplored." Here is another:—"That, whereas favourable conditions were conceded to the small schools of Ireland by the Government and the Commissioners of National Education, culminating in certain provisions of the Irish Education Act, 1893, and on the faith of those concessions, a number of our schools were brought into connection with the National Board, we regret the proposal to withdraw those concessions as amounting to a grave injustice on the part of the Government." That was passed in the year 1908. You see, our position is greatly changed. Within my time the National Board was entirely opposed by the clergy to whom our schools belong. They fought a long and stubborn fight against allowing their schools to come under it, and the Government and the National Board were on the other hand equally anxious to take in our schools so as to show that the system was a success. It was a tremendous struggle, which went on for a long time in the Church to which I belong. In fact, it went to such a pitch that a clergyman of our Church who joined the National Board was regarded as having gone traitor altogether. I have been in two parishes where it could only be carried with the greatest difficulty to put the schools under the National Board. The Rector asked my advice, partly because I had had experience in working the system in a country parish, and I encouraged him and helped him to do it; so we put the schools for the first time into connection. We fought a stiff fight, a most uphill fight, and we did our best. The Commissioners offered some concessions to meet the difficulties we were urging, and we, on the other hand did all we could to mollify our brethren and bring them into line. Then, when the Church was disestablished, and the Church had to struggle with its own finances, a great many had to leave prejudice aside, and they brought their schools into connection with the National Board. Lord Plunket and Lord Justice Fitzgerald got great concessions from the Government; and we consider it a reversal of that policy that an effort is now made to close these small schools, and to force the parents in some cases to send their children long distances. Many of the children go at present three miles to the school, and there would be two miles more added to that before they could reach the next school. The National Education Commissioners have been very fair with the Churches. I think, and anxious that Protestant schools and Roman Catholic schools should have a sufficient number of teachers, and that there should be fair play, and that the children should be taught in schools where their own religion is the prevailing influence. Now, this withdrawal of the grants of small schools is forcing the children to travel much longer distances. It seems to me that they rather take for granted that there is bound to be a continuance of decrease in the population, and there never will be any growth. I have seen children going in country places to school on carts provided by the manager, and it was very jolly on a dry day; but on a wet day to have to go five or six miles, it may be, to their home would be a very different matter.

9477a. Mr. KAVANAGH.—But from the point of view of the education of the children, do you think the small school is an advantage?—You will hear more of that from Canon Tristram, we will ask him to tell you about it. Really, the one point of view which has been taken in the Education Office is that a small school is necessarily an inefficient school. But it is not necessarily so. Professor Huxley knows, I think, in connection with the training college that a number of the very best teachers go down to the small schools, and one simple reason is that in many cases there is an organically attached to the school and a residence for the teacher, so that many of the teachers of the small schools of the Church of Ireland are better off than some of the teachers of larger schools. I tried to get some of them back to the city, and they would not come back from the country from the small schools,

I have consistently heard of cases where small schools turned out numbers of children who were distinguished, because the teacher had more time to teach them.

9478. They are usually taught by school mistresses?—Yes, but we get a very good type of school mistress.

9479. Now, I want to ask you about uniformity. Do you think that uniformity is actually possible amongst so many inspectors?—I do not think it is absolutely impossible. I think that where a school has been reported on as being in a wrong condition it would be easy to have a sufficiently independent test before drastic action is adopted—penalising the teacher for the whole of the rest of his teaching career by stopping his increments. I think it ought to be possible to test the matter by an independent report.

9480. Suppose a number of inspectors visited the school, you could tell very well if there was any discrepancy?—I think it ought easily to be found out.

9481. Then you think uniformity is possible?—Not absolutely impossible; but such a reasonable amount of uniformity as would prevent wrong being done to the teacher.

9482. What we may call a workable uniformity?—Yes.

9483. We were talking of the School Attendance Act. Have you any experience of that, whether it has worked well or efficiently?—I do not know. I was very deeply concerned in the starting of it here in the city, and gave a great deal of the best work of my life to it. We gained a great deal; but the absence of compulsion on the child was the weak point in the Act, that is to say there was no penalty on the child, but the father could be fined; but some years ago amending clauses were inserted in the Children's Act, which allowed the formation of day industrial schools. We never got those, and there is no way of dealing with the difficulty, except to send the child to a certified industrial school. That could be done; but it is supposed to be a rather extreme measure.

9484. I thought the parent was the only one who could be got at?—Practically so; but the Children's Act of 1906 gave power to send to a certified industrial school a child attending badly. It allowed the formation of day industrial schools which the child could attend by day and go home at night; but in the absence of that there can be commitment of a child to a certified industrial school. However, we have never yet had in Dublin a day industrial school.

9485. Now, as to the automatic increments, do you not think that would take away the inducement to the teacher to improve?—Automatic is too strong a word. I mean payment of increments in the absence of some unfavourable report.

9486. But that would be practically nearly so, and what I suggest to you is, that it would put all teachers on the same level together, good and bad, practically. Do you not think so?—If a teacher is entitled to be in a school, he may assume that he is reasonably good, and that he is doing his work as well and faithfully as he can, and I think he ought to be entitled to his increment when the time comes.

9487. You think it would be an inducement to a good teacher?—Well, now he has no guarantee. If the teacher is the best teacher that ever was, he has no certainty. If he has an assistant in the school, that assistant may be badly reported on, and the principal teacher may be damaged by that circumstance, so he has no guarantee that he will get his increment.

9488. I think it is rather a hardship on a teacher that he should be judged at all by the work of his assistant, whom he does not appoint himself?—That is so.

9489. There is a great outcry with regard to rule 127 (b). Boys under 7 years of age are ineligible for entrance. Have you come across any grievance of that kind?—No, we have not had any grievance in most of our schools.

9490. You were raising a great outcry about that?—Yes, in some places there was much discussion about it.

8491. It only affects the teacher's salary?—Yes, it is a hardship on the teacher. He loses an assistant in some places; but I think the rule was modified.

Mr. HENRY.—It practically does not affect our body, because we are not in sufficient numbers throughout the country to have separate schools, and then the boys cannot be removed from the schools, even if there were a suitable school to remove them to.

8492. Mr. KAVANAGH.—It would be better for boys under 7 to be taught by a woman?—I think it is, and that is what we practically carry out; but this removal is a serious thing if it deprives the school of an assistant. It is a serious loss to the school.

8493. Mr. HANBROW.—I think you said you were manager of five schools?—Of what we call five schools.

8494. They would not be called five in England or Scotland?—No, with the boys and girls, and infants together, a group of schools. We call them three, you would call them one. I have also two small outlying schools with an average of about 50 and 40.

8495. That is you are manager of one three-department school?—Yes, and two small mixed schools.

8496. In the suburbs?—Oh, no; right in the heart of the city, in the neighbourhood of Stephen's Green.

8497. Now, you have told Mr. Kavanagh that you thought it was possible to secure uniformity among the inspectors. Do you think that it is possible under the present conditions of the grading of the schools, and the increment system, when you consider how very minute the grading has to be, and how very much depends upon it from the teacher's point of view?—I do not think it really is possible to secure uniformity. I think a system something like what I propose would be a fairer one.

8498. But you told Mr. Kavanagh you thought it was possible to secure uniformity. I want to know whether you think it is possible under the present conditions to do so?—I do not think so. Of course, it is only approximate uniformity. I do not think it is quite possible to secure uniformity; but an approximation to it.

8499. But I will put it this way—a sufficient uniformity to carry out the present system fairly?—I do not see the bearings of the question. If you ask me am I in favour of continuing the present system as one which would do justice to the teachers, I would say no.

8500. I do not think the present system could do justice to the teachers; but what I rather wanted to know was whether, supposing the present system went on, it would be possible to secure such uniformity that justice could be done to the teachers. Let me put a case. You know what an important difference it makes to the teacher in securing his increment whether he gets in a particular year the mark of "good" or "very good." Is it possible to secure among any body of men such uniformity of judgment that all of them would be able to say definitely that that school is "good" or "very good"?—I hardly think it is possible.

8501. So that it comes to this, that uniformity breaks down under present conditions?—I think it does.

8502. But your answer then would mean that it is quite possible, given sufficient provision, to secure sufficient uniformity to work with a system as we have in England?—Your system in England is a good deal different, because local authorities allocate the salaries.

8503. But we want to secure sufficient uniformity, so that if two inspectors go to the same schools, their reports may be very nearly the same or approximately the same?—I see a good deal of difficulty in getting that, because, as I stated to you at an earlier time, the district in which the school is may very seriously affect the excellence of the teacher's work. It is a case of who does the best in the circumstances.

8504. Surely a trained man will take that into consideration?—But the work will not be actually on the same level. Suppose you put two men in different parts of the country, men with similar qualifications, and each doing his level best, it might be that the result of the examination of these schools on the same lines would turn out to be unfair towards the man who had disadvantages in his neighbourhood. He might be working just as well as the other relatively to his circumstances, his work might be just as good

as that of the other, but yet, by an inspector looking at it solely and purely from the mathematical point of view, it would not be considered as good.

8505. You are supposing that the inspector is unable to make allowance for varying circumstances. Surely a trained man would be able to do that, would he not?—I am very doubtful about its being done.

8506. Then it comes to this, that in your opinion no uniformity at all is possible?—It is not very easy to obtain it.

8507. I only wanted to clear up the answer you gave to Mr. Kavanagh in that way?—Absolute uniformity might really be unfair to the teacher, if you have no consideration for the circumstances of the school.

8508. But we must suppose that uniformity must take these varying circumstances into consideration?—But it is very hard to secure; and there is another place where difficulty comes in, that is, when the examination is made at different parts of the school year. We do not think any inspector could form a proper opinion of the work of the year which had begun only a little while before. It is not easy in examining say, the fifth standard to keep in mind that there has only been perhaps one month's work in that standard.

8509. Of course, that would mean giving up the uniform school year, would it not?—I think it would. I do not think there is much advantage in retaining it in view of the difficulty. I think the advantage of the uniform school year is more than counterbalanced by the impossibility of inspecting fairly under the present circumstances. Formerly an inspector came sometimes 11 months, but generally about 12 months, since being there the previous time, to check the work of the year.

8510. What you would like would be, partly to secure uniformity, and partly in order that longer notice of a visit should be given to managers, that there should be an examination towards the end of each school year?—I think it is the best way. Let there be as many surprise visits as you like; but I think there ought to be an examination.

8511. But you quite recognise that if that is to be carried out, a uniform school year is impossible?—I think so. I think the present uniform school year has such disadvantages from the point of view of test by the inspection, that it could not stand.

8512. You made it a strong point that the inspector should have some experience in primary schools. Would you be satisfied with the English system, which requires that all candidates for the post must now spend roughly about six months as teachers in primary schools before they are appointed?—Yes; but I would be ready to accept service either in a primary school or secondary school.

8513. Any good experience of teaching?—Yes.

8514. Now, you went on to say that you thought that a man who had practical experience would be more tolerant of different methods than others?—Yes.

8515. Surely the reverse might very well be the case, and that he might only recognise as sound those methods which he had himself proved and found efficient?—I think that is just possible, but I do not think it is likely.

8516. My personal experience for 35 years in England would rather go to show that people who had been schoolmasters themselves were much more fond of prescribing methods to teachers than those who had not?—I know one inspector who was a secondary teacher in England, and I think he was one of the very best inspectors we ever had, just for that very reason that he was fair and tolerant towards the methods of the teachers.

8517. Not in that because he has had experience, or because naturally he is a fair-minded person?—I think it is because he has had experience.

8518. You said something about security of tenure of the assistant teachers?—Yes.

8519. What security of tenure have they, for I did not quite understand that?—They have the same security of tenure as the principal teachers; that is to say, they are under agreement with the manager, who is entitled to give the assistant three months' notice for sufficient reason; but practically that right to give a three months' notice is very much withdrawn.

8519. And the security of tenure depends upon the manager, so that is hardly the term to use?—It does not depend upon the manager now. The manager has very little power in the matter.

8520. But the manager always can give three months' notice to the assistant?—Yes, he is supposed to be able to do that; but, of course, it has been a good deal limited, and the Board intervenes in certain cases. We were anxious to give the teachers a quiet mind, as far as was possible, and I have always strongly advocated giving them a referee, a third party, before the notice would take effect; but, I understand, that the Board in some cases has intervened to disallow the notice. Is not that so, Mr. Henry?

Mr. HENRY.—That is so.

8521. Mr. KERRAN.—The point is, that suppose the principal teacher finds himself handicapped by having an incompetent assistant, he has got no remedy?—It may not most seriously to the detriment of the principal teacher. One of the best teachers I have ever known, had that difficulty one year, and the inspector wanted to make an unfavourable report, because there was an assistant who was not up to the mark. That was the best teacher I ever knew.

8522. Mr. HARRISON.—And the best teacher may suffer by having an incompetent assistant, whom it is exceedingly difficult to get rid of, and only by a complicated process and the agreement of several people. That is what it comes to?—Yes, I think so.

8523. Now, you suggested a system for grading schools, by which a certain salary should be attached to certain schools?—Yes.

8524. And that the grading of these schools should vary?—Yes, according to efficiency and numbers.

8525. Now, would not that be open to the same objection as the present merit mark, that the teacher's salary would depend upon the grading of the school, and the inspector would have each year to grade the school?—Oh, not each year; that is just the point. The grading of the school ought to be a thing deliberately done, duly recorded, with whatever precautions you like to secure that it was accurate, and then the removal of that to a higher grade, or the depressing of it to a lower grade, should be a thing deliberately done, and not on the chance view that an inspector would take.

8526. You talked about the small schools being closed for inefficiency. Is it always on account of inefficiency that they are closed? Is it, in some cases, that they are considered unnecessary and expensive?—That may be; but a great many cases that we have been grieved about have been where the schools were very remote and were not necessary.

8527. Still they will be very expensive. Can you give us any particular cases?—Dr. Tristram will, I think, give some of those. You may leave that question to him, because he knows the subject better than I do; but we have constant cases before us. We have a very scattered population at the best, and we are organised on religious lines, and the interests of all the churches have to be considered.

8528. But it is within your experience that these small schools are very expensive to work?—They are not expensive to work.

8529. If you take the money that is spent on them and divide it by the number of children in average attendance, they will come out perhaps twice as expensive per child as a town school?—They were not so formerly. I remember growing inwardly the day I saw full salary granted to the teachers of the small schools. I said: "That means, later on, the taking of those small schools away." We made no request to grant full salary to the teachers of the small schools. We were quite content that they should work as they were, and they were getting a small stipend. Suddenly, without any request, full salary was granted to those teachers. The moment I saw that, I knew it would mean later on that the Board would remove those schools as being too expensive. Of course, there is the expense of a motor car for the inspector, and the schools are, no doubt, more difficult to inspect; but it touches the very life of the population, and the question whether the population are to be driven into our slums. I hold that it is vital to have these schools

in the country. I have been a slum worker in my ministerial life, and I have seen families coming fresh from the country into these poor neighbourhoods, and they have gone down morally far faster than those they found living there.

8530. Have they been driven?—Yes, driven. Whole families would come from the country because there is no school near that the children could go to, and if the school was withdrawn the people could not live in these very remote parts.

8531. Mr. KERRAN.—And that would be the sole cause?—That would be the cause, and I do not like to see them coming into the city, because it is not good for them.

8532. Mr. HARRISON.—I think you say that junior assistant mistresses have been very useful people. Have you had much experience of them in your schools?—I have at present with a junior assistant mistress, and she is a very capable teacher. She was not able to pass the National Board examination fully, because she had been during her earlier years an invalid, and had missed the time when she could have worked hard; but she is thoroughly trained in Swedish Slöjd and other things, and she is a very useful teacher.

8533. Have you had fairly large experience of junior assistant mistresses?—Not a very large experience; but we have several instances where a teacher waiting for her place as a graded teacher takes the position of junior assistant. I have one in my schools at present, is a trained teacher who served as a junior assistant, and if she were gone to-morrow, I would, perhaps, have another that would come from a similar position, where she is acting as junior assistant mistress.

8534. You find they do their work well and are very useful people?—Yes; but it depends on the type that you get.

8535. But have you any experience of junior assistant mistresses in the country school?—No.

8536. Mr. COOPER.—I am not quite clear as to what your attitude is as to the possibility of securing uniformity of standard amongst the inspectors, and whether you think it is possible with this impressionist system of inspection for a number of inspectors to approach even a reasonable degree of uniformity in their marking?—I do not think they could.

8537. You said that reading in the schools had improved; but has there not been a large change in the character of the reading matter—if you compare the Sixth Reader of the results time with the Sixth Reader of to-day, do you not think it is very much easier for children to get a grasp of what they read at present than it was at that time?—It is; and, of course, story reading is exceedingly easy compared with much of the reading that was put down before.

8538. Do you know that the reading in the Sixth Reading Book of the results days was the limit almost of English literature?—Yes, it was very good, indeed.

8539. And now you have very much simpler reading, and that would account, would it not, for the greater intelligence of the reading?—I suppose it would.

8540. That, coupled with the better staffing at the present time?—Yes, and the books are better printed, and they are brighter. The old books were rather hard looking.

8541. Mr. KERRAN's question appeared to suggest a difficulty, that if you abolished these merit marks, there might be no inducement to a teacher to work as between the moderate man and the highly efficient man; but do you not, from your own experience of teachers of the schools as a whole, believe that there is a very large number of teachers who would work if there was no merit mark at all?—Yes; I have often said no honest teacher will work well under any system, and I have had experience of the most thorough honesty and faithfulness on the part of the teachers with whom I have had to do, and very seldom have had to make a complaint on that point. They are doing their work honestly and faithfully.

8542. Witness.—Before resuming your examination, will you permit me to read some resolutions extracted from the minutes of our Association, because I think they represent the attitude and feeling of our school managers generally on these points. Here is one dated the 26th day of April, 1908:—"That we thankfully recognise the desire of the National Board and

its officers to deal fairly with the claims of the teachers for increment and promotion; but we are of opinion that under the present system the interest of the teachers are to an undue degree dependent upon the views of individual inspectors, and upon circumstances outside their own control." Then on the 21st of April, 1909.—"This meeting of school managers, while cordially recognising the general desire of the inspectors of the National Board to deal fairly and kindly with the teachers, feels much concerned at the complaints which come from several directions as to the unsympathetic and disheartening character of the inspection in some districts." Then, on the 19th of April, 1907.—"That in cases where the present requirements of modern education have rendered it necessary that teachers of long service should retire before being entitled to full pension, it is desirable that an addition be made to the number of their years of service which count for pension, so as to lessen the hardship of retirement." Anyone who, like myself, remembers the exceedingly difficulty of getting good teachers 35 years ago will recognise that they had to take into the service, in order to fill the places, some men and women who were not competent. In the course of time they have become less fitted for their work, because the requirements have become greater. It is a hardship to have to turn them out, and it is a hardship to the school and pupils to keep them in, and we feel strongly that their retirement should be facilitated by giving them more liberal terms of pension to enable such persons to retire before the full age.

8543. THE CHAIRMAN.—I suppose that is a Treasury question?—I suppose it is a good deal a Treasury question. Then on the 21st of April, 1909, I have this resolution.—"This Association desires strongly to support the claim of the National Teachers for an improved scale of pensions, inasmuch as the frank demands for improved methods of work put severe pressure on teachers of long service, and render it impossible in many cases that they should continue 'efficient' up to the age at which reasonable pension can be obtained." There is one other of the 11st of October, 1906.—"That in the opinion of this Association of Church of Ireland School Managers, the request of the teachers for a monthly payment on account of salaries is reasonable, and in view of the fact that this privilege has already been conceded throughout a large portion of the public service of the country, it does not appear to be justifiable to withhold from the teachers what they so earnestly desire." People of small means do not like to have to wait three months for their salary, and that has been recognised in the Civil Service long ago. For forty years monthly payments have been made, enabling people to manage their business better.

8544. Are those all the desiderata that you have?—Yes. Those are the resolutions of the Church of Ireland School Managers' Association.

8545. Sir HIRSH WILKINSON.—Your first suggestion here is that apart from the surprise visits, there should be one visit each year, of which due notice should be given, in order to enable the managers and inspectors to confer. I do not know whether you have read Messrs. Dale and Stevens' report upon the Intermediate Schools. Here is a recommendation of theirs which seems to be in accordance with yours, and I will just ask you whether you agree with it.—"The inspector should visit each school sometimes without giving notice of his visit, in order to see its normal working. At other times, when a more detailed inspection was required, he would give to the authorities and the head master or head mistress notice."—Yes.

8546. That is exactly, it appears to me, what your recommendation is?—Yes, I am in entire sympathy with that, and I think my brethren working with me are also.

8547. That is the report of Messrs. Dale and Stephens upon Intermediate Education in Ireland in 1905. You spoke of notice being given of alteration in the rules. This is the 129th recommendation in the report of the Powis Commission of 1879 (a Royal Commission of Inquiry into Primary Education in Ireland).—"That it is desirable to adopt the present practice of the Committee of Council in England, that no alteration of any rule, regulation or bye-law, should be put into operation until such alteration should have been laid for one

month before both Houses of Parliament, the alteration having been shown in distinctive type." I suppose you are in sympathy with the tenor of that?—Yes; quite in sympathy.

8548. But the laying of reports before Parliament is generally a statutory matter; the Rules Publication Act was passed in 1893, for the purpose of statutory rules being notified before they came into operation or before they were made, and then is the operative clause of that Act?—At least 60 days before the making of any statutory rule to which this section applies, notice of the proposal to make the rule and of the place where copies of the draft rule may be obtained, shall be published in the *London Gazette*. Now, of course, the *Dublin Gazette* would apply in the case of Ireland. With the tenor of that would you also be in sympathy?—Yes, certainly.

8549. But there was a question asked, and I did not catch your answer, as to the notice that you thought it would be desirable to give in view of the circumstances of the schools in Ireland. In the two instances which I have quoted of the recommendation of the Powis Commission and the Act of 1893, a period of a month is mentioned in one place and of 60 days in the other. Do you think that 60 days would be sufficient time?—Well, I hardly think it would, to let all the different bodies who are interested be aware of it.

8550. In this Rules Publication Act, the following provision was made:—"During those 60 days any public body may obtain a copy of such draft rule on payment of not exceeding threepence per folio, and any representation or suggestions made in writing by any public body interested to the authority proposing to make the rule shall be taken into consideration by that authority before finally settling the rule, and on the expiration of those 60 days, the rule may be made by the rule-making authority, either as originally drawn, or as amended by such authority, and shall come into operation forthwith, or at such time as may be prescribed in the rules." Would you agree with that, except for the question of the time, and would you suggest a longer time than 60 days? How long would you suggest for notice to be given?—I suppose two months ought to suffice; but certainly it ought to be a longer notice than is first mentioned. In some instances the Board have made rules which they have had afterwards to revise, because they had not themselves at the time recognised all the bearings of the rules.

8551. You are not aware whether that recommendation of the Powis Commission was ever carried into effect by the National Board?—You see, it is not a statutory body. I know that the National Board exists under Charter from the Lord Lieutenant. It is not governed directly by Parliament, and I do not think it is bound, at least, I am not sure whether it is bound, to lay its reports before Parliament; but I rather think not. They are sent to the Lord Lieutenant.

8552. Yes; they are laid before Parliament?—I was not aware of that.

8553. This is a recommendation of the Powis Commission, and I wanted to know whether you were aware that that had at any time been adopted?—I do not think so. We simply get a copy of the rules from the office, which is our first intimation that changes have been made. In one instance, a change that was made proved to be *ultra vires*. They changed things without the Lord Lieutenant at all, and an instance was mentioned this morning in which a circular of the National Board cancelled some section of an Act of Parliament.

Mr. COFFEY.—I referred to the circular of May, 1909, which altered the distribution of the moneys. It cancelled a section of the Act of 1892, which settled the apportionment, and by which it was made compulsory in lieu of school fees. Of course, that did not stand.

8554. Sir HIRSH WILKINSON.—You were stating that they were not bound to publish the rules, not being a statutory body. That is probably the reason why they never adopted the provisions of the Rules Publication Act. Probably they have been advised?—I do not know.

8555. Mr. KERR.—Any alteration of the rules of the Intermediate Board is laid on the Table of the House?—That is quite different.

8556. Sir HIRAM WILKINSON.—We will approach the question from the point of what is expedient. I do not suggest that the Board has broken any statutory rule in failing to give notice, and in my question to you I am only wishing to find out whether notice is desirable, and how much notice is desirable, and you think that three ought to be two months' notice?—If three months' notice could be given, it would be better, and I think ample notice ought to be given, because so many interests are affected by those rules.

8557. Would you recommend that the increment of a teacher should not depend, as at present, upon the system of merit marks now in force?—Yes.

8558. Would you make any difference between the head teachers and the other teachers—as the assistants are to some extent on probation—would you expect in the case of assistant teachers, say up to a certain period of service, that they should, before they get an increment, have any special report upon their teaching?—I have not considered that point. The assistants at present are limited to third grade; they cannot rise any higher than third grade, and, I suppose, that their increments at present are subject to favourable reports. I know they are subject to favourable reports by the inspectors, and I would be in favour of allowing the assistant, after a certain period to go on to the higher grade, because practically it forces the assistant out of his position as assistant before he can get promotion. That is not answering your question; but I want you to understand what the position of an assistant is. They have to leave their position as assistants in order to get their further increments. There is a block put in their way.

8559. Well, would you make any distinction between them and the head teachers—I will read to you a statement as to what the present rule is with regard to head teachers of the London County Council:—"In this connection, it may be mentioned that head teachers of elementary schools proceed to the maximum of the scale without being subject to any special report on their work." They proceed without any special report on their own work after they once get into the position of a head teacher. Now, would you make the same rule with regard to assistant teachers, or would you consider it desirable, in order to make sure of the qualifications of the assistant teachers, to require them to either submit to inspection or examination before they rise from the third grade to the second grade. Have you considered that point?—I have not considered it. It would seem to me to be a reasonable thing that a special report should be made prior to their being raised to the next grade; but I think all assistant teachers favourably reported upon should be eligible to rise.

8560. Would you consider that they ought to be able while still remaining assistant teachers to go into the second grade?—I understand that that is your point?—Yes; I am strong for that.

8561. But would you consider, whether the present rules were retained or not, that when they get into the second grade, the rule should be applied to them that they should get their increment unless there was an unfavourable report upon their work?—Yes, I think so; in the absence of an unfavourable report, they should go on to the top of their grade.

8562. So that you quite agree with what is stated here to be the rule with regard to head teachers under the London County Council, and you would apply that to the assistant teachers who had passed into the second grade?—Certainly. Some may like to remain assistants; some may not have sufficient courage to take charge of a large school, and yet may be as efficient as if they were in second grade, and it is rather hard lines that they should be shut down to the third grade.

8563. That is a distinct recommendation, apart from the point that we have been considering, apart from the point that if your recommendation were to be followed, the present rule should be altered so as to allow a man who is an assistant teacher to rise into the second grade?—Certainly.

8564. Mr. HENRY.—Your first suggestion here is this, that, in addition to the surprise visits, to which you do not object to any number, there ought to be one of which due notice would be given?—Yes.

8565. Would you put that simply on the ground of the managers' convenience?—Not at all. I think, in the first place, it is a fair thing to give the teacher a chance of putting his best foot forward, and having his school ready in all its subjects for a thorough inspection from top to bottom, whenever the inspector chooses to test it.

8566. Is it not fair that he should have an opportunity, not only of having the pupils steady, but all of them there?—Yes.

8567. And, of course, in many instances, the schools are inspected at present when a large proportion of the pupils happen to be absent?—Yes, a number of them are absent sometimes.

8568. With regard to the appointment of teachers as inspectors, I think I understood you to say that one-third teachers and two-thirds graduates would be a fair proportion?—No, I went further. I said that they might be half and half. I think it is a good thing to have a mixture. I think the teachers' body should be given a larger proportion than they have at present.

8569. You mentioned some inspectors whom you considered very efficient?—Yes.

8570. And I think one of the reasons you gave why they were so efficient was that they had been teachers?—Yes.

8571. Was not Mr. John Molloy a teacher?—I do not know.

8572. A teacher down in the Co. Meath?—He was a splendid inspector.

8573. Well, then, with regard to the proposition of graduates, Mr. John Molloy had not a degree?—I said that I did not stand out as much as my brethren for a college qualification, because, you know, a man might be an excellent teacher and inspector who had not a degree.

8574. Mr. William Molloy had not a degree, and Sir Patrick Keenan had not a degree, and Mr. Pinner has not a degree, and Mr. Downing has not a degree, and in the face of the fact that these men, who were the ornaments of the National system, had not a degree, do you think that the mere possession of a degree is sufficient?—I do not. Many a duffer gets a degree.

8575. Then would you be prepared to give a larger proportion of the vacancies to teachers, or, in other words, would you require a larger amount of experience of the work of primary schools for the proper training of inspectors—would you think that a larger amount of experience in primary school work than what you suggested this morning would be necessary training for an inspector?—Well, I do not know. I think a man who is fit to be an inspector ought to acquire in a comparatively short time practical knowledge of the work of the school.

8576. The CHAIRMAN.—I think you said to me that as part of the training you thought the young inspector ought to touch in a National School?—I certainly think he ought.

8577. Mr. HENRY.—You have had some experience of small schools?—Yes, a large experience.

8578. Do you see any reason why they should not be efficient?—I do not, if you have got a good teacher, as the children in country parts are easier to teach as a rule. You must remember that in most country parts there is a difficulty of attendance where the children have to go long distances, but where the children are able fairly well to attend the school the work ought to be better than in our town schools, because the children's attention is less distracted, and the school-work is more important in their point of view.

8579. Are you aware that Carlisle and Blake prizes are given to teachers who distinguish themselves by the efficiency of their schools?—Yes.

8580. Are you aware of these having been awarded to teachers of small schools?—Not in my experience, but I have heard that that was so in the past.

8581. But as a matter of fact you know that in the past teachers of small schools were successful in winning these Carlisle and Blake prizes?—So I have heard.

8582. And therefore their schools must have been not only efficient, but highly efficient?—Exceptional schools.

8583. The CHAIRMAN.—What is the size of schools that you have in view when you speak of small schools?

29th April, 1918.]

Rev. CANON MARSHY, M.A., examined.

[Continued.]

Mr. HENLY.—I would not call any school not under 50 a small school?—There is a general contention on the part of the National Board that a school which is small cannot be efficient. That is a wrong test in my opinion.

8284. The Honor or Ross.—Would you draw a distinction between two-teacher schools and one-teacher schools?

Mr. HENLY.—That is a modern thing. The Honor or Ross.—But do they not draw a distinction between these?—Of course, the ones they attack are the small ones, and they attack them on the ground that they cannot be efficient where there is not a good school-house.

8285. What number will justify you in having a junior assistant mistress in addition to the principal teachers?—Thirty-five, but they will not withdraw the junior assistant mistress when it does not fall below thirty. Thirty-five is the number for appointment.

8286. Mr. HENLY.—You think a more efficient test should be applied to the pupils?—Certainly.

8287. Do you think that arithmetic can be tested by mere inspection?—I do not know how it can be.

8288. I have here a statement by Mr. Kelly. He says:—"I gave an arithmetic test on the same day to the Fifth Standard in two schools which have always obtained 'Very Good' or 'Excellent,' and there was a difference of sixty per cent. in the answering. Now can a mode of testing, which would allow a difference of sixty per cent. on such a subject as arithmetic in two schools getting the same mark, be regarded as a sufficient test?—I do not think it can."

8289. What other subject would you consider necessary—would you consider reading and composition?—Yes, I am very strong for spelling too. It almost seems to be a test of an educated man to be able to spell properly.

8290. I think you stated this morning that the reading was better now than under the old system?—So far as I know from casual observation.

8291. And you were asked by Mr. Coffey how far it was due to difference in the difficulty of the books put into the hands of the pupils?—I am sure that some of it is due to that.

8292. Well was it not partly due to the mode in which they were examined under the results system in which in some of the classes for some time they were merely asked to name the word?—I suppose it might be due to that.

8293. Well is that mode of testing a necessary part of an individual examination of the children?—Do you mean the mere naming of the words?

8294. The mere naming of the words without requiring the pupils to understand what those words are intended to convey?—That would be a poor test of proficiency.

8295. Are you aware that at the close of the results period a change was made in the mode of examination of reading?—I do not recollect that.

8296. I have here the rules laid down for inspectors in respect of the sixth class. This is 1896, page 89:—"The pupils of this class will not be awarded a pass in reading unless, in addition to exhibiting fluency and correct pronunciation, they are able to answer readily and intelligently on the meaning of the words in the subject matter of the lesson read, the examination on the words of the subject matter may be conducted with books open." Now had that test been applied to the standard or a similar test, would it not have led to reading with intelligence throughout the school?—It ought, certainly.

8297. And are you aware that there was a general agreement—and I think I am right in saying that there was an agreement among inspectors, that the introduction of that change led to a great improvement in the intelligence of the pupils as far as reading was concerned?—I would expect that, certainly. My recollection is, that reading was better in the later times, and that more attention was given to the understanding of what the pupils read.

8298. This general examination of the pupils, I think, ought to be at the end of the school year?—Yes, if the teacher's promotion is to depend upon it, it ought

to be after the year's work had been gone through. I said before to-day that very few inspectors could, by any possibility, measure fairly all through the school year the work of a school and bear in mind when the work of the particular standard had been done only for a small part of the year or in the early part of the year.

8299. When there was that general examination, did not the teachers and the parents take an interest in having all the pupils present and ready for the examination?—They did.

8300. And was not the fact that the pupils had to make a certain number of attendances to be qualified for the examination a stimulus for the attendance?—It was, certainly.

8301. And attendance that was beneficial to the child?—It was. I think so.

8302. And that stimulus has been taken away by the present system?—We protested strongly against that as one of the results of the present system.

8303. Then you are not in favour of a uniform school year?—No. There is a gain, I suppose, from it, but it is more theoretical than practical, and it is a certain loss in that an examination may take place before the children have been through any serious part of the year's programme.

8304. So far as your experience goes, what would you say would be the percentage of migrants at present that may possibly gain by the uniform school year?—It differs enormously according to the district. In country places it might not be many, but in town places it might be many, because you have a moving population in towns. We have often had fifty to sixty new pupils entered in a year in a school with an average of fifty-six.

8305. But taking the whole of Ireland?—I think there would be a very small percentage through the country parts.

8306. Would it be over two per cent.?—I do not suppose it would be more than that.

8307. And then at that time the teacher would have an opportunity of showing the amount of work that was really done during the year?—Yes.

8308. Which he cannot do under the present system. I need say nothing further on that point. But what is the check you propose to put on the power of deprecating or appreciating the rank of the school under the system which you suggested this morning?—Well, of course, I have not gone into all the details of the plan completely, but I think it ought to be done in some responsible way by, say, a Committee of Inspection. It could not be left solely to one inspector who had not sufficient knowledge of the general standard throughout the country. There ought to be a sort of Committee of Inspection, I suppose one of the chief inspectors with the senior inspector and a local inspector.

8309. You have suggested that the chief inspector should go through the country. You see, aware, of course, that under the results system up to 1900 we had six head inspectors?—Yes.

8310. And it was the duty of the head inspectors to secure uniformity as well as they could amongst the district inspectors?—They checked the work of the district inspectors.

8311. Have you had, in your own experience, any instance of a chief inspector coming to hold a check inspection in your school?—I recollect one instance formerly.

8312. What was the result of it, do you know?—I do not recollect just now, but it was a precaution that was known to exist, that in case there was any doubt about whether the inspector had examined fairly there was a head inspector coming after him if necessary, and the head inspector came and examined where the school was a candidate for the Certificate and Blake prize.

8313. And also when the teacher was a candidate for promotion?—Yes.

8314. And whether, do you think, it would be better to have the head inspectors restored and the chief inspectors put as they were in the way of dealing with the reports as they come into the office, or to have them deal with all clerks, as they are at the present time?—I think the present system is worth



20th April, 1913.]

REV. CANON MARSHALL, M.A., examined.

[Continued.]

very little in that respect. It always seems to me to be a great mistake. It is work that can only be judged of by experts, and they were a sort of judicial committee sitting there. I have always held that the office of the chief inspector was of a judicial kind, that he sat in judgment to determine the career and welfare of a large body of teachers, and that he not only ought to be laid on, but ought to be fairly treated throughout the country. They constituted a sort of Court of Appeal from the inspectors.

8615. You are aware that they do not weigh the reports at the present time?—Oh, yes, there are examiners in the office since 1900.

8616. And would you be of opinion that it would be desirable now to get the head inspectors and the chiefs of inspection to weigh reports as they did formerly?—I think so. It would be vastly better than the present system. As far as I know there was a strong feeling that things were fairly done in those days, and after consideration.

8617. Now have you had any experience in your own schools of inspectors giving contradictory recommendations to the teachers?—Well, yes, during that time of transition when we had a number of inspectors coming to practice more or less, and, of course, every one of them had to recommend something.

8618. Can you give the Committee a concrete case?—I do not care to recall any of them now, because I rather blocked them by the instructions I gave the teachers.

8619. You told us that your schools were highly efficient (which, of course, they are known to be), and you attributed that, if I understood rightly, to the fact that the teachers were conservative, and adopted as little of the new system as they could?—I did not put it quite that way. I said that while adopting all the directions that they could, and conforming, as far as possible, to the new system, they retained all that was best in the old.

8620. By retaining all that was best in the old, I suppose they must have limited the amount they took of the new?—Our schools were formerly very strong in the essential subjects, arithmetic, grammar, and geography. They were pretty good as primary schools, and we had an opportunity of comparing them with schools in England. We have had pupils coming from schools in England, and I would ask the teachers regularly as to the relative proficiency of the children, and they found in many cases that the children from the English schools were barely able to stand in the same standard with our Irish children. Ours were more solidly grounded in the primary subjects.

8621. I think if you took the Irish schools as they were as a whole, they were a long way ahead of the English, whether they held that position or not. (I prefer not expressing an opinion, but Sir Patrick Keenan was always very strongly of the opinion that the schools could not be compared.) Now have you no instances of inspectors unduly interfering with the freedom of teachers regarding the methods they employ, since you say that when teachers employ recognised methods inspectors should not interfere?—Well, my impression is, that there has been a little too much of trying to direct the details of the method. I think they might fairly trust the teachers to follow their own course. We have had instances where one inspector commands the abolition of headline copy-books, and another recommends them again. We have had instances of interference with various details of that kind. I think the teachers might fairly be left to their own discretion with regard to these details.

8622. You think as long as the work is satisfactory it ought not to be interfered with?—Yes.

8623. There is one point with reference to the change of rules that I wish to draw your attention to. You say they should not be retrospective. Now will you explain that?—Well, it comes to be rather hard when a rule is made which affects what has happened already without reasonable notice. We have had lately that rule affecting married women-teachers, for instance. I am not in favour myself of the retention of married women as teachers, but at the same time when they

have been allowed they ought not to be unduly handicapped. That has been abolished, I understand, or suspended, as regards the past.

8624. But now are you in favour of giving teachers promotion from class to class by examination? Well, I think the examination formerly was very helpful. I would not like to speak strongly on the subject, but I must say it gave the younger teacher an object to work for. I think, at any rate, the teachers ought to be allowed to improve their position somehow. I think it would be a good thing to allow them to improve their position by seeking personal advancement in education.

8625. Do you not think it would be a good thing if they were induced to pursue their studies?—Yes, I do. The present system choked it off altogether. Of course, sometimes it was very hard work to be going on with their schools, and at the same time going on for class examination, but yet it stimulated them to self-improvement.

8626. I saw a report the other day of twelve teachers in Ballinacorney working at a University course, and nine of those twelve that year had their schools marked "Excellent," so that the mere fact that they were engaged in study did not interfere with the efficiency of the schools?—That is very good, indeed.

8627. Mr. Keenan.—You used a phrase that struck me when you said that under the present system of inspection, even if the teachers got just treatment, they are not impressed with a sense of justice?—Yes, and that struck me as an important point.

8628. That is owing to the lack of thoroughness in the examination of the school work, I suppose?—Yes.

8629. Due to this modern impressionistic inspection?—Yes.

8630. And I suppose your association has experience to show that teachers are discontented on that score?—Yes, there is an uneasy feeling; we never know what is coming.

8631. And in your opinion is that well founded?—I think so, and it is detrimental to the school work.

8632. Now with regard to the type of men to be appointed as inspectors, I suppose you would agree with me that although degrees sometimes get degrees the mere possession of a University degree does not prove a man to be a suffer?—No, it is evidence of wider culture.

8633. And I suppose you would like to see as many teachers who were promoted to the position of inspectors as possible become acquainted with the University?—Certainly.

8634. It is desirable that the primary system of education should be linked up with the University system?—Quite desirable that many ought to know a great deal more than they do know.

8635. You quoted from a report which you described as a model report, in which an inspector said that although some of the methods adopted were educationally indefensible the results produced were so good that he did not recommend any change?—Yes; you see the best of modern things is that in methods we are governed at present by fashion.

8636. The circumstance that suggested itself to my mind was this—if the method of education educates the pupil well, how can that be described as indefensible?—Well, it may not be in accordance with the present fashion.

8637. That is not in accordance with the educational theory prevalent in the office at the time.

8638. Well, with regard to a uniform school year, I suppose you will agree with me that in the country districts the school year ought to be adjusted to the life of the country?—As far as possible.

8639. The continental practice (as far as I know) is that the primary schools are closed from hay-time to harvest?—Yes.

8640. That is a very natural period during which to close them, because the children are needed in agricultural operations?—Yes.

8641. And I suppose there would be no difficulty of having one uniform year for town schools?—The difficulty is, that if you based the inspection on the school

year, you would have to work your inspection in a very brief period, and the inspectors could not get through them.

8642. With regard to promotion to teachers, do you propose to determine the promotion by examination?—I think that might be one of the factors.

8643. The main factor?—I would not object to see teachers promoted for showing exceptional ability in school work.

8644. But in the case of a promotion of that kind, would there not be always a suggestion of favouritism?—Oh, I suppose there would, but I suggested it from another point of view. There should be some way, at any rate, in which a teacher could advance and acquire something additional by showing proficiency.

8645. I am anxious to know what sort of examination you would found promotion on?—The old examinations for classification was not a bad one. It tested most of the subjects.

8646. Would you be satisfied exclusively with the result of examination in the appointment of inspectors?—Oh, not exclusively. I have seen some bad appointments made exclusively on examinations. There are some people good at books and not good at practical work.

8647. What scheme of promotion would you propose have you thought over it?—I am not prepared to go into that point, because it is not a practical matter at the present time.

8648. You spoke about the case with which children from your school have got employment in the city?—Yes.

8649. Can you tell me if you are acquainted with those leaving certificates that they issue in some of the schools?—Yes.

8650. Are they held in much estimation?—I think they are, being positive certificates of good work done.

8651. In your experience, do employers attach some considerable importance to them?—The teacher does, but, of course, the employers attach more importance to the recommendation that the teacher can give. I do not give a recommendation to a boy unless his teachers can recommend him. No matter how well I know a boy, I insist on his getting a good recommendation from the teachers, and then I back that up by another, and then I rely more on the boy's character than on any certificate.

8652. But under the new system, I understand the pupils, on leaving primary schools, enter immediately into positions in business?—Yes.

8653. Apparently the education is so far, at any rate, efficient?—Yes. I have told you that the work of the schools is very efficient. Our boys' school is on the old lines, and we have not much change.

8654. Your liking for the monitorial system, I gather, was due to the fact not that you wanted to keep the monitor in a blind-alley, but that the monitorial system kept him at school a couple of years longer than he otherwise would have stayed? Not only that, but it kept other older children.

8654a. It was solely on the ground that it kept them necessarily a little longer?—That was one ground, and I do believe that we got some pupils with some power of teaching under that system, and there is a certain amount of loss in not having it. Under the present system there may be pupils who have teaching gifts, but their teaching powers would be developed in some of them as monitors.

8655. You appear to think that the school attendance age ought to be somewhat raised?—I think it ought; it has a tendency to become the time of leaving.

8656. A minimum of that kind always tends to standardise itself as a maximum?—I was not proposing to re-establish the monitorial system. It merely came in in connection with the question of the necessity for appointing junior assistant mistresses. In

cases where there were two or three mistresses formerly, now a junior assistant mistress will take the place.

8657. Touching the question of the action of the National Board, you spoke about the suppression of small schools in the rural districts?—Yes.

8658. Have you, in your experience, found that to be in any instance the sole cause of migration from the country to the city?—It was a chief cause. I am not prepared to say the sole cause. I have known people deliberately leave the country with their families to come into the city for educational reasons because the school was too far off, and people have refused to go to situations in the country on the ground that there was no school there.

8659. Refusal to leave the city for the country would be a different matter?—Oh, no, refusal to go from one place to another because of the absence of a school.

8660. Would the number of cases of that kind that have come within your experience be very large?—Not very large, but enough to make me feel that there is that tendency.

8661. Would those be typical cases or very isolated ones?—Not very isolated ones at all. One of the commonest things with us now is this. It has occurred several times in the year, and must occur with other people too, that a man be sought for the position of a gardener or coachman who will have a family big enough to help to make up the school. That has frequently occurred in the past year, and here is a case in point—a man lost an appointment as caretaker within the last three months because, though he had four children, the eldest of the children was only four years of age, and therefore it would not do what it was wanted to do—to keep up the numbers in the school. I am speaking of what is a matter of ordinary experience to me as a clergyman in the city. They are not very numerous cases, but they exist, and some of them come my way. It is a common thing to ask me children old enough to keep the school from falling.

8662. The school attendance age is 14?—Yes.

8662a. And the age at which young people must be insured under the Insurance Act is 15?—Yes.

8663. That leaves a two years' interval during which the child need not be at school?—Yes.

8664. And need not be brought into the insurance system?—Yes.

8665. I have been making inquiries, and I think that has, up to the present, at any rate, in the small area I have investigated, increased considerably the number of children between 14 and 18 employed as messengers in shops. Do you find that to be the case?—I have not had experience of it, but it is likely enough, because they would not be insured. I have known cases of older children being disposed of; I have known cases of messengers over 16 being dismissed.

8666. Mr. HENLEY.—Your schools are usually small through the country?—Yes, very largely.

8666a. And being small they have very little need for monitors?—Yes.

8667. And therefore the number of monitors out of that 8,000 you were referring to would be very small belonging to our body except in the cities and towns?—They have practically ceased now.

8667a. So that we get for training in the training college a much larger proportion of people who have got no preliminary training, and we find the difficulty you refer to in getting them?—Yes; I was going to ask you as to whether you did not find that it was harder to get persons with capacity for teaching that came up without any previous experience of teaching.

8668. That has been noted by the inspectors in the reports?—Yes.

8669. We are getting less of them, and therefore the difficulties we have to contend with are greater?—I think so.

## EIGHTEENTH DAY—WEDNESDAY, APRIL 30, 1913.

At 28, Kildare-street, Dublin.

Present:—SIR SAMUEL DILL, M.A., LL.D., LL.D. (Chairman); The Most Rev. DENNIS KELLY, D.D., Bishop of Ross; SIR HIRAN SHAW WILKINSON, LL.D.; Mr. JOHN COFFEY; Mr. HENRAGE E. B. HARRISON, B.A.; Mr. JEREMIAH HENLY; Mr. WALTER MCMURROUGH KAVANAGH, B.L.; and Mr. THOMAS MICHAEL KNITTLE, B.L.; and

Mr. ARTHUR J. DONNELLY, M.A., B.Sc., Secretary.

Rev. J. COURTESAY CLARKE, D.D., Galway, Commissioner of National Education, examined.

8670. The CHAIRMAN.—You are a Commissioner of National Education?—Yes. Perhaps, I should say, before you begin to put questions to me, that I do not appear in a representative capacity. I am speaking solely for myself.

8671. I understand that. You speak as an individual Commissioner. Now, you were appointed Commissioner of National Education in 1908?—Yes.

8672. You have had five years' experience, or nearly that, I suppose?—Well, something like that.

8673. And in Galway, I suppose, you have schools under your management?—No. We have a model school there, to which our children go, and with which I am closely connected, inasmuch as I give religious instruction to our own children every week.

8674. Is that the only school of which you have had experience?—Oh, no.

8675. Before you went to Galway, had you any experience of schools?—I was assistant minister. You will understand the position.

8676. You were assistant minister before you went to Galway?—Yes, and the senior minister had been manager, and he nominally remained manager, because I did not in any way want to let him see that he was out of the running.

8677. You practically did the work?—I practically did the work.

8678. How many schools had you under you?—Well, one definitely; practically two.

8679. What part of the country was that?—That was near Banbridge.

8680. Did you conduct the correspondence with the Board in those days?—Of course, I might give advice and so on, but the correspondence was done by the senior Minister.

8681. I think I understand that you did the work, although it was nominally done by the manager?—I did work. I visited the schools, and so on. I did work in that direction.

8682. How many years ago is that?—It is a good many years ago, over thirty.

8683. That was under the old results system?—Under the old results system.

8684. And you attended when the inspector came and examined the school, I suppose?—Yes, I was in close touch with the inspector, and he would come up to me as the practical manager, and spend, perhaps, the afternoon or evening.

8685. Now, have you had recently, or since you went to Galway, any chance of personally observing the present mode of inspection, since 1908?—I have, in the model school. I know a good deal about the work in connection with model school inspection.

8686. But you say that the changes effected in 1900 were a serious part of the system when you became Commissioner in 1908, and seemed to be working then smoothly?—I was speaking of the position I occupied when I became Commissioner, and the evidence that I could give to you.

8687. That is you mean that in 1908, when you took your seat at the Board, the system was fully established, and, in your opinion, seemed to be working smoothly?—Yes, working smoothly in the main.

8688. You have seen, I suppose, the series of circulars that have issued from the Office between 1900 and 1912?—Oh, yes.

8689. Were those circulars submitted to you before they were issued?—I cannot say with regard to them all.

8690. I will draw your attention to two very important circulars, to which we have had our attention called a great deal, which were issued in June, 1911, and August, 1912?—Those were submitted, of course.

8691. And you know, of course, the tenour of those circulars?—Oh, yes.

8692. Instructions to inspectors?—Yes.

8693. Now, did these come before the Board when they were being issued?—I cannot say. I believe both did. Certainly I can say that absolutely regarding the 1911 circular. If I had thought that I would be asked the question I could have been in a position to answer, but I was quite absent of the matter as a Commissioner.

8694. You were well acquainted with those circulars?—I was at the time.

8695. The impression some of us have got in connection with these circulars is that they were aimed at certain grave defects of inspection that needed to be remedied. Was that your impression?—I do not know about "grave."

8696. But that they were unduly serious?—As a matter of experience of the system and its working, and the attitude of the teachers in regard to it, we certainly thought that there might be improvements.

8697. Certainly these circulars (especially the circular of 1912) seem to show that the system was not working quite smoothly?—Observe that I do not say it was not working quite smoothly. I say in 1908 it seemed so to me.

8698. Your point is, that when you became Commissioner everything was going smoothly?—Oh, yes.

8699. But you would not say it has worked smoothly?—No; I hesitate, I think, that there was considerable discontent.

8700. Yes, you say that further on in your statement?—But before you pass from that, I would like to say that this was really an experimental period in the matter of inspection, and the point I would make on behalf of the Commissioners is, that the Commissioners were ready at any time to take advantage of the experience of the teachers, and to modify things in the direction of helping the teachers.

8701. Mr. COFFEY.—What do you mean by the "transition period"?—Before 1900 you had a certain system at work. After 1900 the system was changed, and very radically changed, and, of course, as we went along that system was being put to the test, and the Commissioners were looking into it. As occasion required they were ready to change, and the changes have been altogether, according to my view, in the interest of the teachers, and in the direction of safeguarding the teachers.

8702. That is not the point exactly, but how far do you wish us to understand that the transition period extended?—It began in 1900.

8703. The CHAIRMAN.—How low do you bring it down?—We have been making changes in the interests of the teachers, and safeguarding them up, you may say, to the present time.

8704. Mr. COFFEY.—But do you still regard the theory of a transition period as being applicable? What is the definition of the transition period?—If we see any defect now, or if I see any defect now, I would be very glad to do anything that I could in the interests either of the inspectors or teachers, and so far as relates to anything of that kind, I would call it a transition period.

8705. The CHAIRMAN.—So that the system is always in transition if it is under improvement?

Mr. COOPER.—That is what I want to know, whether you fix the transition period at any definite date?—Oh, no, we are not perfect even yet, and we have not arrived at the final stage.

8706. The CHAIRMAN.—May I recall your attention to this circular of 1912, and to the very important matters mentioned in it. In the first place, attention is called to the mode of awarding merit marks to schools, and to grave differences between the senior and circuit inspectors. That came before you, I suppose?—Yes, it all came before us.

8707. And then it goes on to say that the Board have been concerned at grave differences of judgment between the senior and circuit inspectors on the merit marks. That occurs in the circular?—Yes.

8708. And then they lay down a rule providing that the merit mark is not to be altered by the junior inspector without consulting the senior?—Yes.

8709. It looks as if that had been done before this circular was issued?—Yes.

8710. It had?—At least, so far as I know, that was so. I believe it was so.

8711. And as if cases in which the inspectors differ and have conflicting views are to be submitted to the chief inspector for report to the Board?—Yes.

8712. Have you had reports of that kind coming before you?—Not that I remember.

8713. And then they recommended an altered method for securing uniformity, that the senior and circuit inspectors are to go together to an average school, form their judgment independently, and then confer?—Yes.

8714. And this has come before you?—Yes. It was definitely sanctioned by the Board, discussed and sanctioned by the Board.

8715. And the circular of 1911 enumerates five or six grave faults of inspection?—Yes.

8716. That the inspectors take too narrow a view of their work, that they have given too much time to schools obviously good, that junior inspectors have lowered the merit mark without consulting the senior inspector, and sometimes that a mark has been given founded on a temporary decline in proficiency in some one subject, and lastly, they accuse the inspectors of want of proper respect for the teacher. I suppose that is not frequent, that has not come before you much, the complaint of want of courtesy to the teachers?—There have been complaints in that direction several times.

8717. Those were the principal things. I see you have had them before you?—Yes. I wish to say that I have not, in prospect of appealing before you, gone back upon these matters. I did not know where I would be taken, so I really did not go back.

8718. Now, you say that you have come into close contact with teachers, and you find that, on the whole, the relations between inspector and teacher are very satisfactory?—Yes. I will tell you what I mean by that. Teachers appeal to me as a Commissioner in regard to several points, and I have means, when talking to a teacher, of judging his attitude towards the inspectors and towards the system. I find, on the whole, that there is no bitterness or ill-feeling; and even a fortnight ago two teachers came to me, and it came out in conversation, that they came on the advice of the inspector, who advised them to come to me, in order that I might know exactly the position of the teachers. It was not any special claim on the teachers' part that I should exercise influence, but simply that I would know exactly the position in regard to a special year, and as they came on the advice of the inspector, that seemed to indicate that inspectors and teachers are, in the main, really going in the right direction. That is only one instance.

8719. Your impression, in fact, is that this discontent is not so general as it is represented?—Yes, that is my contention. I do not say that there is not a strained feeling in certain districts, but I say it is not general, so far as my limited knowledge goes.

8719. But your impression is that this discontent is confined to certain districts?—Yes, to a very considerable extent.

8720. Belfast and Clonmel; you mention both of them in this paper?—I mentioned them because I thought you might be asking some questions on that.

8721. Now, have you formed a decided opinion on the present system of marking in six different categories "excellent," "very good," and so on?—No, I have not formed a decided opinion.

8722. Has it not come before you as a question whether that system can be worked with approximate uniformity?—That has been before us time and again, but it came definitely before the Board, I understand, before I joined. It was decided then, and though we have talked about it at various times, it has not been definitely before us as a question to be decided.

8723. The Board have not recently considered the question as to whether the system can be really maintained with approximate uniformity?—No, my recollection is that it came definitely before the Board, possibly a year before I joined it. It was then issued, and we have had talks about it, but so far as I remember, there has been no definite issue before us.

8724. In the observations of the chief inspectors on the Belfast case, I see that in 1904 the "excellent" and "very good" were 182. They dropped slightly to 179, then to 152, then in 1907 to 114, in 1908 to 110; so that in the end they had dropped from 182 to 110?—Yes.

8725. That is a very considerable variation?—Yes, it certainly is.

8726. Now, corresponding to that, the "goods" (rather a neutral mark) have steadily risen from 87 in 1904 to 135 in 1909. You say you have attended to the Belfast case. Now, did not that strike you as rather startling?—Yes, that was one of the elements that came before us very particularly.

8727. But did the facts revealed in the Belfast case not cause some uneasiness among the Commissioners as to the working of the system—perhaps you may think that you would not be justified in saying that, for if you do let me know, and I will not press it?—The Belfast case engaged our very anxious attention, and difficulties arose in connection with it (there is no doubt of that). We tried, I can say, honestly to meet that case in the best way that seemed within our reach. We saw that there were difficulties, and we were bound to try and meet these difficulties; so we had a meeting of senior inspectors, and there was a conference in regard to the whole matter. That circular was issued in connection with all the facts that came before us in that case.

8728. My point is this. If the Belfast case revealed anything, did not the table of statistics show a very grave difference of judgment among the inspectors in a very few years in awarding the merit marks?—Certainly.

8729. And that that difference of judgment had very seriously affected the emoluments and rise of the teachers?—Yes; I do not know how serious an effect, but it must have been considerable.

8730. It must have been when the "excellent" could fall from 182 to 110?—But that would not affect the emoluments.

8731. These are the "excellent" and "very good." The "very good" would affect them?—Oh, yes, I admit that, but what I say in that connection is, that we as a Board took whatever steps we thought were within our reach at that time in order to meet that, and we afterwards took other steps.

8732. My point is rather this, that the Belfast case would seem to have required a very thorough and searching examination of the whole system of awarding merit marks where results like that were possible?—I thought that we had taken very considerable steps.

8733. That is in that particular place, but I speak of the system as a whole?—Yes; but we were dealing with the system as a whole when we called a meeting of the senior inspectors.

8784. I only wanted to know whether that Belfast case did not raise a very serious question as to whether this system could be worked with anything like uniformity and justice?—It raised this question in our minds, that we should look very carefully into the matter, and come into close contact with the inspectors with regard to this special point, and we did so.

8785. Perhaps what I ought to ask you is, did you consider that there was something special and peculiar in the Belfast case that required your attention as apart from the rest of Ireland?—It required their attention because the Belfast teachers came to us and made complaints, and, therefore, we deal with that, but at the same time we got into touch with the whole system when we brought up all the inspectors.

8786. Do I understand you to say that by assembling the senior inspectors you raised the whole question of the system of awarding merit marks?—Yes, as to the attitude of the inspectors towards the teachers, and various other things, including the merit marks.

8787. That was a regular conference with the Commissioners, was it?—Yes.

8788. I do not think we have heard of that?—Yes, that was a regular conference.

8789. Mr. CORRY.—Was it all the senior inspectors, or only the Belfast senior inspectors?—We had the whole of the senior inspectors.

8790. The CHAIRMAN.—And they met the Commissioners?—They met the Commissioners.

8791. And you went into the whole question?—We heard the inspectors. The Commissioners, of course, interjected questions and so on, and there was a regular conference, and Dr. Stankie spoke to the inspectors in the name of the Commissioners upon these topics, and a circular issued afterwards. But you will get these things much better from, say, Dr. Stankie, who has all the facts.

8792. Could you give us an idea of when that conference was held?—It was held—

About 1911?—Well it was held some time after the Belfast cases came before us, according to my recollection.

8793. Mr. KAVANAGH.—Did you come into touch with the Belfast teachers at all; did you examine any of them or hear their case?—We heard their case.

8794. In what way?—I could not tell you exactly.

8795. Was it by petition, or was it at a personal interview?—I cannot answer you that, but you will easily find it from others. One comes into contact with the case in so many ways. Although I have seen the teachers, I am not in a position at the moment to answer that.

8796. The CHAIRMAN.—The deputation from Belfast teachers met the Resident Commissioner. Mr. Ward was present and you were not?—No, I was not present. Mr. Ward was present.

8797. He was the only Commissioner present besides Dr. Stankie. Now, with regard to the publication of new rules and amendment of rules, that question comes before you every year, I suppose?—It comes before us at particular times, and then it comes in bulk at the end of the year. It comes definitely before us at the end of every twelve months.

8798. And those amendments or changes are inserted at the commencement of the rules, the old rules being in parallel column with the amendments?—That is so.

8799. Has it ever struck you that these rules come rather suddenly upon managers and teachers?—Yes, I have sometimes thought that they do, and I have thought nothing would be lost by having a little delay.

8800. Now, would you develop that a little—would you have a certain time to elapse, say, 40 days or 60 days, so as to give the public time to criticize them; would you publish them, as is required to be done in many cases of statutory rules?—Unless it was a matter of extreme urgency, I would rather give six months, or something of that kind, before they would come into operation.

8801. On the understanding that in the meantime you would receive representations?—We are always willing to receive representations.

8792. I mean to ask whether there could not be a better system than the present one, for it is complained that these rules are sprung upon managers and teachers without any notice at all, and that no chance is given of asking for explanations or making suggestions?—Yes.

8793. And you seem to think that that is a real defect?—Yes, I think that is a difficulty. I have always been of opinion that there is no use in hurrying these changes.

8794. You know that in the case of the Intermediate Board their rules have to lie on the table of the House for 40 days, during which time any member may call attention to any rule, or even move for its rejection?—Yes.

8795. Now, do you not think that some such system might be adopted. I do not say precisely that system, but some system of advertising or making public the rules, so that expostulations or objections might be received by the Board of Commissioners?—Yes, I would agree with that. At the same time there is this, that we are very ready even afterwards, if we find that a rule does not turn out as was expected, to make a change.

8796. But the point is, that it has been found essential in other cases?—Yes.

8797. Essential to have a period before the rule comes into force, during which explanations may be asked for and criticisms may be received, with the result that possibly the rule may not be published in the original form. Now, is there any reason why the National Board should not have a similar defence against too sudden action?—Not so far as I know.

8798. Now, in your experience have there been many appeals from teachers coming before the Board directly?—Yes, we hear a number. I could not tell you how many.

8799. You have had a number every year?—I think so.

8800. Can you remember what some of those appeals at any rule related to?—I suppose the one that is most prominently before my mind is a case in Lesham, but I have not been going through the matter in such a way as to look into it. There was one in connection with Lesham, where a teacher got three months' notice, and it came before us on appeal.

8801. That was notice to withdraw his salary?—No, he got a notice from the manager. But let me suggest to you that you might ask me as to the question of secrecy.

8802. I will come to that?—I hear there has been a good deal of talk about information being withheld from the Board as a whole. As to secrecy, there is none. The whole records of the Office are open to me, and the officials are ready to give the details of every case.

8803. That expresses your experience?—Yes, and a statement is put on the table every fortnight. Teachers and managers and others write to me in regard to cases. Sometimes I have a dozen or even fifteen, and the whole records of the Board in regard to every case are open to me.

8804. When you have those complaints sent to you by teachers, to what official do you apply in order to get the information?—To one of the Secretaries.

8805. What do those complaints generally relate to?—Well, they really relate to a great variety of things. They relate to increments, to promotion, or to some fine that is likely to be imposed, because of a transgression of the rules, and so on. Very frequently information only is sought.

8806. And you find that in every case you get the fullest information?—Yes, there is no question about that, and if the case would come before Dr. Stankie, and would be more within his province, I go to him, or I go to Mr. Wynn, or I go to a chief inspector.

8807. You get the fullest information?—Yes, there is no doubt about that.

8808. And all the Commissioners can do that?—Yes.

8809. Every Commissioner?—Every Commissioner can do that, and, of course, a good many of them do.

Unhappily I am connected with both the North and the West, and I am afraid I get a double portion. Thus I think there was another point about the unreasonable criticism to which the Board has been exposed. I do not know whether you want to hear anything about that or not?

8770. In what respect have you been misrepresented?—I could not exhaust that subject. Just take one case, that I have no doubt you have met with, the question of balances. We have been denounced in the strongest terms over that.

8771. But the way in which the matter is referred to in your accounts is, as has been pointed out here by one of our members, a little misleading. It refers to £16,000 of the Parliamentary Grant being "surrendered" at the end of the year?—I do not know about that, but you know exactly how the matter stands.

8772. That is what you call the balances?—Yes; I mean we make estimates, and then, at the end of the year, we find that there are certain portions of those estimates not expended, and we have been greatly blamed because a single halfpenny goes back to England; but you understand that we must account for the balances, and we must spend only according to the requirements of the Board.

8773. That your grant is cut-marked, and you cannot devote money voted for one purpose to another purpose?—Certainly not. We have also been denounced in regard to the grades, but you know well that we are bound hand and foot with regard to the standard number of the grade. I could refer to a number of things, but I thought I would mention that, as we do not often talk in public.

8774. Mr. CORRY.—You were appointed Commissioner in 1908. Will you kindly give the Committee an outline of your powers and duties as a Commissioner of National Education?—Of course, I need not go into that. It is in a public document.

8775. We would be glad to have it from you?—But mine would be only a guided statement.

8776. Will you refer us to the document where it is published?—Well, it is published in the original letter to begin with, Lord Stanley's letter.

8777. You know there was a charter?—Yes.

8778. Has any document been ever issued defining your duties outside that charter?—I do not think so; perhaps there was.

8779. Now, will you give the Committee (as we have nothing but what is in the charter) an idea of what your duties and powers are?—I really do not know that I need do that.

8780. I do not know them, and I do not think the Committee knows them, and it would be very important for us to know?—Well, I really think that if you want me to do that you had better let me have an opportunity of going into the matter and giving you a reasoned statement.

8781. But you might give us a short statement?—I would scarcely know where to begin.

8782. You have been a Commissioner since 1908?—Yes.

8783. Can you refer us to any document except the Charter of 1864 and the Charter of 1867?—No. I have no objections to give you a reasoned statement on the matter, but to give it here in that way I do not think would be quite fair.

8784. I thought it would be quite simple from your experience as a Commissioner?—I can tell you what I do from day to day, if you would like to hear that, but I think a statement of that kind—if it is to be of any value, except to test me as to my knowledge of things—if it is to be of any practical value, should be a reasoned and definite statement.

8785. It is not to test you in any way whatever. Do not take it that my question is due to any desire whatever to test you, but I want really to know whether there is any difference between the powers of an ordinary Commissioner and a Resident Commissioner?—Well, I really could not answer you that question, if that is the point you want.

8786. I want to know what are your rights and privileges of an individual Commissioner, and how

they differ from the rights and privileges of the Resident Commissioner?—I could not tell you what the rights of the Resident Commissioner are. I can tell how it works out.

8787. The CHAIRMAN.—Is there any document where the rights and powers of the Resident Commissioner as distinct from the other Commissioners are laid down?—I really could not tell you.

8788. I want to know if there is such a document?—Of course, it is a perfectly legitimate thing to ask me as to the rights of the Resident Commissioner as compared with the lay Commissioners, but I thought it was an academic question.

Mr. CORRY.—Oh, no, it had a very practical object.

8789. The CHAIRMAN.—But you do not know of the document where that should be found?—No. I can tell you how we work.

8790. Mr. CORRY.—So we may take it that the duties of the Commissioners are not specifically defined in any document within your knowledge?—Not within my knowledge; at least I have not come into touch with it, nor has it concerned me very much.

8791. Are you familiar with the terms of the charter of incorporation?—Well, I read it at the time when I was appointed, but I have not gone into it since.

8792. You remember it well enough, and you are familiar enough with it to know that it does not make any difference between the standing of the Resident Commissioner and the standing of any other Commissioner?—I can say that, that in our practical working I do not know any difference, except that we give over to the Resident Commissioner certain things to do.

8793. Has each Commissioner an equal right and power on the Board?—Certainly.

8794. Has the Resident Commissioner power to promote an inspector?—No.

8795. Has the Resident Commissioner power to appoint a model school teacher?—The ordinary case is that every appointment of a model school teacher comes before the Board, and the Board appoints him. It comes before the Board.

8796. Has the Resident Commissioner power to promote a clerk to a staff appointment in the office?—Certain appointments come before us.

8797. Certain office appointments?—Yes; but I think a good many of those of minor importance are made without reference to us.

8798. But the staff appointments?—But observe I do not know of any regulation with regard to the matter. I am not dealing with that, but I am dealing with our practical work.

8799. What is the practical work; it is that the staff appointment of clerks in the office are made by the Commissioners?—A number of appointments are made by the Commissioners, and often on the recommendation of the Resident Commissioner.

8800. What I want to make clear is, that in the promotion of the clerks in the office to staff appointments each Commissioner has the same right, and can vote independently of the Resident Commissioner if he so desires?—Yes; the only thing is that I am not quite sure as to the extent of the meaning of staff appointment. I am not the best one to give you the information on the point as to what appointments are made.

8801. The trusteeship of the central model schools is a position held by a woman, who superintends the dealing of the central model schools. This is an appointment which rests with the Commissioners, and is decided by vote, and not by the Resident Commissioner?—Yes, I think so.

8802. Have you read the evidence of Sir Alexander McDonnell, a previous Resident Commissioner, given before the Pavia Commission?—No; you must remember I am a modern.

8803. I thought that as a Commissioner it would probably have come before you?—Well, I suppose it ought to, but a man has a great many things to do.

8804. The Board in its corporate capacity, and each Commissioner individually, is charged with a great responsibility in relation to the education of the country?—Certainly.

30th April, 1913.]

Rev. J. COURTESY CLARKE, D.D.

[Continued.]

8805. What is the amount of money administered yearly for primary education?—About a million and a half. I am not a great authority on these things.

8806. As all events, the Board accepts the responsibility for the just and equitable administration of this money?—Yes.

8807. The teachers are the direct agents for the advancement of education in the country. You admit that?—I do not exactly know about their direct agency as apart from other direct agencies, but they are a very necessary and important agency.

8808-9. And are they not the most essential agents, while you may call the inspectors and staff of Tyndal House subsidiary instruments?—They are helps if you like.

8810. Do you admit that the Commissioners are responsible for taking adequate precautions to ensure that no injustice is done to a teacher?—Yes, as far as lies in their power.

8811. There is a responsibility binding on the Commissioners as men of honour and men of position. Do you also recognise that there is a responsibility of a constitutional nature, a responsibility to Parliament, and that there is a responsibility of a legal nature, which may be tested in the Courts of Law. You recognise that?—There is a responsibility to Parliament, inasmuch as Parliament provides the money, and there is a responsibility to the country. I do not know where the responsibility would end. I do not know about legal responsibility. Of course, in certain cases legal questions might arise. I think possibly all Government departments have their decisions subject to legal review.

8812. Mr. Stanley Leathes, First Civil Service Commissioner, in his evidence before the Civil Service Commission the other day, said:—"There is no appeal from the Commissioners' decisions, provided they are acting within their powers, and bona fide, without negligence. I imagine, if the Commissioners did not act bona fide, or showed negligence, there would be an appeal to a Court of Law." That is his evidence in regard to the Civil Service Commission. Do you think that the same would not apply in the case of the Board of National Education?—Now you are asking me a question on which I can throw no light.

8813. Have the Commissioners any reason to think, from a recent opinion which they got from Counsel, that they are subject to legal review?—I do not know.

8814. You said that you have from time to time changed the rules. May I ask you was the Maternity Rule changed in obedience to legal advice, that the rule could not stand in law?—I will not say that it was in obedience to legal advice.

8815. Was it not in accordance with legal advice?—I am not quite certain that there was an absolutely definite legal advice. There was a legal opinion that in the main was adverse to the position we took. That is my recollection, but I do not know how far I can say that was in obedience to legal advice.

8816. But did not the very eminent Counsel in Dublin, to whom you found it necessary to refer your procedure, advise the Commissioners that the rule could not stand in law, as being harassing, unjust, and against the liberty of the teachers?—As to that I cannot say. I can tell you that his opinion was adverse to the position we had taken up. Of course, when you are dealing with a legal document, you require to have the document before you in order to answer the question.

8817. However, you got an opinion on the matter which was adverse to the Commissioners' rule. Now, Rule 96 says, that "should a teacher have any well-grounded cause of complaint against an inspector, he may submit his case in writing directly to the Commissioners for their consideration"?—Yes.

8818. Has that rule been sanctioned by His Excellency the Lord Lieutenant, by whom all the rules have to be sanctioned?—I expect it has, but I do not definitely know.

8819. That Rule gives the right of appeal to the teacher direct to the Commissioners?—Yes.

8820. As a matter of fact, is there any appeal to the Commissioners by the teachers under that rule, as the public are led to think. Is there any appeal directly to the Commissioners?—I mentioned the case at Lisburn.

8821. That is a different thing. That was an appeal of another kind. The appeal that Rule 96 deals with is the appeal of a teacher against an inspector. The rule says:—"Should a teacher have any well-grounded cause of complaint against an inspector, he may appeal directly to the Commissioners in writing." Now, has the teacher the right of appeal directly to the Commissioners, which that rule leads the public to think he has?—I believe he has. He has, of course.

8822. What were the terms of the decision of the Commissioners in 1902 ridding themselves of their responsibility in regard to these appeals?—1902 was before my time.

8823. But as a Commissioner you would make yourself acquainted with your position in regard to the rule. You are aware that the Commissioners in 1902 placed this whole question of appeal, I understand, in the hands of Dr. Stuckle, the Resident Commissioner, and that it was for him to say whether or not a case of appeal should go to the Commissioners. You are aware of that rule?—Yes, I am aware that there were certain matters that were left in the hands of the Resident Commissioner.

8824. Are you aware that this question of appeal against the mark of an inspector was one of them?—I read it over last night, and I just cannot remember absolutely, but I expect it is.

8825. Now, do you think it consistent with the adequate precautions which you have admitted to be necessary, that the Commissioners should, by this private action, have disabled themselves beforehand from hearing cases of appeal?—If we trust our Resident Commissioner, and if he appeals to us in any case of difficulty (as we expect he does in any case of special difficulty), we think that in these matters it is really an advantage.

8826. Now, during the time that you have been on the Board since 1908, has any case of appeal against the marking of an inspector come before you except those cases from Belfast and Tipperary in which a body of teachers joined?—Well, I do not remember any at the moment, but I would not say that there was not.

8827. You do not remember any?—No.

8828. Now, how can you claim that the Resident Commissioner puts cases of appeal before you, or do I understand you as claiming that the teachers have a right of appealing to the Commissioners when you cannot, for your five years on the Board, say that any one of appeal came before you?—Cases of that kind would come before the Resident Commissioner, an experienced officer, whom we have every reason to trust, and who has been kindly towards the teachers in my knowledge, and we think that is fair enough.

8829. The Commissioners are very busy men, of course, and they cannot be expected to look up every detail of the office. It is quite proper that the details of the administration should be dealt with by a paid officer, but the question of increment to a teacher is not a detail, and do you not think that that should be considered by the Commissioners, who have led the public to think that they had provided for it?—Well, I do not know whether it can be regarded as a detail or not, but I know this, that if the question of increment came before us we would have a six days' sitting every week.

8830. You would have to sit every week?—More than one day.

8831. I have been very much struck by the far-seeing wisdom of the evidence of Cardinal Cullen when he was examined before the Forster Commission in relation to the Commissioners of National Education. His evidence was that the difficulty is to get gentlemen who will attend and manage matters themselves, and not take everything that is proposed to them on the word of a Resident Commissioner?—I know this, that I

80th April, 1913.]

REV. J. COURTESY CLARKE, D.D.

[Continued.]

examine every case that comes before myself. I give the fullest attention to every case that comes up, and deal with the business of education within the limits that are laid down as honestly as any portion of my work. That is all I can say.

8842. I am quite certain of that. I dare say you, according to your views, discharge your duty very honourably and very conscientiously, but do you not think that you placed yourself in a rather awkward position if you make a rule saying that you give the teachers the right of appeal to you, and yet that that appeal is not allowed to come to you, by reason of the Board having divested itself of authority? Do you think that that is discharging the duty properly?—I would not say definitely, but I believe the teacher has the right of appealing definitely to the Commissioners. If it were decided against him in the ordinary course, I believe that he could appeal definitely to the Commissioners as a body.

8843. But how can he—supposing his manager got down a letter saying: "I am directed by the Commissioners of National Education to say, that having considered your appeal, they disallow it," or something to that effect?—That is what I believe is done in all offices. Certain matters that are left to officials and certain other matters that come before the Commissioners and letters, are written in the name of the whole Board.

8844. Quite properly and quite regularly; but if the teacher or his manager got this letter, which says: "I am directed by the Commissioners of National Education to say that your appeal, having been considered is disallowed," how can he appeal to the Commissioners then, or how can he reach the Commissioners?—Well, a direct letter to the secretary, I believe, or to the Commissioners, would reach the Commissioners.

8845. But the first letter was to the Commissioners?—Yes.

8846. The letter of his manager was to the Commissioners, and do you think the procedure in the case of the second letter would be different?—They need not go to the Commissioners. Dr. Newell, who was then private secretary, was examined before the Foran Commission, and he was asked whether appeals go to the Board, and he said: "Of course, any letter appealing to the Board should go to the Board," and the member of the Commission who was examining him asked: "Is it as a matter of certainty?" and Dr. Newell replied: "As a matter of certainty, I would consider it my bounden duty to do so, quite irrespective of the feelings of the Resident Commissioner." So the secretary at that time would send the appeals to the Board, whether the Resident Commissioner liked it or not; but now the position is that no appeal can reach the Board if the Resident Commissioner disapproves. Is not that so?—No; that is not exactly so. By the arrangements of 1902 there are certain matters that are left to the Resident Commissioner, and he acts within that. All other appeals go to the Board.

8847. But appeals of teachers do not go to the Board, at any rate, they do not go to the Commissioners?—Well, anything outside that 1902 memorandum goes to the Board.

8848. Do you not think that it is a very important thing, where you are dealing with the whole of the teachers of Ireland, who, you say, are the direct instruments of education, that they should have access to them the right of appeal to the Commissioners?—I really do not know.

8849. You were not aware of this resolution of the Board in 1902, divesting themselves of the authority with regard to these appeals?—Oh, yes. I told you that I read it last night.

8850. For the first time?—Not at all.

8851. You had read it before?—I certainly have.

8852. Do you not think now that it is placing the Commissioners in a very awkward light before the country to have a rule providing one thing and a private regulation nullifying that rule? Have you taken any steps, or do you propose to take any steps, to have that resolution of the Board rescinded?—My opinion

was that all public bodies acted in something of the same way as the Commissioners did then, that certain matters were left for the permanent officials and that other matters came before the general body.

8843. That is, matters of detail. That is quite right; but certainly you do not consider the increments of the whole of the teachers of the country a matter of detail that should be dealt with by one man?—It is not dealt with by one man, but by the whole permanent officials of the office.

8844. Do you not think that it would be an advantage if there was a permanent Committee of the Board, consisting of two members, in addition to the Resident Commissioner, to deal with these appeals?—There was something of that kind, I believe, a very considerable time ago; but I understand that it really resolved itself into the Resident Commissioner.

8845. I can quite understand. That was not exactly what I contemplated in the question. There was what was called an Office Committee, consisting of the secretaries and chiefs of inspection?—Yes.

8846. But I think that though it had some advantages, it resolved itself into a question of the power of the Resident Commissioner. You said early in your evidence that teachers had talked with you, and left you under the impression that they were satisfied. How many teachers were you speaking to that left you under that impression?—Incidentally, wherever I went I was talking to teachers and trying to find out what their feeling was. I have met a considerable number, and then, in connection with recent matters, this question of what the inspectors say and advise and so on, turned up.

8847. We had it in evidence from Mr. Dilworth that the Commissioners considered very carefully, in fact, I think he told us that they considered word by word, the letter that was addressed to the Belfast teachers through the secretaries in 1911?—Yes, that came before us.

8848. And it was very carefully considered?—It was carefully considered.

8849. In that letter the Commissioners expressed regret that "it appears from the recent enquiry that the relations of teachers and inspectors are not as cordial as they would wish, and the complaint of the teachers that their independence is crushed by the present system has much surprised the Commissioners." Now, what was that explanation of that expression of surprise on the part of the Commissioners?—I rather think that it was in this direction. This is, at any rate, my own feeling—I cannot judge the feeling of the other Commissioners.

8850. Well, you were a party to the expression of surprise?—Yes, I was on the Board.

8851. What was the explanation of your surprise?—Under the new system that had been adopted, we thought that the foundations were laid for a much kinder feeling between the inspectors and teachers, that is, that both teachers and inspectors were put into much more natural relations towards each other than they had been under the results system.

8852. You thought so, and then you were surprised to find that it was not so?—Yes.

8853. Would not the surprise be explained in another way, namely, that the expressions of discontent and dissatisfaction were kept from the Commissioners by the office?—I do not think so; because the Commissioners are well in touch with the general feeling. The Commissioners as a body are scattered over the country, and they know pretty well what the feeling is.

8854. At all events, we had it from Mr. Dilworth, that unless they heard of the discontent in relation to the discontent and dissatisfaction of the teachers with the system of inspection?—Well, I do not know about that.

8855. But you know that no official communications were allowed to reach you setting forth these complaints?—I do not think they did reach us.

8856. Therefore, you were in the dark as regards the feeling of dissatisfaction that existed with the system of



30th April, 1913.]

REV. J. COTTERNEY CLARKE, D.D.

[Continued.]

inspection?—The only way in which it could be said that we were in the dark would be that as a body the matter may not have come definitely before us.

8837. But do you not think it should come up officially before you, as Commissioners charged with the education of the country?—That is returning to the same point.

8838. But do you not think an important matter like that should have come before you, for that cannot be said to be a detail, that the teachers of the whole country were dissatisfied and discontented with the system of inspection? Do you not think that that should come to the official knowledge of the Commissioners?—How could it come?

8839. Through the office and through letters from the teachers?—I do not know how far appeals and letters would come through the office, so I cannot tell; I know pretty well personally the feeling of the teachers, because I had been talking to a good many teachers and knew pretty well how matters stood; but at the same time I was surprised that the change in the system did not work in the direction of better feeling between the teachers and inspectors.

8840. Do you think that the change has been good for the education of the country and has the education improved?—I think I would require a considerable time to give that answer. I know that many who are very intimately connected with education say it is greatly improved, and mention specifically the direction in which it is improved: especially in the direction of the cultivation of the intelligence of the pupils, which is a very fundamental matter.

8841. You are not in a position to offer any personal opinion yourself?—I certainly have come in contact with a number of people who say it has not improved.

8842. Have you as a Commissioner a right to discuss educational matters with inspectors? You told us, in fact, that you did discuss matters with heads of inspection; but have you, as Commissioner, a right to discuss matters in connection with schools and their merits, with the inspectors?—With the inspectors in the district?

8843. Or if you met an inspector anywhere, have you a right, as a Commissioner, to discuss the condition of the school in his district, or in any other district?—I think we would have a right to do it; but I do not know that we would in any way interfere. We might do it as a matter of gaining knowledge or so. If I met an inspector, I would naturally talk to him about his work, and what is the character of the schools, and so on, and the education of the district, and all that; but as to the exercise of any function as a Commissioner in that connection, I do not think I would. I might use it afterwards when I would come before the Board, in order to give them information on certain points.

8844. If you could afford the time and you were so inclined or so interested in education, is it within your rights to sit in the Boardroom of Tyrone House every day and see the details of all administration?—Well, I know this, that any time I am in Dublin, if I have time, I usually go into the office and talk to the secretary, or the Resident Commissioner; but I do not know how far my rights would go. I have never been questioned with regard to such a matter.

8845. But are you aware that two lay Commissioners, two outside Commissioners we will call them, sit in the office, in connection with the administration for days or weeks, as they were able to spare the time, some years ago?—Oh, I do know about that; I have only to say that any time I go into the office I am made most welcome, and am afforded every facility for getting into contact with the working of the system.

8846. Do you say that all the circulars to inspectors during your time, that is, circulars issued by the Board to inspectors, were submitted to the Commissioners?—I and that I had a clear recollection of one, and that I was pretty certain that the other was too.

8847. Have you any recollection of the circular of \* 7th December, 1912? (Circular handed to witness.)—I have not a clear recollection of it.

8848. Have you any recollection at all of that?—That is, that the junior inspector is not to lower the mark?

8849. The personal merit mark of the teacher?—I am not saying whether this direction is right, or whether it is proper; but I only want to know whether that circular was authorised by the Commissioners (the date is the 7th of December, 1912)?—The date conveys nothing to me. The circular is to the effect that the junior inspector cannot alter the merit mark of the teacher.

8850. The merit mark of the teacher?—That idea certainly is not at all strange to me.

8851. What you had before was the merit mark of the school?—Yes.

8852. And you have no recollection of it coming before the Commissioners?—That does not mean that it did not come before the Commissioners?—That does not mean that it did not come before the Commissioners, because you can understand that amidst so many documents coming before us, I will not have an individual recollection in each case.

8853. Now, you told us that the records and papers in reference to any particular complaint are very kindly placed at your disposal by the secretary?—I did not say kindly.

8854. They are placed at your disposal by the secretary, is not that so?—Yes.

8855. But that is when a teacher is in a position to approach you personally?—And write to me on anything.

8856. I say to approach you as an individual Commissioner?—Or in regard to anything in which I am interested.

8857. Or in regard to any case in which you are interested, and on which you get a complaint from a teacher, the office staff is quite open to place the file at your disposal. Do you think though that it is an adequate or satisfactory way for a teacher to get his case considered by the Board that he should have to be in a position to approach an individual Commissioner?—He may be in this position, that he simply knows my name, and perhaps teaches that I have never seen, and probably will never see, write to me and I deal with the case, just as if they were men that I was familiar with, although I may not know them at all.

8858. You must get a great deal of correspondence then?—Unfortunately, I do.

8859. But do you think that is a satisfactory way for the official transaction of business that the teacher has to approach an individual Commissioner to get his case before the Board?—I do not think he has to at all. He may have come before the Board, and may simply want me to understand the facts of the case. Very often the letter is an enquiry only, and as a rule it is not a case that comes before the Board. I never exercise undue influence on behalf of anyone.

8860. But if you understand the case, if there is anything in the case that is worth understanding or worth considering, should it not be brought officially before the Board by the Secretary?—Some cases are not of that nature. Some cases have already been decided and would not come in that way, and the teacher is under the impression that certain things have not been understood, or else it would not have been decided in that way, and he wants me to look into that. I want you to understand definitely that the thing is according to my view quite proper. It is not a case of a teacher approaching me with a desire that I should press his case in any undue fashion. Very often he only seeks information.

8861. Sir HIRSH WILKINSON.—You have been asked with regard to the transaction of business by the Commissioners, but you are aware, of course, that the question of how this business should be transacted came before the Povey Commission. You are familiar with the recommendations of the Povey Commission?—I have read them; I do not know how far I could say I am familiar with them.

8862. I will read the recommendation on this point: "That it is inexpedient that the whole Board should

\* Vide Appendix II.

be summoned weekly for the consideration of routine business?—Would you agree with that?—I read that a very short time ago.

8883. "That the routine business should be conducted by a Committee of the Board sitting in Dublin, whose names should be known to the public, and that all questions of the general policy of the system, such as changes of rules or interpretation of rules, should be referred to the whole Board, to be specially summoned?"—Yes.

8884. You see the recommendation there that there should be a Committee of the Board sitting in Dublin for the consideration of what is here called "routine business?"—Yes.

8885. Such business as the Commissioners decided (I suppose you were not on the Board at the time) should be referred to Dr. Sturkie for his decision?—No, I was not on the Board at the time.

8886. That was in 1902?—Yes.

8887. Would you consider that routine business that was left over to Dr. Sturkie?—Yes, to a large extent.

8888. Would you consider that that came within the recommendation that it should be referred to a Committee of the Board?—I would think so.

8889. As a matter of fact, would you call the decision, as to the right of the teacher to his increment, routine business?—Yes, there are certain regulations laid down by the Commissioners, and the point is, are these regulations fulfilled in the particular case? We define particularly under what conditions a man is to receive his increments, and then, it seems to me, that it would largely come under the rule about routine business.

8890. You admit, though, that that came within the recommendation of the Poria Commission, that it should not be considered by the Resident Commissioners alone, but by a Committee?—Yes, I think so, so far as I see. I was not on the Board when this particular regulation was made, and I do not know what position they took up then.

8891. But you are now on the Board, and do not those matters, in your opinion, come within the rule of 1902?—I have tried to explain the conditions that the Board lays down in regard to increments, and how, in view of the regulations that were made, it may have been regarded by the Board at that time as coming under routine business.

8892. Do you consider it is routine business in the ordinary sense used at the present time?—In most instances, I believe it is.

8893. Is it routine business if a teacher says that an inspector has wrongly marked his school, depriving him of his salary?—Yes; but that should come up as a separate issue. That is a prior matter.

8894. In what way a prior matter?—If an inspector has done a teacher an injustice that should be considered, and that would not be routine business I admit; but when it comes to the inquiry, you have there the records in the office, and those records must be accepted as true.

8895. But the inspector's merit mark is one of the most material things in the decision, and it would be alleged that that merit mark is wrong. Could you consider for a moment that that was an ordinary routine matter of business?—No, I would not regard that as ordinary routine.

8896. Then you would agree that that ought to come before the Board in some way, that they could consider it?—I would think that possibly that is the position that would be taken up.

8897. It is not taken up at the present moment?—Well, as I have said before, I cannot say absolutely; but in the main it is not.

8898. The CHAIRMAN.—The cases are very infrequent when they have left no trace in your memory?—I have no recollection of it.

8899. And you would remember them if they were frequent?—One does not like to commit himself absolutely if he does not know definitely.

8900. But the conclusion from your having such an indistinct recollection would be that the cases were very infrequent?—I think it is very likely, and they may not come at all.

8901. Mr. HENRY.—Have you not stated that appeals against merit marks do not come before the Board?—I did not, I think, say that absolutely. I am afraid if I did I would not sustain that. There might have been rare cases before it, but I would say that as a rule they do not.

8902. Sir HERMAN WILKINSON.—Here is one matter in which there is nothing controversial, that it is desirable that any important circulars, letters of instruction, or anything issued during the year, should be inserted in the Appendix to the Report of the year. Would you agree to that?—Yes.

8903. I said that that was not controversial; but as a matter of fact we have discovered that very important circulars and letters of instruction have not appeared in the reports of the Commissioners from time to time. You think that they ought to?—Yes; all important matters should, certainly.

8904-5. The CHAIRMAN.—The public had no access to these circulars till we got hold of them. Were those circulars to inspectors supposed to be confidential?

Mr. HENRY.—They were kept secret from the public.

Sir HERMAN WILKINSON.—Is it at all legal or justifiable on any grounds whatever to keep from the teachers the rules by which they are judged?—But I do not know that they are kept from the teachers.

8906. But you have heard just now that they were kept from the teachers?—I understood that the position just now was that they were not published, but were they not sent out to the teachers?

8907. Can you inform us on that point?—I know that a great many important circulars are sent out to teachers and managers, and so on, but I am not dealing definitely with any particular case.

8908. Mr. HENRY.—Were the teachers informed that each of them got a merit mark?—Oh, I cannot tell you that.

8909. Sir HERMAN WILKINSON.—Or that their increment depended upon a certain number of merit marks of a particular description?—Oh, I think they surely knew that.

8910. Mr. HENRY.—No, it was not known?—I cannot answer on that; I do not know.

8911. Sir HERMAN WILKINSON.—"That the regulations of the Board should be reviewed only once a year and only after due notice to all the Commissioners, a majority of whom should be present at the meeting at which the alterations are to be considered." That is a reasonable rule, is it not?—Yes; it seems to be. I think that that is in accordance with the practice with the Commissioners.

8912. This is a letter dated the 16th of November, 1910, from Mr. Knight to Dr. Sturkie, and it says:—"At a meeting of the Belfast Teachers' Association, held on Saturday, the 12th inst., I was asked to write to you in order to ascertain the following information: (a) The mark on minute showing the general condition of school which is necessary to obtain increment in each grade; (b) the mark on minute necessary to obtain promotion to second grade, second of first grade, and best of first grade respectively; (c) the personal mark of efficiency of teacher necessary to secure increment in each grade and promotion from grade to grade. You will doubtless see it is not fair that workers should know fully the conditions under which they serve." And this is the letter that was written in reply:—"November 26th, 1910. Dear Sir.—In reply to your letter to the Resident Commissioner of 16th inst., in which you request to be informed of the character of report required to warrant award of increment and promotion to teachers in the various grades, I am requested to say that the Commissioners do not consider it desirable to give formal public expression to any more precise rules in these matters than are to be found in Chapter 8 of the Code." And you know that these do not appear in Chapter 8 of the Code?—That is, the personal mark of the teacher?

8913. The mark or minute showing general condition of the school which is necessary to obtain increment in each grade (that is, the school merit mark); then mark on minute necessary to obtain promotion to second grade, second of first grade, and first of first

grade respectively; and then the letter asked also for the personal mark of efficiency of teachers. The answer covers the whole, and it says:—"I am requested to say that the Commissioners do not consider it desirable to give formal public expression to any more precise rules in these matters than are to be found in Chapter 8 of the Code." And you say that on account of there being precise rules in these matters, they become formal matters to be dealt with by Dr. Stokelo, and that the Board need not be troubled with them?—I understood that there were precise rules as to getting so many "goods" and so many "very goods," and that that determined really the promotion.

8914. Can you recollect whether you were at the meeting of the Commissioners in which this letter was authorised?—I do not remember the letter at all. If I had remembered the letter, of course, I would have given a different answer.

8915. The CHAIRMAN.—Is it likely that that came before the Board at all, considering that it is a reply to a letter of the 14th?

Sir HIRSH WILKINSON.—The Resident Commissioner directs Mr. Bonaparte Wyse to write this letter, and the Resident Commissioner says "the Commissioners." It is not a question of the secretary writing in the name of the Commissioners, but it is a question of Mr. Bonaparte Wyse, the private secretary of the Resident Commissioner, saying that the Commissioners have come to that conclusion, but could anyone reading that have any other interpretation than that the matter came before the Commissioners, and that the Commissioners had delivered themselves on the subject to that effect?—Oh, I can only say that I do not remember at all, and that I definitely understood that there were certain merit marks laid down in regard to increment and promotion.

8916. The CHAIRMAN.—Where did you think they were laid down?—They have been very familiar to me.

8917. Where would you think these merit marks exist and are to be seen?—Well, I cannot tell you at this moment.

8918. You never faced that question?—It has never come before me.

8919. Mr. HENLY.—Do you think it desirable that they should be withheld from the teachers?—I did not know that they were withheld.

8920. Mr. COOPER.—You are a member of the Board, and therefore made to seem to approve of it?—That may be.

8921. Mr. HENLY.—Do you think it right now that teachers should work under these rules, and yet not know them?—I thought they did know, and I thought it was reasonable that they should know them.

8922. Sir HIRSH WILKINSON.—Then the 7th recommendation is:—"That it is desirable to adopt the present practice of the Committee of Council in England, that no alteration of any rules, regulations, or by-laws, should be put into operation until such alteration should have been laid for one month before both Houses of Parliament, the alterations having been shown in distinctive type." You have already told us that in your opinion notice should be given, and that where it is practicable six months' notice should be given?—Yes, I think, of course, there might be certain cases of urgency that might not admit of six months' notice. Of course, that was what I intended.

8923. There you have five recommendations made by the Royal Commission as to how the Commissioners of National Education should conduct their business, and not one of these has been followed, except that one that they are not to meet as a body weekly. Do you consider that that disregard of the recommendations of a Royal Commission is justifiable?—You know I was really appointed at a time when that did not come before us at all. It was not decided as to what course should be taken during my time.

8924. It is right to say that this Commission was in 1870?—I know that.

8925. But that is no reason why the recommendations ought not to be followed. I do not say that it came before you recently, but there it is, that after hearing a mass of evidence, that Royal Commission made a series of recommendations as to how the business of the Board should be conducted, and those re-

commendations of that Commission are all of them, except one, totally disregarded?—I do not know that it is usual to follow out in every particular the decisions of a Royal Commission. I do not know that.

8926. But is it not a matter for serious consideration that you have five recommendations of that Royal Commission for the conduct of the business of the Board, and that of those five recommendations only one has been followed, and that a negative one?—Yes, it is a matter for serious consideration.

8927. The CHAIRMAN.—May I ask whether you would approve of the appointment of a small permanent Standing Committee of the Board to meet more frequently. Now, would you not think that some of your difficulties would be got over by the appointment of such a Committee?—I am familiar with the working of a Standing Committee, or something of that kind, and it is a very good plan to get through the business in that way.

8928. Would it not get rid of some of the difficulties of the National Board?—I am sure it would.

8929. Sir HIRSH WILKINSON.—You thought that the application of teachers to individual Commissioners was quite a proper proceeding. By that I understand that you consider that the Commissioner, in receiving that application, violates none of the rules governing what ought to be done in matters of that sort; but do you not think that with a properly constituted Board it ought not to be necessary?—I do not really know. The Commissioner has a local knowledge, and if he gets fully abreast of the case, and uses it in connection with the Board in a legitimate way, I think it does good and not harm.

8930. As the Board is constituted at present, I take it that it is the only chance that a man has of getting justice?—I do not know.

8931. But if it is not the only way, it is a necessary way for a man to get justice, or to get his case heard. If it were not necessary, of course, it would not be justifiable, I think you would say; but, if I may say so, under the present constitution of things, it does appear to me that it is a lesser evil than to shut him out from appealing to the individual Commissioners, and that individual Commissioner need not feel that he is doing any harm in trying to get justice done. I will put it that way in order that I may not appear to disagree with you on that particular point as to the attitude of the Commissioner himself.

8932. As things are constituted now, you consider, and many men would consider, that that rule is not applicable to the position of individual Commissioners; but do you not think it would be a better thing if the Commissioners as a body were sure to have these cases brought to their notice without the individual application?—In many cases, they would not be brought to the notice of the Commissioners at all.

8933. Quite so, that is my very point. Do you not think it desirable that the arrangements should be so made that the cases should be brought before either the Commissioners or a Committee of the Commissioners?—I think it would be very desirable that all cases where there is any complaint made by a teacher should come before the Commissioners themselves, or in the way that they have arranged.

8934. But how have they arranged?—That, of course, refers to the arrangement of 1902.

8935. But do you approve of the arrangement of 1902, with regard to complaints of teachers as to the merit marking?—I think you have already told us that you do not?—I have said that I have great confidence in Dr. Stokelo, and having regard to those matters, I believe they were fairly and carefully examined. That is my opinion.

8936. But, as I have pointed out to you, the recommendation of the Royal Commission was that these things should be examined by a Committee of the Commissioners?—Yes, and I am not at all unwilling that that should be done.

8937. But that the existence of the Resident Commissioner was before the eyes of the Royal Commission on that occasion is clear from one of their recommendations, which is, that the suggestion of a second

30th April, 1913.]

REV. J. COURTNEY CLARKE, D.D.

[Continued.]

and Commissioner does not meet with their approval, and then they make that recommendation with regard to the business?—Yes.

8039. Now, with regard to your talking intercourse with the members of the staff, we have had a letter before us in which a former chief inspector was rebuked for holding such intercourse with the Commissioner. This is a letter of 1911 from Dr. Starke to "Mr. Purser, and this is one of the complaints:—"That you discussed details of administration with Mr. Ward, in violation of my orders, sent round some years ago, that no officer should do this."—Discussed what?

8040. "That you discussed details of administration with Mr. Ward, in violation of my orders, sent round some years ago, that no officer should do this. I am glad that you denied the charge. Mr. Ward had told me that you had discussed the matter with him, and that you showed him specimens of the work." That is a complaint made against the inspector by the Resident Commissioner. Now, would you be surprised if a chief inspector told you that he was sorry he could not let you know anything, because Dr. Starke had told him not to do it?—That would depend on what I said him, and I would be surprised if he told me, because, as I told you, I have never sought information with regard to any point from any of the officials that I was not met with the utmost candour. Of course, I do not know what the details of administration were to which reference was made.

8041. No; but could not a Commissioner be able to know everything?—Yes.

8042. Administration as well as everything else?—Yes.

8043. Even in details of administration, ought not a Commissioner to know, or to get an opportunity of knowing, if he wishes to know?—I have noted on that. That is all I can say.

8044. Then with regard to appeals to the Board, Dr. Starke says:—"I have decided not to bring your appeal before the Board. You are not entitled to appeal against a decision of mine which does not affect you personally." Do you agree that the rules have given Dr. Starke the power to refuse?—I do not know the case at all to which reference is made.

8045. But there is a refusal there to allow an appeal to go before the Board?—I am under the impression that if an inspector appeals he can come to the Board.

8046. Mr. HENLY.—But that was the chief inspector, Mr. Purser?—You see, I do not know what the case is.

8047. The CHAIRMAN.—You notice that there is a qualification in that letter:—"On a matter not affecting you personally." He would not allow him to appeal on a matter not affecting him personally; but you say you would give the inspector a right of appealing on any question?—It would depend on what the question was.

8048. Mr. HENLY.—The question was this—A report was given on the school at Clonduff. Mr. Purser, chief inspector, went down and he reported that that school was under-marked. He then wanted to bring his report on that school before the Board, to get what he considered justice done to the teacher, and that was refused, and then he asked to appeal. What is referred to in that letter is that he wished to appeal so as to have his report on the school laid before the Board. That was what was refused by Dr. Starke?—Were there not some complications in the matter, that Mr. Purser went at a time when he should not have gone, or something of this kind, or in opposition to some express statement of the Commissioner or something of this kind?

8049. The CHAIRMAN.—What happened was that the letter of a teacher was referred to Mr. Purser for his observations, and Mr. Purser, relying on Clause 5 of the Directions to Chief Inspectors, considered that he had a right to go down and see that teacher and inspect the school, and he sent in a report on that?—Did Dr. Starke dispute that?

8050. Dr. Starke said that he had no right to go without special instructions in that particular case.

Sir HIRSH WILKINSON.—He also said that he had rebuked Mr. Lemass for not telling him not to go; so that it seemed as if it was the absence of an order not

to go that left it in Mr. Purser's mind that he could go as a matter of course. Those were the conditions?—Of course, you will have Dr. Starke before you, and I think you will have another Commissioner before you who is almost of this.

8051. But you were good enough to come and give us all the information you could as to the position held by the Commissioner. We wish to get from each Commissioner what his own idea is of the duties of the Commissioners, and if we do not consider that a proper idea is entertained, we may have to make a recommendation on the subject?—Yes.

8052. Now, here is another point. In a letter of the 12th July, Dr. Starke says:—"Of course, I could not conduct the administration if Commissioners behind my back discussed questions with officials." And then he says:—"I am the final authority on detail of administration." You are surprised to hear that, I should think, from your own experience?—I have never discussed things with officials in any hostile spirit to the Resident Commissioner; but I have discussed all sorts of questions with officials.

8053. Mr. COOPER.—Do you not think that you would be free as a Commissioner to discuss matters with officials, even in a hostile spirit to the Resident Commissioner?—I would discuss them with the Resident Commissioner himself.

8054. It is not a question of what you would do; I am talking of your freedom and power as a Commissioner?—I do not know any limit to my power in that direction. I do not say what power I have.

8055. I do not think any right to limitation of the Commissioners' power was ever claimed by any previous Resident Commissioner; because we have it in evidence from Mr. Dowling that on an occasion when a certain Commissioner asked him for information which he knew was to be used in opposition to the then Resident Commissioner, he consulted Mr. Badington about it before giving the information, and he asked Mr. Badington:—"Can I give it?" and he replied:—"Certainly; every Commissioner has the same right as I have to obtain all information available."—My experience is that I could obtain all the information available.

8056. Mr. HENLY.—I have not very much to ask you. Now, you think that the Commissioners have been subjected to unreasonable criticism?—I think so.

8057. What grounds have you for considering that?—I mentioned one or two points by way of illustration.

8058. What were they?—I mentioned, for instance, the question of the balances, and the sin we are committing by returning any of the balances, and the denunciations we are receiving on account of that. I also mentioned the standard numbers in the grades, and other things.

8059. Who was it that proposed the standard numbers first?—I was not there.

8060. If they were proposed by the Commissioners to the Treasury, we have evidence that they were, are you not responsible for it?—No.

8061. I mean the whole body of Commissioners?—I understand you, but I will tell you what I mean. We have again and again applied to the Treasury and said:—"These standard numbers do not meet the conditions of the case at present," and when a refusal was returned to that, what could we do?

8062. But what I want to bring out is this, that they were proposed originally by the Commissioners themselves to the Treasury?—Yes.

8063. And you publish to the rules year after year that the standard numbers of teachers in each grade shall be fixed from time to time by the Commissioners?—We cannot fix them without the consent of the Treasury.

8064. But do you not put that in here?—Perhaps it was understood.

8065. And you publish year after year that you had the power of varying the numbers in each grade, that they would be fixed from time to time by the Commissioners, and that being so, was it not reasonable that the teachers should grumble?—Yes, if they understood that we had the power to fix them.

8066. You stated that in the Rules?—I do not really know the point. I know that we cannot do it apart

from the consent of the Treasury, and I know that we have applied for it and the Treasury have not given their consent.

8967. Just before the adjournment you asked were you not to be questioned about Clonmel. Now, will you tell us what you know of the Clonmel case and of the Belfast case?—I said in my short memorandum that I had been absent of these cases and the action of the Commissioners in those cases. What exactly is your point?

8968. What was your attitude as a Commissioner with reference to those cases—what action did you take to make yourself acquainted with the facts of these two particular cases?—I simply attended the Board regularly, and heard all that was brought up and formed an opinion thereon.

8969. You know, of course, that there was a considerable difference in the marking between Mr. Welpy and his predecessor, Mr. Brown, and there was a considerable difference between the marking of Mr. Welpy and the marking of other inspectors, and knowing that, would it not in your opinion be natural that the teachers in that circuit should be dissatisfied?—I am not denying that at all.

8970. Do you know if any of them appealed individually for re-examination or re-inspection of their schools?—No, I am not acquainted with that. I am acquainted with the fact that a general complaint came up.

8971. But before that general complaint are you aware whether any of the teachers appealed, and that their appeals were refused?—That has not come before me so far as I remember.

8972. You are not aware of that?—No.

8973. Then after some time a considerable number of the teachers appealed?—Yes.

8974. Do you know when that appeal was received in the office?—I would not remember that.

8975. It was received in June, I think, and do you know at what time any action was taken to inquire whether the teachers had grounds for appeal or not?—I know there was considerable delay, but I do not know the exact time.

8976. Do you think it was right to make that delay?—I think various questions intervened, and one point was the action to be taken in view of that appeal from the teachers. That engaged a good deal of our time and attention. We had, or we thought we had, made ample provision to meet the Belfast case.

8977. Never mind the Belfast case?—But you are taking them out of their order, and I am only explaining to you how we dealt with them. We had sent our two chief inspectors there, and we thought that that would fairly meet the conditions of the case. We found (without saying a word against the inspectors) that the teachers were greatly dissatisfied in Belfast. Then the Clonmel problem came before us as to what we were to do in face of a somewhat similar complaint, and it exercised us a good deal, at any rate it exercised me a good deal, and thinking over it, I said to myself there is no use in going in the direction of sending the two chief inspectors down to Clonmel. I do not say that I was the party who made the suggestion first, nor do I say that I took any leading part, but I conferred with Dr. Starke. My idea was that the only resources left for us was to ask Dr. Starke and Mr. Dilworth to go down to Clonmel. That was discussed in various ways, and it eventually came before the Board, and the Board agreed. Is that as far as you want me to go?

8978. Now when Dr. Starke and Mr. Dilworth went down to inquire into a technical matter, as to whether those schools were under-marked or over-marked, will you tell us what training either Dr. Starke or Mr. Dilworth had to perform such a delicate duty as you entrusted them with?—The training was this, that Dr. Starke had visited schools largely, and gone into matters as they came up there, and Mr. Dilworth had done the same, and, in my opinion (I am only speaking for myself), I regarded those two men as the very best that we could select for that special work. Their training was in the direction of large experience of the schools.

8979. Had they ever inspected schools?—Yes.

8980. Inspected schools as inspectors?—No, they had not inspected schools to determine the marks for teachers, but they had examined the school work, and all that, and they had compared what they saw with the inspector's reports, etc. The whole question had been before them very closely.

8981. But had you not an officer whose special duty it was to make inquiries into matters of that kind, that is Mr. Furner?—With regard to that we had sent Mr. Furner and Mr. Hyman to Belfast, and I do not say at all they failed, but, at any rate, the teachers were very much dissatisfied, and it was because we found that the teachers were very much dissatisfied that we did not turn to the chief inspectors again on that occasion.

8982. How many teachers complained in Belfast—how many signed that memorial?—I cannot say. I do not really remember the number. There were a good many.

8983. Did you ask Mr. Furner and Mr. Hyman to go and re-inspect all the schools of those teachers who had signed that memorial or who complained of unjust marking?—In regard to Belfast, what was done was that they were asked to go, and the arrangement was that they would take, say, every fifth school, to select, say, every fifth school and inspect it. The fifth may not be the right number. They did not select schools. The list was there, and they took a certain number.

8984. I concede that they were not specially selected?—That is all I want to make clear.

8985. Did the report in those cases agree in every instance with the reports of the previous inspectors?—I do not really know.

8986. I think the facts will show that they did not, and yet although in some cases they differed, was there any attempt on the part of the Commissioners to adjust properly the merit marks after their review of the cases?—All that I know is, that in the main the chief inspectors agreed with the ordinary inspectors.

8987. But in some cases they differed?—That is likely enough.

8988. Then in those cases in which they did differ, did the Commissioners take any steps to redress the grievances of which the teachers complained?—I do not think they altered the mark.

8989. And then would it not be reasonable to expect that the Belfast teachers would be dissatisfied on two grounds—first, that all the schools that complained were not examined or inspected, and secondly, that in those cases in which the chief inspectors differed from the other inspectors still the mark remained?—There might be ground for complaints in certain cases, but what I say is that in the main they agreed.

8990. No matter about the mark; there were a number of appeals, and in some cases the chief inspectors decided in favour of those who appealed, and yet the Commissioners granted them no redress, and I say, would it not be natural that under such circumstances the teachers of Belfast should continue to be dissatisfied?—Those who found that their mark was not as good as the chief inspectors said it ought to be would have ground of complaint. It affected them.

8991. And would not the others whose cases were not reviewed still have cause of dissatisfaction?—Well, of course, but the idea evidently was, "How does the case stand, taken as a general rule?"

8992. But the general rule does not apply. Supposing that I am teaching a school it is nothing to me what the general rule with regard to the inspector's judgment may be, but it is a matter of importance what his judgment is on my own particular school?—Looking at it in that way, a teacher might have grounds to complain, but you see what evidently the idea of the Commissioners was—they desired to know how the case stood generally.

8993. But you did find out that in some cases the marking was wrong in the opinion of your own senior officers, and still nothing was done?—You could not exactly say that nothing was done. You could say that those teachers who should have got a higher mark had grounds to complain.

8994. And there was nothing done for them?—Not so far as I remember.

30th April, 1913.]

REV. J. CONNERY CLARKE, D.D.

[Continued.]

8995. Now, coming back to Clonmel, was not Mr. Purser then the officer that ought to have been sent down to investigate those cases?—I have indicated to you why we did not make that arrangement.

8996. You did ultimately send down Mr. Hynes?—We only sent down Mr. Hynes in order to examine a remnant of cases.

8997. But why not the whole of them?—Simply because we came to the conclusion we did, in view of the position taken up by the Belfast teachers when the two chief inspectors were sent to investigate their case, and one of those chief inspectors was regarded as a friend of the teachers.

8998. Who was that?—Mr. Purser.

8999. Mr. HURLEY.—Do you classify inspectors that way?—No, I am not classifying them, I am simply quoting what was said of one of them by the teachers.

9000. Are these other inspectors who were known as the enemies of the teachers?—Not that I know of, but I am simply taking an expression that has been used in regard to Mr. Purser.

9001. Mr. CONNERY.—Who used the expression?—I could not tell you, but I have seen that somewhere, that they had confidence in Mr. Purser.

9002. Mr. HURLEY.—In any case you sent down Mr. Hynes?—To examine a remnant of the cases.

9003. Why a remnant?—How were these selected down in Clonmel district?—So far as I know, the only matter in regard to selection was as regards those schools that were favourable to the teachers. The positions of those schools were favourable, and they were visited by Mr. Hynes. It was not with the idea of taking any cases that would be unfavourable or harmful to the teachers.

9004. That is, you submitted to Mr. Hynes only those cases which you thought would be most favourable to the teachers?—Yes, that their case would be most favourably examined by the Inspector.

9005. Now take the case of Leaghmore Boys' School. The report that was given to that school was "Excellent"?—Yes.

9006. Now how could anything more favourable come for that teacher than to get the highest mark that is awarded?—I do not know the individual case.

9007. It is this. What had the teacher of that school to gain by having his case reviewed, the teacher of Leaghmore School which had received the mark of "Excellent"?—I suppose that was one of the cases returned, and not visited by Mr. Starke and Mr. Dilworth. I do not know. The teacher may have been one of those who joined in the memorial, but I am really not able to answer any question with regard to it. I do not know the individual case.

9008. Then you are not aware that individual appeals came up, and that a joint appeal came up in June, and that an inspector was sent down to review them, if I remember aright, in November, and that Mr. Dilworth, in writing to them, complained that the case was made difficult, and that the appeal should have been made without avoidable delay in the interest of all parties concerned?—That was one of our difficulties.

9009. But you yourselves delayed from June to November before you took any action to inquire into the matter?—Yes.

9010. Now under these circumstances, the teachers appealing individually, as I am informed they did, and then collectively after a long delay, are they to be blamed for the delay which was not theirs? Would it not be natural for those teachers to feel aggrieved?—They certainly were not blamed for delay from the time that their complaint came before us.

9011. They were blamed for making delay, when it would naturally take some time for the teachers to find out what was the state of marking all over the country?—Of course, we may have been wrong in blaming them; they may have only taken a reasonable time, but I am only telling you what happened.

9012. Looking at the matter calmly here now, do you think it is a proper way to treat teachers when they send up an appeal of that kind to have six or seven of the cases reviewed?—That is not the position. The position in regard to Clonmel is, that the main part of the review was made by Dr. Starke and Mr. Dilworth.

9013. Has Dr. Starke sent in a report of his on that to the Board?—Certainly.

9014. When did he report?—I do not know, but when he came back I know certainly that I had a long conversation with Dr. Starke, and tried to make out definitely how matters stood. I had also a long conversation with Mr. Dilworth to try and make out the position for myself, and the matter came definitely, and at length before the Board.

9015. In writing?—I think so. I know Dr. Starke had it.

9016. Had it in writing?—Had it in writing; I do not mean as a report. That part is not so clear to me, but we had a good deal of it read out.

9017. Had you any idea of the length of the time Dr. Starke spent in each school?—I think I may at the time have had a pretty fair idea, but I do not know.

9018. We heard incidentally that his visit extended to twenty minutes and sometimes thirty?—But he was accompanied by Mr. Dilworth, and Mr. Dilworth took the one side and he took the other.

9019. What do you mean by the one side?—One department in connection with the school, say Mr. Dilworth would take the mathematical side, and then Dr. Starke would go on with the other side.

9020. And do you think now that Dr. Starke or Mr. Dilworth could determine whether the schools were justly marked or not by spending ten or fifteen or twenty minutes in them?—I am not committing myself to the statement, but I do believe that both Dr. Starke and Mr. Dilworth went into the matter sufficiently to be able to come to a definite conclusion.

9021. Have the Commissioners ever, as a body, entrusted the secretary with the duty of an inspector?—No, they have not, as far as I know.

9022. And why did you send out the secretary to review the work of the inspectors?—Well, the reason was what I have indicated. We had used the inspectors (the best we had) for the Belfast case, had sent them to Belfast, and after they had given their report, it made things worse instead of making them better, I am afraid; but I have said already that I am not blaming the inspectors.

9023. Mr. HURLEY.—I quite see why you sent the secretary and the Resident Commissioner. Do you now agree with me that it was an error of judgment to send them?—I would not be disposed to say that; I might say this, that under the circumstances I believe even now that we did the best thing.

9024. And the visit of the secretary and the Resident Commissioner produced content?—Unfortunately it did not.

9025. Then will you agree with me that it was an error of judgment to send them?—No, I would not even agree with you in regard to that.

9026. Mr. HURLEY.—If the teachers in the Clonmel district, when they appealed, had the right, according to your own rules and regulations, of having their cases reviewed by a senior inspector, had they not still just ground of dissatisfaction in having merely a passing visit or a short visit from an officer who had not been trained in inspection work and from the Resident Commissioner?—What I say is, that it was a very difficult position, and I still hold, in view of all the facts of the case, that we did the right thing. That is, we had exhausted our power in the direction of inspection by coupling Mr. Hynes and Mr. Purser, and then by coupling them to them, and it was because we were committing that work to them, and it was because we felt (and I was closely in touch with this matter) that we could not send these two officers down to Clonmel with a hope that we were going to solve the question. It was for that reason that we sent those that, in our opinion, are very fair-minded men, and kindly in all their relations with the teachers, and who had great experience in examining schools.

9027. I could follow that line of reasoning if Dr. Starke and Mr. Dilworth, no matter how indifferently they may have made a report on schools individually, said whether the marks were too high or too low, and recommended such an alteration or adjustment of the marks as they thought necessary, but so far as we are aware, they did nothing of the kind, and then you ultimately fell back on Mr. Hynes?—In regard to comparatively few cases, and in regard to particular cases that were entirely favourable to the teachers.

9028. But what about that case that was "Excluded"?—I cannot deal with the details.

9029. Was it not natural then that there would be discontent in Chesham under those circumstances?—I can tell you that we did our best to meet the case.

9030. Mr. KERRAN.—But your best did not meet the case?—Well, it did not. It is very possible that at that time nothing could have met the case. Looking at it afterwards, what I have to do is to tell you that we honestly tried to meet the case according to our knowledge.

9031. That we have no difficulty in behaving. The whole point is whether the system permits of the case being met?—We honestly tried to meet it.

9032. Mr. BRYAN.—Now after the Belfast cases were tried some of the teachers were awarded by the inspectors higher marks than they got from the local inspectors. Why, if you wanted to meet the case, were not those marks raised?—Well, I really only say that it evidently was intended to deal with the case generally, and you may say that we should have got into each particular case, and I am not going to dispute that.

9033. You should have?—I am not going to dispute it.

9034. And if a mark were found to be either too high or too low, should it not have been lowered or raised as the anomaly of the case required?—I say I do not want to dispute that.

9035. You think that ought to have been done. You say that you called up the 22 senior inspectors to try to get uniformity after the Belfast case. Will you tell me what directions you gave them in order to secure uniformity in the future?—Of course, you will be able to get those because a circular was sent out.

9036. A circular was sent out as a result of that conference?—That is my recollection; that it was sent out as a result of that conference.

9037. Because we applied for every circular issued by the Board, and we got a large number, but as far as my recollection goes, we did not get one as a result of that conference?—I cannot give you a definite answer, whether it was a result of that conference.

9038. Were you present at that?—Yes. My recollection is that a circular was issued after the Belfast case; it may not possibly have been done exactly to the Belfast business, but I believe it was.

9039. Mr. HARRISON.—Would there have been a memorandum taken of the proceedings of the conference?—I do not know that there would be a memorandum of the conference.

Mr. HENRY.—The report of the chief inspectors on Belfast is dated the 6th of February, 1911.

The CHAIRMAN.—The circular of June, 1911, is the circular in question.

9040. Mr. HENRY.—Then it was the famous tone circular, I suppose?—That may have been part of it. In addition, of course, there was a long conference, and a statement was made by the Resident Commissioner on behalf of the Commissioners in the direction of urging upon the inspectors to seek to cultivate kindly feelings, and so on.

9041. What I was anxious to know was this, over and above a friendly talk were there any steps taken, or were positive directions given to inspectors in the matter as far as you know?—I believe that there were steps taken to advise the inspectors as to what the Commissioners wished, but as to dealing with the mark that had been given, I do not know anything that was done in connection with them.

9042. According to your own rule, had not all those teachers a right to have their cases reviewed?—Yes, of course they had.

9043. But they were not?—The individual cases, so far as I know, did not come up before us.

9044. There is a point on which I feel very keenly—the treatment that some old teachers are getting under the system at the present time. If you carry your mind back thirty years, when salaries were lower than they are at present, you will remember that a number of teachers were taken into the service who perhaps were never very efficient. Well, now, do you think it right to have those teachers turned adrift at the pre-

sent time on pensions sometimes amounting to £30, £40, and £50 a year?—All I can say in regard to that is, speaking generally, that we deal with each case as justly as we possibly can, and we are as patient as we know how, and it is only as a last resort that we say to a man, in the interest of the pupils, "We cannot continue you."

9045. Mr. KERRAN.—Do you ever repent in your report to the Government of the day that if your financial resources were somewhat larger you could deal more generously with those teachers?—Yes; of course, we have urged the question of the pension scheme again and again.

9046. And if your financial resources were larger, would you deal more generously with them?—We certainly would; there is no question about that.

9047. Mr. HENRY.—But that is the question. Those people were taken into your service; they have worked long, and I think, according to their lights, they have worked faithfully. They are no different as perhaps they have been at any time, and now it is right to turn them adrift penniless when they are worth for anything else?—I just say, as regards that, that as Commissioners we are as patient, and we endeavour to be in each case as kindly as we know how.

9048. Mr. KERRAN.—But you still turn the people adrift, do you not?—Yes, occasionally about that.

9049. Mr. HENRY.—Must it not have come to your notice that a number of teachers have been threatened with dismissal at the present time in the County of Wicklow?—Such cases have come before us.

9050. Have you not had two cases of teachers of 34 years' service in Delphin's Barn, Dublin?—I do not know whether we had any in Delphin's Barn or not. We had two or three down in Wexford.

9051. Or Wicklow?—Possibly Wicklow.

9052. And does it not strike you as peculiar that you only meet these cases of insufficiency in particular localities and at particular times—they are not all over Ireland?—I do not think you can say that we do it in any particular locality.

9053. The cases only arise in particular localities and at particular times?—I do not think you can say that.

9054. We have that circuit of South Dublin with a number of teachers at present under dismissal. Can you point to another circuit in Ireland where you have the same number of teachers under dismissal as that?—I know that we have circuits in which teachers' cases are being examined and their services dispensed with.

9055. Many?—I could not tell how many. I would not really be able to differentiate as to circuits or special districts. It is the teacher's record that comes before us in Dublin, and, in my opinion, everything that is reasonable is done.

9056. But still they go?—There are some going, but it is only when we cannot help it.

9057. But do you really inquire whether they are as efficient now as they have been all the time?—We wait, and we examine, and so on, year after year, and it is only when nothing else can be done that we agree to it.

9058. Mr. KERRAN.—Who examines?—We have the reports of the inspectors, and then we have special reports, and so on.

9059. Is it the modern inspectors?—Not necessarily.

9060. The modern inspector examines the old teacher?—No, you have some of the older inspectors.

9061. But the point is, that very great hardship is inflicted. I know it before this Committee was established, and I have known in greater detail since, and there are cases in which, in my opinion, most scandalous injustice has been inflicted upon some of these old teachers. They were incompetent when they were taken on, and they were never competent, and then you improve your standard of education, and you turn them adrift?—We give them all that we can, and we only dispense with their services when we really feel that we cannot do anything else.

9062. Mr. BRYAN.—Take, for instance, the cases in South Wicklow at the present time. Have you done anything more than just read over the reports of the inspector in the circuit?—We have sent our senior

inspectors there on occasion. We send our head inspectors or chief of inspection, and we have done everything that seems to me possible.

9053. I am asking you a definite question. Was the chief inspector sent to review these cases in Wicklow—some of them have been communicated to us by letter, a copy of which we sent over to the office?—Yes, I know.

9054. Was the chief inspector sent down to review those cases or not?—I really cannot tell you.

9055. As far as your knowledge goes?—We have cases before us for years, and we have the record in the books for years sent to us and considered, and if there is any possible way of allowing them to remain, we are quite willing to do it.

9056. We had a record here, a rather unique one, in which everything that could be said against a teacher was in the record, and there was nothing in his favour?—I am sorry for that.

9057. Is that the case of record you get?—No, we get the ordinary inspector's record, and I very often find if there is anything good to be said about the teacher the inspectors are quite ready to say it.

9058. Even assuming that these teachers are not as efficient as we would like to see them, considering that perhaps, as Mr. Keble has put it, they were never efficient, still as they were taken into the service and kept in the service till they were unfit for anything else, is it right to turn them adrift on the road?—We do not turn them adrift on the road. If we can keep them for full pension we do it.

9059. For full pension?—If we can possibly do it, and it is only when we really cannot do it in the interest of the district and of education that we anticipate the time that they should retire.

9060. Would it not be natural that their cases should be reviewed by a chief inspector?—A senior inspector reviews them.

9061. I know a senior inspector does?—And if we think there is anything in the case that we think should be looked into, you may be sure that we would send one of the chiefs of inspection.

9062. It was not done in Belfast or Clonmel if my information is right?—With regard to Belfast, we did send a chief of inspection.

9063. To examine a few of the cases?—Under the arrangement that I have told you.

9064. And now do you think it right that under the present arrangement an inspector may go into a school and report on that school, and have the report made without asking a single question, as we have it in evidence?—I do not think he should. At any rate, I do not see how he could.

9065. We have been told that he could?—I do not know how he could. The general rule is that if you are going to lower the mark, you should certainly get a sufficient examination.

9066. I know, but is it done?—So far as I know it is, but can you point to any case?

9067. That is not the evidence of your own officials here?—I do not know.

9068. Now, in the interest of the pupils, do you think that they should be tested or examined on all their work in the school?—In certain schools it may not be necessary, only on an occasion; but they should not be examined on the whole programme at all, because that would largely bring us back to the results system, and would prevent proper inspection, but the inspector should certainly know what is the character of the work that is being done.

9069. What I want to know is, how can he know it without questioning the pupils?—I indicate to you that if he is perfectly persuaded that the school is going on all right, he may, on a given occasion, test it by simply looking at the general course of things, that is, if he is persuaded that the school is going right.

9070. How could he be persuaded?—He would have to get an idea of what the teacher is doing, and in that case, of course, he would not at all lower the mark, and, so far as I am personally concerned, my view is that if I went into a school, I would take

particular means to see, at any rate, some part of the school as to how it was going on.

9071. That is, by examining the children?—I would like to examine only very few. Very likely I would prefer to hear the teacher teaching a class.

9072. But how could you judge of the efficiency of the work of the school by having the teacher teach?—I would know a good deal of what the teacher was doing in the school, and what he was capable of doing, by his teaching.

9073. How could you infer that he did as good work the day before, or that he would do as good work the day succeeding?—It is really wonderful what you can learn when you go in and just look at a school, and listen to the teacher, and so on; but at the same time I am saying that I believe in testing the school by examination in its literary work, and all the work incidentally. What we want to get rid of is the individual examination of the pupils.

9074. Why?—Simply because the inspector cannot do it. I do not know what staff you would have in order that the inspector might do it. That was the great harm of the certificate system.

9075. I do not think so; but remember this. You had a much larger attendance in the schools in the days of the results than at the present time, and you had not a larger staff of inspectors, and they were quite able to do the work, and they did the work?—Well, they did not do it to their own satisfaction, and they visited the schools more seldom than they should visit them, and then they had to spend their strength on seeing whether this pupil passed in this subject and that other subject, whereas what you really need is to know how the school is going on.

9076. Now, if you had a son going to school, would you not, as a parent, as a member of the public paying taxes, have a right to know how your son was doing?—I always did know.

9077. How?—My boys went to the model school, and there were judgment cards, and I was at home pretty often, and I knew pretty well what work they were doing at home, and so on.

9078. And how could the judgment cards enable you to tell whether they were really making progress or not?—Because those judgment cards, and I have got numbers of them, showed me how the boy was doing, and how he was going on. If I saw on the card that he was making an effort being third to get second, or if I saw that he was keeping top, and so on, it would give me a fair idea of what he was doing.

9079. Now, in justification of the claim that has been made with reference to appeal, could you tell us what was that case in Lisburn that you referred to?—That was where a manager gave a teacher notice. The teacher got three months' notice, and he appealed against that, and though I may say that I thought the manager was hardly dealt with in certain particulars the teacher gained his appeal.

9080. Now, were the Commissioners' reference in that case?—I have been told by Mr. Coffey that they were.

9081. Mr. Coffey. I have said that they were possibly references?—It was only because Mr. Coffey said that possibly they were references that I had any doubt about it, because my own opinion about that was altogether that that was a definite appeal to the Commissioners.

9082. And now will you tell us under which of your rules are you justified in stepping between the teacher and the manager, and saying that the teacher must be kept, irrespective of the manager's wishes, for that is what is really involved in this case?—No, you cannot really say that.

9083. How?—All that you can say is that the manager was not justified in giving the dismissal.

9084. But the manager, according to your own rules, has the right of appointing and dismissing teachers subject to giving them three months' notice unless there is a reference?—Yes, but in this case we came to the conclusion, that is, the Commissioners came to the conclusion, that the manager had not a sufficient reason for giving notice.

9085. I grant that, but I want to know by what rule?—And then, of course, the manager could insist



30th April, 1913.]

Rev. J. CONWAY CLARK, D.D.

[Continued.]

on that notice being carried out, and then the only thing that the Commissioners can say is: "Well, we will not support you in appointing a successor," or we can say: "You have so tried as manager that we will hold an inquiry under rule 48 as to your fitness to remain manager, in view of what has been done." I think that is the position.

9096. Have you ever heard of the Cloudeff case?—I have heard of it, but you need not ask me any questions, because I know little or nothing about it.

9097. We have evidence that the marking of that school was lowered to "middling," and then that the chief inspector, Mr. Purser, visited that school, and Mr. Purser reported that the mark on the school ought to be raised to "good"?—Yes.

9097A. Now, I suppose I need not ask you did that report come before you as a Commissioner, that is, Mr. Purser's report?—Not as far as I remember.

9098. There was a case where a teacher appealed the very next day after the visit of the inspector, and the chief inspector went down, re-inspected the school, and spent a long time there. He reported that the school was under marked, and that the mark ought to be raised to "good," and yet that report did not go before your Board, and the mark remained. Now, do you think that is a satisfactory state of affairs to have?—Yes, as I have indicated already, I do not know the details of that case.

9099. But apart from the details?—If the case is simply this, that a school is inspected, gets a certain mark, there is an appeal against that, and in the ordinary and regular course the chief of inspection goes down and gives his report—well, then, I think, there is a good ground for saying that that report should be dealt with.

9100. It should have gone before the Board?—There is that arrangement of 1902, and the question of its extent is a difficult one.

9101. But apart from 1902 there you have a concrete case where a school, in the opinion of the chief inspector, is undermarked, and where he reports that that is so. I am not saying that the Commissioners ought to have adopted that report, but to my mind that report should have gone before the Commissioners, and it did not go; and I ask you is it a satisfactory state of affairs that a report of that kind, when it comes up from a chief inspector, is not laid before you?—If I have got all the facts of the case, I would say that it would be desirable that that report should come before me, but I understand that it was not a simple case of that kind. However, I do not know.

9102. Now, up to 1902, all the reports coming into the Education Office were read?—Read by whom?

9103. By the chiefs of inspection, as they were then?—Yes.

9104. Do you think it is a satisfactory arrangement to have that work of reading these reports, and noting the action to be taken, and admonishing and reprimanding teachers, done by clerks, called examiners, who have never examined a school, without the matter going before you, as Commissioners, at all?—The work would be simply impossible if the Commissioners, as a body, had to undertake it.

9105. But do you think it is right to have a clerk dealing with those reports, and reprimanding teachers, without that work being subject to review by some higher authority?—But is it not subject to a higher authority?

9107. We have it on the word of Mr. Purser that even when the inspector does not recommend any action to be taken, he himself, after reading the report, will send out a reprimand on his own authority?—I cannot answer you as to the practice in regard to it.

9107. But assuming that I am right in that, in representing Mr. Purser's evidence, do you think that that would be a satisfactory arrangement?—That is that the report comes before the examiner, and on the report of the examiner a reprimand may go to a teacher?

9108. May go to a teacher without going to a higher authority?—I do not regard that as satisfactory.

9109. That is the arrangement that you have at the present time?—I do not know.

Mr. KATTE.—It is not on the report of the examiner, but it is the examiner himself who sends the reprimand.

9110. The CHAIRMAN.—Has this become known to you for the first time, so that all Professor Herby mentioned if you never heard of this before?—That on the examiner's action alone reprimands are sent out to teachers?

9111. Yes?—I did not know that before.

9112. Mr. KATTE.—It is also to be understood that there is no personal attack on Mr. Purser. Mr. Purser struck me as being an extremely able man, but he had purely office experience?—Yes.

9113. He has had no experience of inspection?—No. The CHAIRMAN.—He seemed to me to be a very careful official.

9114. Mr. HERBY.—The point I was anxious to get out is this. What has been alluded to by the Chairman, and what I am sure is the opinion held very largely throughout the country, is that the Commissioners, as a body, are not really aware of the systems which they are said to be administering, or the rules which are being carried out, and we have a striking case here in illustration of that, that you say that you were not aware of the existence, on their own initiative, sending reprimands to teachers?—I say that.

9115. When such a state of things as that can exist, is it wonderful that dissatisfaction should prevail among the teachers?—I do not know whether it is wonderful or not. I am only telling you what has happened.

9116. But we know that there is dissatisfaction and discontent, and I am asking you is it not a natural thing that that should arise in such a state of administration as we have at the present time?—It depends on how the examiners do their work, and their competency for the work.

9117. Now, we had Mr. Hynde here giving evidence, and his evidence was that had the reports still continued to be read by the chief inspectors, a great portion of this difficulty would not have arisen and we had Mr. Gill here from the Department of Agriculture and Technical Instruction, who stated expressly that all the reports coming up to the Department from the inspectors in the districts are all read and reviewed by the chief inspector; and then we have the opposite state of affairs in the Education Office, with dissatisfaction, as far as my information goes, rampant all over the country?—So far as I know, it would be impossible for the chiefs of inspection to do it.

9118. But they did it up to 1902?—No, there was a very different state of affairs: there were the chiefs of inspection, largely office men, and four divisional inspectors.

9119. Six head inspectors?—Six head inspectors engaged just in that special work.

9120. They were not reading reports?—They were largely engaged in this work of review and appeal; and now you are in the position of having all that work that necessarily has to be done as before thrown on the chiefs of inspection, and we, as a Board, have applied to the Treasury several times—at any rate we applied last year (and that was not the first time)—and I need not go beyond that, and it was refused.

9121. Mr. KATTE.—Applied for what?—For what you may call the head inspectors, for divisional inspectors.

9122. Mr. HERBY.—But it was on the motion of the Board itself that the head inspectors were abolished?—It may have been; I was not there.

9123. And now they feel that they want to go back to the arrangement that they had before?—I know that is one of the points on which I have been very urgent, so far as I could be urgent, as a member of the official body.

9124. The CHAIRMAN.—Did I understand you to say that you applied to the Treasury to provide means for six new divisional inspectors?—I think it was four. They would be satisfied with four, because they would no longer have the work in the office.

9125. Who answers your letters?—They go through the Chief Secretary's Office.

30th April, 1913.]

Rev. J. COURTESY CLARKE, D.D.

[Continued.]

9126. Mr. HENRY.—What is your opinion as to these marks on the school?—That was an arrangement in force when I came.

9127. What is your opinion of them?—My candid opinion is that if I were an inspector, I would find it very difficult work; but it might be that if I had experience in dealing with the worst schools, many things that seem difficult to me would become easy with practice.

9128. Do you know any place in the world where the schools are classified in that way except Ireland?—I do not know, but such places may exist.

9129. Do you think it right to keep your teachers 36 years under your present system before they can get from the bottom to the top?—I would be very glad if they could get there sooner.

9130. Do you think that a wise arrangement to provide that they should have to wait 36 years?—I really do not know. It is largely a matter of money.

9131. But it was not a matter of money up to 1907?—But it was a matter of money of the change, because as I understand (though this is not within my own knowledge) the Commissioners in their new arrangement were not to go beyond the expense of the old arrangement, and they have to cut their coat according to their cloth.

9132. But in the proposal they made they proposed a saving of about £50,000?—I did not know that they saved anything.

9133. What would be your opinion of an annual increment to teachers instead of a triennial one?—If we could get the money, I would be very agreeable.

9134. But even with the same amount of money that we have at present an distributed that the teachers could get an annual increment?—I do not object to annual increments; if we had a system of inspection that would guarantee that every teacher was doing his duty and deserved an annual increment, I would not quarrel with it at all.

9135. A scheme of annual increments and involving an increased grant has been proposed by His Lordship the Bishop of Here, in which there would be a larger initial salary and a smaller increment than at present coming annually and automatically, or at least as long as the teacher escaped censure or was doing fairly satisfactory work. Would you approve of that?—I would have no reason to disapprove of it. I would need to look at it more carefully, and see how it would work out. I quite agree that the initial salary, especially in the case of women, is too small.

9136. And what about the men, who are the most costly animals?—I am only looking at the amount.

9137. Then you think that the initial salary of both should be raised?—I would not at all object. It is a very difficult thing at first to make the salaries meet the natural and normal expenditure.

9138. You gave us a qualified opinion as to whether the schools are improving under the present system, and you said that some people say they are and some people say they are not?—That is pretty much the question I have gathered; but I think I went further, did I not? At any rate I might have gone further and said that efforts are made by the teachers in the direction of cultivating the intelligence of the pupils, and that I think there is a good deal being done in that direction more than was done formerly.

9139. In all subjects?—Their general intelligence.

9140. But how is that general intelligence to be measured?—Well, some things are not easily measured, and yet you might come to the conclusion that they exist. For instance, I go into a school of boys or girls, and I may put questions to them, and I see that they are intelligent and that their intelligence is being cultivated, and they will make an effort to face something that they did not know and still they will try it, and you will help them a little till they come to a conclusion, and there may be some others that you cannot help at all, as their intelligence is in some way or other undeveloped. I am afraid that under the present system there was no attempt to cultivate the intelligence of the children. They had to make up certain things, and that was the main thing to get done.

9141. Mr. CORRY.—Do you think it is a mark of intelligence for a child to attempt to answer something that he does not know anything about?—I do not say that it is, but you might put a question to a child and the child instead of saying "I don't know" begins to think about it, then you put another question that will lead the child on, and the child begins to face it, and you can lead the child on to the answer.

9142. Mr. HARRISON.—You told us that the Commissioners met on one day in the week?—I should say that though they meet fortnightly, we have many meetings of committees.

9143. Is there much committee work?—A good deal of committee work.

9144. Mr. KERR.—How many committees?—There is a Book Committee, and then we have a Committee of the whole Board for quite a number of subjects.

9145. Would you mind telling us the number of the committees and the subjects?—For instance, we met yesterday to receive a deputation representing the Irish Organisers. We have a committee on small schools and a committee of books and subjects as they turn up.

9146. Mr. HARRISON.—Have you any committee that takes appeals?—Not that I know of.

9147. That has never been considered?—No, I do not think so.

9148. But you delegate a certain amount of work to committees, and you delegate a great deal to the Resident Commissioners?—Yes, that is practically what we do. Then, in the matter of appointing inspectors or organisers, and various other matters of that kind, it comes before a committee and we recommend to the Board, and possibly there are others, if I had time to think about it.

9149. Now, would the programme and the Notes to Teachers come before a committee or before the whole Board?—They would come before the whole Board.

9150. And are they carefully considered?—What is done is that they are sent out to the Commissioners beforehand, then they are put on the agenda, if the Commissioners have the time to look into the matter, and whatever points come up are considered, and there are frequent changes.

9151. When those programmes and Notes to Teachers were submitted, did you, as a Commissioner, understand that they were practically the work of the expert officers, that is to say the inspectors, or that they were largely the work of the inside staff?—I believe that it was the work of the inspectors as well as the inside staff.

9152. It is a joint production?—That is what I believe.

9153. That you understood?—Yes.

9154. But you did not make much inquiry?—Not any definite inquiry.

9155. It is quite possible that some of those suggestions may have received their best touches from the inside staff?—It is very likely that the inside staff would have the last word, as they are on the spot.

9156. Was there much debate on those Notes to Teachers?—That depends on the individual Commissioners.

9157. Do you remember that when they have been brought up for revision in your time there was much debate on them?—I do not remember specially the Notes for Teachers, but I remember quite a considerable time spent on various documents that have come before us of that nature. One Commissioner brings up a certain point and another Commissioner will bring up another, and that is discussed, and discussed carefully.

9158. If there has been a considerable divergence of opinion amongst the people who have drawn them up, does that come before you in the way of a sort of minority report, or do you only receive the final draft in, whatever way the majority have settled it on the authority of the Resident Commissioners?—Very often the opinions of the head inspectors on such a matter would be brought before us.

9159. Even if they were slightly divergent from the draft as finally agreed upon?—Oh, yes.

9160. Now, has the whole question of the present system of awarding grants ever been debated by the Board?—Not in my five years.

80th April, 1913.]

REV. J. COURTESAY CLARKE, D.D.

[Continued.]

9151. No motion has ever been made or proposed for a change of system?—No, there has been talk occasionally about these merit marks, and so on. I believe it came before the Board the year before I joined, but I will not say that definitely; but it did not in any way.

9152. Mr. KERRIE.—What was the nature of the talk about the merit marks?—The question has come up in a definite form in this way, that there are too many merit marks, and that the merit marks should be simply, say, "V.G." and "G.," and then another merit mark which might be for "Fair," and then a mark that would be for "Insufficient."

9153. And that has come up before the Board?—Yes, that has been discussed, and I would not wonder that when the thing came before the Board formerly that it was a definite proposal on the part of somebody, but I do not know.

9154. Mr. HARRISON.—You have not known a proposal to alter the whole system of grading schools and grading teachers?—No.

9155. Now, last year two circulars, one of April and one of August, were issued to inspectors. I presume that that was the result of the Belfast and Clonmel cases?—Yes, it was in the desire to arrange matters in connection with the complaints that were made.

9156. Both those circulars seem to show a very considerable distrust of the inspectors by the Commissioners, do they not?—Well, I do not know that that was the intention.

9157. Well, at any rate the gist of what the Commissioners say in this is—The Commissioners wish to impress upon the inspectors the importance of cultivating friendly relations with the teachers, and they deprecate harshness, irritability, fault-finding on slight grounds, etc., etc. That clearly shows on the part of the Commissioners a considerable distrust of their outside staff?—I can say that so far as I was concerned there was no distrust of the inspectors as a whole; but that I thought there were cases in which inspectors should show more discretion.

9158. Mr. KERRIE.—Had you any particular cases?—I do not think I had, and I do not think I would be justified in giving a particular case.

9159. Mr. HARRISON.—How does the outside world regard a circular of that sort?—I do not know.

9160. Would they not naturally be regarded as showing a considerable amount of distrust on your part towards your staff?—I am only telling you what was in my own mind, and I do not consider that we would be justified in being distrustful of the inspectorial staff as a rule.

9161. Can you tell me what would be your conclusion on reading that circular (if you had not been a Commissioner)?—I would need to know much more about it before coming to a conclusion with regard to the matter, but at any rate I know the Commissioners were most anxious to do what they could in order to indicate that those matters were looked into.

9162. And they go on to say that frequent cases of appeal definitely point to a want of good judgment. This is a heavy indictment upon the inspectors, is it not?—Not on the inspectors as a whole.

9163. It is issued to every inspector?—Yes, we have to do that.

9164. And yet in spite of this you yourself took no steps, as I understand, to remove or redress any hardship caused by the offending inspectors. Was there either at Clonmel or Belfast any redress of hardship?—Take the case of Clonmel now.

9165. We will take Belfast first?—The difficulty about Belfast is that you have got a good many inspectors, and I need not tell you that I do not object to that; but take first of all the Clonmel district and Mr. Welby. I inquired as earnestly as I could as to Mr. Welby's marking, and I definitely came to the conclusion that his marking was not above the average or not quite up to the average of the marking of the country.

9166. So what it came to was that the Commissioners threw over entirely their own expert officers, and then failed to redress the grievance of which the teachers

complained?—I admit there was no change of marking; but in regard to the other motions the desire was strong on the part of the Commissioners to lay down rules that would name in a better feeling and all that in future.

9167. Mr. KAVANAGH.—The most important part of the whole thing to my mind is these appeals. Now, I understand from the evidence (I think, of Mr. Delworth), that all teachers' appeals were laid upon the table of the Board at their meeting, is that not?—That is likely enough. I was not dealing with that. Of course, when it is laid on the table it could be brought up by any individual Commissioner.

9168. The teachers complain, at least I think they do, that their appeals do not get to the Board, that they do not get past the Resident Commissioner. But I think it was either Mr. Delworth or Mr. Wyse who said that all appeals were laid upon the table of the Board at every one of their meetings, and I want to know from you: knowledge whether you think that is so?—I fancy I would know it, and I think it is very likely; but I am not going just at the moment to say that it is. I expect it is.

9169. But supposing a teacher in his private capacity writes to you in your private capacity, and begs his case before you, and says he has appealed, do you when you attend the Board call for that appeal?—I am afraid Sir Hiram Wilkinson misunderstood me a bit. I do not think the teachers do write to me over cases of that kind. I have no recollection of anything of the kind coming up before me.

9170. But I understood you to say that a teacher who had a case coming before the Board, which would, of course, be an appeal, would write to you drawing your attention to it?—Yes.

9171. And I suppose they do to other Commissioners besides, and not particularly to you?—Yes, but my part is not drawing attention to matters that come before the Board, but in regard to delay and various other things of that kind that come up.

9172. But the fact remains that appeals do come before the Board, because they are laid on the table?—I think that is correct.

9173. In your experience are the appeals increasing of late years?—I am not able to answer that.

9174. Now, supposing the appeals are not heard by the Board, do you think it is a good system that one man should decide on these appeals, even though he be as able a man as Dr. Sturkie?—I do not know. I have every confidence in Dr. Sturkie.

9175. I am not talking about Dr. Sturkie by himself; but do you think it is a good thing that one man should hear all the appeals?—If it were of all convenient, I think it would be likely a better plan that there should be three, or something of that kind.

9176. But would you approve of an Appeal Committee of the Board being formed?—The difficulty is as to the time the Commissioners have at their disposal for deciding all appeals.

9177. But I put it to you in this way. Do you not think that appeals form one of the most important subjects that could come before the Board?—Oh, it is an important subject.

9178. And if there were a great number of appeals in the year, it would save time?—Certainly. I have no objection to that arrangement.

9179. You say there is a good feeling between the inspectors and teachers, so far as you know?—What I have said was that there is a great deal of good feeling between the inspectors and teachers.

9180. Have you had experience of many inspectors?—I have had, in one way and another. Of course, there are inspectors coming into districts and changing, and so on.

9181. Are you a school manager?—Our people go to the model school.

9182. Have you found much difference in the marking of the different inspectors?—Do you mean from my personal experience?

9183. Yes?—I could not say that. I have not gone so closely into it that I would be able to answer from my

25th April, 1913.]

REV. J. COURTHAY CLARKE, D.D.

[Continued.]

personal experience; but I know what the feeling of the teachers is in regard to the inspectors, and there has not been much complaint in regard to the Galway district.

9194. Mr. CONYER.—That is the teachers of the model school?—Not the teachers of the model school.

9195. Mr. KAVANAGH.—Then you think there is a certain amount of uniformity?—Yes, a considerable amount of uniformity.

9196. Mr. HENLY.—Have you any idea of how far Mr. Wexley differed in his standing from Mr. Browne?—I had at the time, but I do not know it now. There was a considerable amount, I think.

9197. You have no clear impression now as to that?—No, I really could not answer you, so as to give you exact information.

9198. Well, within 10 or 20, or 30 per cent.?—There would be no use in my saying it. It would only be a sort of guess.

9199. Mr. KAVANAGH.—We are inquiring into the present system of National Education. Are you satisfied with that, with the system of merit marks and so forth?—I am not satisfied that there should be differences.

9200. No; but suppose there was uniformity, do you think the present system is a good one?—I think it would work out very well.

9201. Have you any experience of the results system?—I know of it, but not as a Commissioner.

9202. You could not tell us whether you think the children should be examined more during an inspection at present?—No; what I say is that there was far too much examination in connection with the results system.

9203. And would you say that there was not enough in the present system?—There might be cases in which there was not enough; but, I think, in the main, possibly we got a very fair share of examination.

9204. And do you think that the inspector under the present system can arrive at as good and definite a conclusion as under the results system?—Well, he cannot arrive from the nature of the case at as precise a result; but, then, I have always felt that this inspection of the individual child and marking of the individual child, meant far too much labour for the inspector, and drew him off from the general position of the education of the school. I would not at all be inclined to go in for the system of results that we had.

9205. From the children's point of view?—From the point of view of education.

9206. There is just one point I want to clear up, and that is about the examiners issuing reprimands to the teachers on their own initiative. You say you have had no experience of that?—No.

9207. My recollection of the evidence is different from Mr. Henly's. My recollection of it is that when the inspector made a report to the examiner, the examiner looked at that report, and if he saw that there was any complaint in it which appeared in the previous record of the teacher, he then issued a reprimand. He would not, however, issue a reprimand merely on his own initiative; but it was on the past record of the teacher that he issued the reprimand. However, that is only my own recollection?—I do not know that.

9208. Mr. KERRICK.—In the few questions I am going to ask you, I want you to understand that I appreciate thoroughly that you are sacrificing a great deal of your own private time to attend meetings of the National Board and administer the system; so, consequently, if I ask you any questions that seem to you to have a hostile tendency, I want you to understand that it is strictly and solely against the system and not against you?—I am hardened.

9209. I wanted to make that explanation?—Thank you.

9210. It seems to me that you are very imperfectly acquainted with the details of administration in the office of the National Board?—That may be.

9211. I mean is it not the fact that you have learned things since you came into this room about the National Board that you never knew before?—I have learned some things.

9212. Does that strike you as pointing to the effectiveness of the administration of primary education?—Possibly, I have neglected my duties.

9213. I do not think so?—I say that may be.

9214. But I think it is a necessary part of the working of a system. Do you happen to know anywhere else in the world in which primary education is controlled by a body bearing any resemblance to the Commissioners of National Education?—I do not know any.

9215. Now do I. I suppose there is no doubt about the existence of serious discontent amongst the teachers?—There are a good many that are evidently discontented.

9216. I mean there is no doubt at all about it?—I say a great many are discontented.

9217. It is quite plain that the present system has produced that discontent?—There is, unfortunately, discontent in many directions nowadays.

9218. But this is a particular sort of discontent that is to be explained by its own cause?—That may be.

9219. The chief cause is the lack of uniformity, is it not?—There has been a certain amount of lack of uniformity; but there has been a great deal of uniformity at the same time.

9220. Now, coming back to the position of the National Board, the Resident Commissioner, who is a very valued friend of mine, appears to me to have explained the discontent of the teachers and the unpopularity of the National Board, in an inaugural address delivered by him on the 2nd of July, 1911. This is what he says of the National Board:—"In my opinion, the unpopularity of the Board is due to the following reasons:—There is no doubt that it was long the object of certain prominent members of the Board to anglicise Ireland. It is possible that we have heard too much of Archbishop Whately's 'Happy English Child,' and his rejection of 'Freedom strikers when Keshidan fell.' This may have been ludicrous pomposity. It was certainly anti-national and fairly represented the attitude of the Board for fifty years. The Irish, like the Bourbons, never forget anything, and the memories of those evil days still rankle." I mean the history of the National Board, in addition to its constitution, would explain the discontent of the teachers, would it not?—Of course, that may be. Anyone can form an opinion just as readily as I can on the point.

9221. I am quoting from the Resident Commissioner's address, delivered on the 11th of September, 1902:—"And yet, though more stoned against than stoning, the Commissioners cannot be acquitted of having initiated a most disastrous policy. We are told that National Education is 'an expression of the social, religious and political aims of the people of which it serves.' A Protestant clergyman as Resident Commissioner, and Archbishop Whately, with his well-known racial and religious prejudices, were not the men to mitigate the suspicions of an intensely suspicious race, nor was the Archbishop's ambition 'to uproot the gigantic fabric of the Catholic Church,' a hopeful policy in dealing with a people whose religious fervour has always been a wayward. The design against religion was not professed at the time, but the Archbishop raised open war against the language and national feeling. The speaking of Irish was not permitted in the schools, even in Irish-speaking places, which were very numerous 70 years ago; children were punished for using the language, and the extraordinary spectacle was presented of teachers who knew no Irish endeavouring to teach through reading books children who knew no English and never heard a word of it in their own home. Archbishop Whately's attitude towards national feeling was still more unapologetic. In 1838 he struck out of the reading book: 'Breathes there a man with soul so dead,' and forbade the recitation of 'Freedom strikers when Keshidan fell.' In those circumstances, it is not strange that the atmosphere of national sympathy, which is now held to be essential to educational efficiency, was wanting."

Would you agree with Dr. Stacile that the history of the National Board, to a large extent, explains the present discontent of the teachers?—I cannot answer that. It is not my business, and I am not responsible for it.

9222. Are you not administering that system?—I am, to the best of my ability.

9223. Do you think that the system of primary education in Ireland by the National Board has ever secured the confidence or the sympathy of the people of Ireland in general?—I do not really know.

But you have formed an opinion, at any rate?

The CHAIRMAN.—Have you power to deal with this?

9224. Mr. KERRIN.—Is the National Board responsible to anybody?—It makes its reports to Parliament.

9225. That does not make it responsible. When you changed your rules, had you to lay the altered rules on the table of the House of Commons?—No; not so far as I know.

9226. It is not responsible to Parliament, but I gather that it had a little quarrel with the Treasury?—We had not a quarrel, but refusal on the part of the Treasury to give us money.

9227. To what extent does the Treasury control the alteration of your rules?—I mean what happens?—That depends. That deals with money. The Treasury can put their foot down and say "No."

9228. About every penny you spend?—Yes, every penny.

9229. It was the Treasury that fixed the standard numbers, I gather?—Yes; that has, of course, been in a measure contradicted; but I know that we wanted the numbers changed in favour of the teachers and it was not accepted.

9230. And you still want them changed?—Of course we do.

9231. There is no doubt that paper promotion inflicts serious injustice on the teachers?—No, it is not an injustice so far as the Board is concerned; but we are most anxious to secure the position of deserving teachers.

9232. But it is an injustice to the teachers?—Yes, there are more who would have higher promotion than they are actually receiving, and as to the matter of the paper promotion, that was done in the interests of the teachers by the Board, so as to guarantee to them that as soon as opportunity offered they would enter upon the emoluments.

9233. I went into that, and as a matter of fact, I think the Board has taken a very creditable attitude about it. I was very much struck by your saying in the course of your evidence that some inspectors were regarded as friends of the teacher?—Well, I was only quoting what I had seen somewhere.

9234. Is that attitude of friendliness on the part of any inspector to a teacher so rare that it is noticed in that way?—No; all that I was trying to deal with was that the teachers had been saying that they had confidence in Mr. Purser. He was exact to Edinnes, and notwithstanding the fact that he was a joint signatory of the report is brought no relief and no comfort to the teachers.

9235. I see that, but you said that some inspectors are called friends of the teachers, and are the others called enemies?—No, it was not that at all. It was simply that this expression had been used by the teachers in regard to this inspector, and it did not go beyond that, and I did not intend to go beyond that.

9236. Mr. CONYNGHAM.—Can you give us specific information as to where that expression was used?—I really cannot; it is a complaint made against the Board, that when they had a man in whom the teachers had confidence they did not send him down to Glenties.

9237. That was when he had retired?—I do not know that. I do not know when it was, but I want Professor Kettle to understand that I was making any general reference, and it was only for that special point that I used it.

9238. Mr. KERRIN.—But it strikes me as strange that some inspectors should be regarded as friends of the

teachers and others apparently as not friends?—I have only used that because I have seen it in some places, that we have done that thing, we had refused to send down Mr. Purser. It was only in that connection that I used that expression at all, and I do not certainly want it to have a wider application.

9239. Mr. HANR.—With reference to that point is pointed in Mr. Purser's evidence which was referred to by Mr. Kavanagh, here is the passage (reads questions 3062-4). Now, I would like to ask you this question. Do you think that an arrangement that permits such a state of things as that to exist is satisfactory?—I think I answered that before, did I not?

Mr. KAVANAGH.—I think Mr. Purser supplemented that evidence by saying that he looked up the record of the teacher.

9240. Mr. KERRIN.—Would you be able to give us a complete list of the Commissioners of the National Board?—I could give you the Committee that have met to consider various points.

9241. I mean the Standing Committee, the regular Committee?—A little time ago we dispensed with the Standing Committee, except the Books Committee, and now it is a Committee of the whole Board. We discussed the matter, and then we agreed that in the case of the Books Committee, which required lengthened examination of the books, and so on, the Committee should be a Committee of the whole Board.

9242. You would have had no difficulty (do come back to the question that Mr. Kavanagh put to you) about the formation of an Appeals Committee?—I do not think there would have been any difficulty, except in so far as I have already mentioned.

9243. Do you not think that whenever any serious effective action is taken with regard to a teacher his whole case should be considered, either by the Board or by a Committee, before action is taken?—Yes, but that is provided for in connection with the Agenda. Serious cases come up before the Board through the Agenda.

9244. But a reprimand is serious, is it not?—Well, in many cases we deal with reprimands too.

9245. But you have heard the evidence that the Examiner issues reprimands without even telling the Resident Commissioner?—That cannot be regarded as a particularly serious case, because, as a matter of fact, we deal largely with reprimands.

9246. I think that a reprimand is a serious thing. Do you think that it is proper, or even honest, for letters to go forth from your office, saying that the Commissioners of National Education in Ireland, having considered the report of their inspector, issued to you the following reprimand, when, as a matter of fact, the Commissioners of National Education do not know one single thing about it, and that letter has been written by an official in the office, who has never submitted it to the Board. Do you think is that fair?—Of course, it may be described as unfair. On the other hand, I want to say that serious cases all do come before us.

9247. When there is a fine they do, but a reprimand is a very serious thing?—And even reprimands come before us through the agenda.

9248. What comes before you is really this. There is first the Examiner, and secondly the Resident Commissioner, and what comes before you is the residuum?—And very serious cases too.

9249. But all the letters issued go out in the name of the Commissioners of National Education?—I think that is correct.

9250. And do you think that is fair?—Well, the difficulty is just to get the business met, apart from officials doing a certain part of it.

9251. I suppose you know the famous tone circular. Was that considered by the Commissioners?—Yes.

9252. What is tone?—What was agreed by the Commissioners to be tone?—Oh, well, I do not know that my definition would be the definition of the Commissioners.

9253. But it ought to be?—And my definition might be different from the definition of the Commissioners.

9254. There is a lack of uniformity than even among the heads of the system?—I do not say that.

9255. Is not that what it comes to?—Of course, when you are getting a circular of that kind, and you see "tone," you are dealing with the attitude and general spirit of the inspectors in the first instance, and then the teachers in the second instance, in their attitude towards the pupils, and the attitude of the inspectors towards the teachers, and the attitude of the teachers towards the inspectors, and so on.

9256. And when you have got all those personal equations considered do you think you will get uniformity?—It would be difficult, but the idea was that it would help a little in the direction of uniformity.

9257. Does it occur to you that this system is an impossible thing?—I mean that a Commissioner cannot possibly attend to his duty, and an inspector cannot possibly distinguish which of the six merit marks he is going to give to a school, and the teacher cannot

possibly guess what is going to happen to him with regard to increment. Is not the whole system an impossible thing?—I do not know. You can only take part of that at once. If an inspector goes into a school he can look into the work and come to a reasonable conclusion, and that conclusion in most cases will certainly be fairly up to the standard of uniformity.

9258. Does it not depend on the inspector?—There must be a great deal of the personal in it.

9259. Consequently a lack of uniformity?—It may be difficult to get uniformity.

9260. I am quite certain that you are anxious to promote primary education, and I am perfectly certain from knowing you that you are anxious to be just to the teachers, but the point I am making is, that it is not possible, even with an ideal inspector or an ideal Board, under the present system, to be just to the teachers?—We certainly try to be.

9261. But can you do it?—There is a certain amount of failure.

9262. We are all trying to do the impossible, but can you do it?—We can do a great deal in that direction.

## NINETEENTH DAY—THURSDAY, MAY 1st, 1913.

At 23, Kildare-street, Dublin.

Present:—Sir SAMUEL DILL, M.A., LL.D. (Chairman); The Most Rev. DENIS KELLY, D.D., Bishop of Ross; Sir HERAM SHAW WILKINSON, LL.D.; Mr. JOHN COFFEY; Mr. HENRAGE E. B. HARRISON, B.A.; Mr. JEREMIAH HENLY; Mr. WALTER McMURROUGH KAVANAGH, D.L.; Mr. THOMAS MICHAEL KENTLE, B.L.; and

Mr. ARTHUR J. DONNELLY, M.A., B.Sc., Secretary.

Mr. PHILIP WARD, Commissioner of National Education, examined.

9263. The CHAIRMAN.—How long have you been one of the Commissioners of National Education?—Since the 6th of September, 1910.

9264. You have had a very long experience of the Board under various systems?—Yes.

9265. At what date did you first have a school under your own control?—I think in 1899. Previous to that I was an assistant, but I became principal in 1899.

9266. Were you a principal in a Belfast school?—In a Belfast school; and an assistant for about a year and a half there also.

9267. And you have been in Belfast ever since?—Ever since.

9268. Was it in the same school or in different schools?—In different schools, practically in two schools, that is only in two districts.

9269. Now, having been appointed principal in 1899, you have worked under three different systems?—Yes.

9270. You have worked all through the period of the results system?—Yes.

9271. And you worked for about twelve years under the new system beginning in 1900?—Yes.

9272. So you are in a position to compare those two systems as regards their effect on education?—Yes, I think so.

9273. What is your judgment?—My impression is, that in many cases, with reference to particular subjects, the present system is really better than the results system.

9274. In what respects?—The education given now

is of a more practical character, and in certain subjects children are really better educated.

9275. What are those subjects?—I anticipated a question like that. This is what I say on that point. If I were asked how do the results of the code at present in operation in the National schools compare with those of the code before 1900, I should say that all round they are decidedly better; the system is more practical, and, therefore, better suited to the requirements of modern life. It aims, too, at making our young people better and more responsible citizens. At the same time it should be remembered that the school life of the child, particularly in this country, is comparatively short, and that the time necessary to obtain a higher knowledge of the most essential subjects ought not to be unduly curtailed. Merchants are crying out that they are not getting as good a material for the countinghouse as formerly, and the conductors of secondary schools make complaints almost similar, but these complaints are not, so far as I know, confined to Ireland. A like system of affairs in educational matters appears to exist in England and in America, and lately I have been reading a magazine in which some faults are found with the system even in Germany.

9276. And in Scotland?—And in Scotland. And then with regard to the school subjects the ordinary school subjects that I consider are better taught now than they were under the old system, are Reading, English Composition, Drawing, Drilling, Science and Object Lessons, History, and, perhaps, Mental Arithmetic, while ordinary Arithmetic, Spelling and Geography are decidedly not as well taught as formerly.

1st May, 1913.]

Mr. PHILIP WARR, examined.

[Continued.]

9277. Ordinary Arithmetic Spelling and Geography are not, you say, as well taught now as they were under the results system?—They are not.

9278. And on that ground you have heard complaints from business men and others?—Yes.

9279. And head masters of secondary schools?—Yes.

9280. That the pupils do not come generally so well prepared?—Quite so.

9281. Is it not the case that Mr. F. C. Forth, Principal of the Technical Institute in Belfast, found it necessary ten years ago to establish a preparatory school?—Yes.

9282. I remember I was present at the Town Council when he brought it forward. The ground was that the boys came in so badly prepared in some respects?—There was another reason for that just at the time. The National Board ceased to pay fees for teaching Mathematics as an extra subject, that is, higher Arithmetic, Algebra and Geometry, and, consequently, a great many of the schools in the city dropped those subjects, but they were afterwards taken up again in a large number of schools. They have not been so generally taken up, I think, as previously, but they have been taken up in a great many schools, and they are pretty well taught, and, therefore, the same complaint does not exactly lie now as it did then.

9283. I must pass on to another subject, with reference to one of the principal things in our terms of reference. I want to ask you as to your experience of inspection since 1906, for that is really one of the most important subjects?—If I might be permitted, I desire to make a statement.

9284. Have you a written statement on that subject?—I have got a number of books. In the first place, I want to make this opening reference. Being in the position of a Commissioner of National Education, I wish to make it very clear to the members of this Committee that I only express my own views.

9285. We understand that?—And lest a wrong impression might be created if I happen to differ from the prevailing opinion at the Board on many points, I want to make this statement with regard to the Board generally, that from what I know as a member of the National Board, I am convinced that every Commissioner, and particularly Dr. Sturkie, in the great National trust that is committed to them, is imbued with one idea and actuated by one motive, to administer in the most efficient manner the system of primary education, so that the greatest possible educational benefits may accrue to the country; and in the second place, that in looking for the best educational results, it is not the desire or intention of the Board that any injustice should be inflicted upon any teacher, but that every reasonable latitude, encouragement and protection should be shown to him in carrying out his arduous and responsible duties. The best proof of the truth of this statement that I can give to the Committee is the promotion of Mr. T. P. O'Connor to the position of Chief Inspector. In making that appointment the principal factor which decided the Board in Mr. O'Connor's favour was, that while he got the teachers under his charge to do splendid work, he never had a quarrel with them. Whether the Commissioners and their offices have been successful in these objects is another question.

9286. Do you propose to give us anything in writing on that subject that I put forward for your consideration, your own personal experience of inspection under the new system, for it would be very valuable if you could give it?—First, with regard to the lowering of reports, a very serious injustice is done to the teachers by lowering the report in the third year, or sometimes in the second year, unless for the gravest reasons, as the teacher may thereby be deprived of an increment or promotion. This, I know, is the cause of much dissatisfaction, discontent, and heart-burning among teachers. Now, there is one case in point, and I may give it as an illustration of many. A teacher, who had qualified by merit for promotion to the second of first grade, mentioned his case to me. I inquired into his claim, and found he wanted

a few months of completing his three years of actual service at the maximum of the lower grade, owing to a break in the service. A junior inspector soon after visited his school and reduced his mark, thus depriving him since of his well-earned promotion.

9287. At a very serious cost to him, I suppose?—Yes, £10 every year since.

9288. Mr. HANCOCK.—May I ask how long ago that was?—1911.

9289. Was that previous to the rule that forbade a junior inspector to lower a mark without reference to his senior?—I am not sure, but if there was any difference in the time it could not be more than a month or two one way or the other.

9290. The CHAIRMAN.—Have you any further remarks to make about inspection?—Yes. I consider that a junior inspector should have power (and this is a very important point) to raise a mark, but not power to lower it. My reason for it is this. A junior inspector should not have power to punish the teacher without consultation with the senior inspector. The power to deprive a teacher of increment and promotion is a formidable weapon, and should not be placed lightly in the hands of an inexperienced inspector. The inspectors, I think, are too much inclined to emphasise faults, even trivial ones, and to ignore the good points of a school, and in this way they miss opportunities of giving useful help and encouragement to teachers. Some inspectors (not many, I think) do not deem it any part of their duty to assist or advise teachers, but I fear rather consider themselves privileged to act in a dictatorial and supercilious manner towards them.

9291. Is that your personal experience?—It is not, because, so far as my personal experience is concerned, I never had a quarrel with an inspector.

9292. But it comes to you on testimony?—It is based on testimony from every part of the country.

9293. Testimony that convinces you that it is true?—During my two years and eight months on the Board I am quite certain I have not received less than 3,000 letters from teachers. They were not all complaints, but a very large number of them were complaints.

9294. That is a very important statement, 3,000 letters?—Yes.

9295. In what time?—In two years and eight months.

9296. About the present system?—About the present system.

9297. Have you any remarks to make on the present system of merit marks?—I have.

9298. And uniformity?—Yes, I will proceed with that now. A little more of the element of examination should enter into the present system of inspection towards the end of the school year. More inspection is not always a sufficient or safe guide in estimating the educational value of a school. During the first six months of the school year there should, however, be no formal examination; it should be more inspection, seeing that the time table was clear and skilfully drawn up, that the proper lines were followed, and a sensible, effective method of teaching adopted, that the grouping was reasonable, that the written work was carefully supervised, that order, cleanliness and discipline prevailed, that notes were prepared where necessary (because I hold that they are not always necessary), and a progress record kept, and that the whole school machinery was working smoothly. During the first six months of the school year the children are not sufficiently trained, and do not possess the power of answering accurately, especially in subjects requiring some exercise of thought, such as Arithmetic, Grammar and Analysis, Science, Composition, and even Reading. I hold this to be true, even if the children are examined only in these portions of the programme which they have already gone over. It is only in cases where the inspection is held during the last six months of the school year that the pupils should be expected to possess the full power and facility in answering, even when examined on a definite portion of work already learned. One or two questions on a subject are not sufficient to test the character of the teacher's work,

1st May, 1913.]

Mr. PHILIP WARD, examined.

[Continued.]

often a whole year's work. In Arithmetic, for instance, I have been frequently told that the sole test in a standard is often a problem that is hardly fair to teachers or children. There should be a judicious mixture of problems, not posing ones, and ordinary calculations, and due marks assigned to each. I consider the present system of merit marking the school and the teacher, although apparently fair, is not a happy or successful one. It places too much responsibility on the inspector, and too great a tax on his judgment, where so many factors are to be taken into account. The grades of merit are too many and the inspectors' ideals too varied. A fair report in one school might be the result of superior teaching to that obtaining a good report in another school. In the early months of the school year, especially, it is extremely difficult, if not impossible, to estimate fairly the educational value of the work accomplished. There should, I hold, be no such thing as six classes of schools or teachers in the country, so far as the character of the work performed by them is concerned. That is all I have to say about merit marks.

6009. Does it mean that you would abolish that system of six merit marks?—I would.

6010. As being impossible to work?—As being impossible to work.

6011. And you consider that to carry out that system of merit marks over the whole of Ireland with anything like approximate uniformity is impossible?—Quite impossible.

6012. The Director of Ross.—I did not quite catch whether you considered that the number of merit marks is too great, and that you would, therefore, reduce the number of merit marks, or whether you would abolish the system of merit marks altogether?—If the system of merit marking is to remain I would reduce the number, but I would be inclined to abolish the system altogether, that is to abolish the system that designates the school or teacher by the terms of "excellence," etc., down to "bad." It is a fearful thing, in my opinion, to label any man or any school by one word.

6013. The Chairman.—Now, you were a member of the National Board in the middle of 1910, September of that year?—Yes, in September.

6014. Now, you know, of course, that in 1911 and 1912 two very important circulars were issued to the inspectors?—Two?

6015. Two at least?—There is only one that impresses itself on my memory. That is the one, issued, I think, in June, 1911.

6016. Well, the circular in August, 1912, was equally important, and it dwelt on the same thing. This is the point that I want to call your attention to. When you look into these circulars and read between the lines, they seem to reveal a state of things all over Ireland that was causing the Board great concern. That is their own expression. Now, that circular of 1911 was issued soon after the trouble in Belfast, with which you are so well acquainted. You were present at the deputation?—Yes.

6017. Now, what we have been asking here is this. Why, when the Board issued that circular, recognising the very great difficulty of working this system of merit marks which you have now condemned so emphatically, did they not tackle the whole question as to what they could put in its place. We asked your brother Commissioner that yesterday, and he could not tell us?—It is a very difficult question to answer. I think they expected more, as I did myself expect more, from that circular, but I confess I have been disappointed.

6018. But you admit this, and every Commissioner must admit it, that the person or persons who issued that circular recognised a very grave state of things?—There is no doubt of it, and the very fact of the Board having summoned up the 22 senior inspectors to have a consultation with them, or an interview with them, about the matter, showed the seriousness of it.

6019. Do you think it was a sufficient way of dealing with that grave state of things to send down a chief inspector here and there to make an investigation?—I do not think that it was the best way.

6020. But it was not dealing with the system as a whole?—It was not the best way of doing it, at all events.

6021. It was intended to get rid of particular grievances, but it left the system untouched?—Quite so.

6022. Were those circulars brought before the Board before they were issued?—I do not altogether recollect the second circular. The first circular was brought before the Board.

6023. There is the other circular (circular handed\* to Witness)?—I confess I am doubtful if I have ever seen this circular before.

6024. But do you remember having seen the one of 1911?—Oh, yes, because I was a party to it. It came before the Board in the ordinary way. But I do not remember this other circular.

6025. I may ask you this question. When those two very serious cases of the Glenside district and the Belfast district attracted the attention of the Board, did the question not definitely come before the Board as to what means should be taken to prevent those violent sudden changes of standard, because apparently they have been sudden when a new inspector goes into a district?—No, that aspect of the question was not discussed, namely, what means should be taken to prevent such a thing occurring. So far as I could gather, the feeling was that the teachers, and not the inspectors, were to blame. I mean that this was the feeling among the Commissioners as a body.

6026. And that the system did not need any radical change?—Yes.

6027. That is your impression?—That is my impression. When I say that, I am talking of the Board as a whole.

6028. And that if the provisions made in those two circulars, apparently with the view of obtaining some kind of uniformity, were carried out the system would be sufficiently remedied?—That was the impression.—If it would not be sufficiently remedied, that it would be, at all events, very largely remedied.

6029. Now, you would get rid of those merit marks, and, apparently, you dislike very much the system of increments, as it is worked at present in triennial periods?—Yes. I am entirely opposed to that.

6030. Can you give us an idea of what you would put in its place?—I think the increments should be annual, and both increment and promotion should come to every teacher as a matter of course, provided, first, that the average attendance is sufficient (and in this connection I would like to see the average attendance lowered for each section of the first grade). And secondly, that the character of the school as a whole is satisfactory as to order, cleanliness and discipline. No teacher should be held responsible for inadequate equipment, but the absence of adequate equipment should be taken into account in the teachers' favour in the appraising of the value of his work. Thirdly, that the work done is efficient, the teacher having already established a reputation for good work. I am of the opinion that every teacher, whose work has earned the character of "good," is deserving of any preferment which may accrue, that is of increment or promotion, as the case may be.

6031. It has been proposed here by one of our members that the teachers should begin with a higher initial salary, and rise by smaller increments for 10 or 11 years, increments of £1 a year, in the absence of any damaging report?—I would be very glad to see a higher initial salary.

6032. Beginning at £68?—I would not think much of an increment of £1 a year.

6033. But this is what it comes to. You would start with £68, which would rise in 10 or 11 years to £79?—At all events, I would be strongly in favour of starting with the larger initial salary, and whatever the increment was, that it should be an annual one.

6034. And it should depend simply on the absence of a bad report?—Quite so. If there is nothing serious against the teacher, or against the work of the school, the increment should come to him as a matter of course.



1st May, 1913.]

Mr. FRANK WARD, examined.

[Continued.]

9325. You have spoken of the immense number of letters you had received from teachers. In your experience of the Board, can you tell us the number of serious cases of appeal to the Board from the teachers during your 2½ years?—No, I could not, because ordinary cases of appeal never come before the Board.

9326. Who determines those?—So far as I know it is Dr. Storkie. I have already made some reference to these appeals, but I think that what I have stated is nearly sufficient. No cases of appeal come before the Board. The only cases of appeal that I know anything about are cases that have been sent to myself, and in which I have tried to get some change made by speaking to Dr. Storkie about them.

9327. But I think it has been stated to us, and we have had it in evidence, that all cases of fines and dismissals come before the Board?—Certainly, cases of inefficiency or irregularity, or of personal delinquency, which involve direct punishment, come before the Board.

9328. Have you many of those cases coming before the Board?—Yes, a good many.

9329. Now, the Board, as it works at present, meets once a fortnight, is not that so?—Yes.

9330. And, therefore, it is not capable of dealing with that kind of business?—Well, I think so.

9331. Would it be more effective if a standing committee were appointed for that particular purpose?—Do you mean this question of appeals alone?

9332. Direct appeals to the Board?—I think that it would be better if there was a standing committee for that purpose, and which should report to the whole Board, because I would grant an appeal in every case in which a teacher thinks that he is aggrieved.

9333. And would you allow those appeals to go before this standing committee that had been proposed?—Certainly.

9334. A small standing committee?—I would. The standing committee should not be too small.

9335. And they would report to the Board?—Yes.

9336. Do you think that would be a good working system?—I think it would.

9337. Is it your opinion that at present a sufficient number of those appeals from teachers do not go before the Board?—So far as I know, in the case of lowering a mark, either of the teacher or of the school, the appeal never comes before the Board at all.

9338. That never comes before the Board?—No. I also wish to say this with regard to the report of an inspector on the work of a teacher from mere inspection. Many teachers are never able to do their best work when they feel that they are being watched, and that every slip and weakness is noted down to their disadvantage, and their work appraised under critical observation. Therefore, inspectors, in my opinion, should be careful to put the teachers at their ease when engaged in the work of inspection, and they should not always judge the value of the work by mere observation, except in the circumstances already stated, that is, during the earlier months of the year, in which there should be no examination.

Now, in support of that view, I would like to read a letter that I received no earlier than last week from a teacher, bearing upon this point of personally remarking upon the teacher's manner and method. This teacher says—"The inspector has treated me unjustly since his coming to this district three years ago. His manner has been very far from sympathetic. As a consequence of this want of sympathy, and his general behaviour in school during inspection, I lose all confidence in myself, and am unable to put forth my best efforts in his presence; so if he conducts the next annual inspection here I have no hope of success." And upon that next inspection depends whether that teacher will remain in the position of principal.

9339. Have you had several cases like that?—Very many.

9340. Very many?—Yes.

9341. You mean, I think, from what you read to us just now, that what they call the impressionistic system of inspection is carried too far?—It is, and I will give you an illustration to show that it is not

fairness. Now, at the very interview to which I referred a few minutes ago with the 23 senior inspectors, that matter was talked about, and some of the inspectors' opinions were asked, and while some of them agreed that it would be easy for an experienced inspector to estimate the value of the school in a very short time, without examining the work very closely, Mr. O'Connor stated an instance of a school that was well known to the Resident Commissioner, and he pointed out that while a very high mark could be awarded to that school from mere observation, yet, when the work was gone into, it was found that the mark should be considerably lower.

9342. Now, to go back, you evidently would like to have more extensive examination of schools every year?—Yes, towards the end of the school year.

9343. Would you have every child in the school examined by the inspectors?—Not necessarily.

9344. Which classes?—Classes. Yes.

9345. But it would be very much more extensive than at present?—It would, but not more extensive than it is in some instances.

9346. As I understand, there is a great variety?—There is. I know one senior inspector who told me himself that he could not estimate the value of the school without examining it minutely.

9347. Now, I think in one of the circulars it is suggested that the men who do that are rather violating the spirit of the new programme?—So they are.

9348. Is that so regarded by the Board?—I think so, by the Board as a whole.

9349. That if a man carries out examination on the scale that you propose he is going against the spirit of the new system?—Well, I might say here what I propose. My proposal is a sort of compromise. I would not have any sort of examination in the earlier months of the school year at all.

9350. Have you any further remarks on that?—Not on that point, I think.

9351. Then you have nothing further on the general system?—Talking about cases of appeal, I may say that in my opinion, when a senior or chief inspector visits a school for the purpose of investigating an appeal made by a teacher or manager, against the character of a report, he ought, on entering the school, to inform the teacher of the object of his visit. That is not always done.

9352. Is it not?—No; and even it would be no harm for some time is only my own opinion) to express a hope that, as a result of his check inspection, he would be in a position to report more favourably than his predecessor had been able to do. I am afraid that is not always done.

9353. Mr. COFFEY.—Is there any such thing known to the Board as a check inspection at the present time?—I think so.

9354. Officially known?—Yes, I think so—there is, and chief inspectors make check inspections. In every case where a re-inspection was demanded by a teacher or manager it should, I think, be granted. I can hardly conceive that appeals would be made except in cases where the teacher conscientiously believed that an injustice had been done to him, and, therefore, the inspector ought not to be over critical or censorious, but make the inspection in the ordinary way, with sympathy and a desire to be strictly just, having due regard to every circumstance exerting any influence on the school.

9355. Sir HENRY WILKINSON.—With regard to the last inspection, at the present time we have had evidence that although notice is given to the manager, that notice is usually on the morning of the day of inspection, when probably he has made his arrangements for the day, or is actually absent, or it may not reach him at all by reason of his absence from home. You mention an inspection in which there should be more examination than there is at the present time, and that that examination should be fuller than it is in most cases than it is at the present time. A question suggests itself as to what would be fair to the manager and to the teacher in the matter of notice. I will read to you something that you

1st May, 1913.]

Mr. PHILIP WARD, examined.

[Continued.]

have probably seen before from the report of Messrs. F. H. Dale and T. A. Stevens, on Intermediate Education in Ireland, page 329 of their report:—"The Inspector should visit the school sometimes, without any notice of his visit, in order to see its normal working. At other times, when a more detailed inspection was required, he would give the authorities, the head master or head mistress, notice."

Would you agree with that?—Certainly.

9355. It would be fairer, of course, to the manager, so that he should have an opportunity of arranging to be present, and it would be fairer to the teacher, would it not, in the matter of seeing that as many scholars would be present as possible for the occasion?—Quite so.

9357. We all know the difficulty with regard to securing constant attendance of pupils in Ireland, but he would probably be able, by reporting to the parents of the child, that on a particular day the inspection was going to take place, and that the children would have an opportunity of being examined, and that on that particular day no accident should keep the children away?—Yes.

9358. And that even if their services might be wanted, as they often are, for potato planting or potato gathering, they might forego that on that occasion?—Yes.

9359. These are two advantages which occur to me with regard to giving notice to the teacher?—Yes.

9360. And I suppose there are other advantages which would occur to yourself?—Yes, I think it would be a very great disadvantage to have an inspector coming to hold a formal inspection or examination, as the case might be, where there was something occurring in the locality to prevent the children attending, such as a fair day, or an extremely boisterous day, or anything else that would take away very probably some of the best children of that school. I think it would be a very unfortunate thing if a formal inspection were held on a day of that kind, because there are plenty of occasions for making these occasional visits, what I may call surprise visits. There are plenty of occasions for these, but when a formal inspection is to be held, let it be of a really formal character, and let every chance of fair play be given to the teachers, the pupils, and the manager.

9361. Do you know that a rule was made which prevents the appeals against the decisions of inspectors coming before the Board?—That a rule was made preventing any appeal from an inspector's report coming before the Board?

9362. Yes?—I am not aware. I do not know that there ever was any rule made preventing an appeal from coming before the Board, but in practice they do not.

9363. They do not?—No.

9364. And you yourself received many complaints with regard to the decisions of inspectors, and having received those complaints you go to Dr. Sturkie as the man who is entitled to come to a decision on the subject?—Yes.

9365. And you ask him to consider the matter?—Yes.

9366. It has occurred to you, has it not, that that is rather a reversal of the ordinary practice, that you as a Commissioner should have to go to Dr. Sturkie, instead of bringing the matter before the Board for its decision?—Yes; I always thought that it was not altogether a fair system; but so far as the practice went, that power seemed to be vested in Dr. Sturkie, when or how that became the case, I do not know.

9367. And may I put it that when you joined the Board and you found that that was the practice, whether as the result of a definite rule or on an understanding of the Board, you accepted that order of things?—Yes; because it was really recently, not very long ago, that I came to understand that there was some such arrangement as that, that the Board at its earlier period placed a certain amount of authority in the hands of the Resident Commissioner. I was not aware of that for a considerable time after I became a member of the Board.

9368. Then there is no book of rules or list of rules laid before a Commissioner when he joins the Board so that he may refer to that and find out what the

practice of the Board and the office is?—No; no rules with regard to the practice of the office in matters of that kind. Of course, there are general rules of the Board as affecting schools and the relations between the Board and the teacher and so on, a very extensive code of rules, of course.

9369. And those are the rules that are made public?—That are made public. I know of no others.

9370. Now, do you not think it would be only a proper thing that where there are additional rules governing the practice of the Board and the practice of the office, a Commissioner on joining the Board should be supplied with a complete statement of them?—I think it would be for the benefit of the education as administered by the Board generally, if each Commissioner were put in possession of such a set of rules. Of course, there are certain things now and then that we find out when we inquire about them; for instance, I myself got the rules or arrangements regulating the character of the school, that is, the number of "goods," or the number of "very goods," or "excellents," and so on, that were necessary in order that the teacher might get his increment or promotion, but I got that information simply by inquiring.

9371. The CHAIRMAN.—And before that it was a secret of the office?—It was a secret of the Office; at least, I think so.

9372. Mr. HENRY.—Has it been sanctioned by the Commissioners at all, do you know?—I do not know.

9373. Sir HENRY WHITBROOK.—Do you not think that a rule of that sort, which affects the increment and promotion of teachers so materially, should be available for the teachers, either made public with their rules or commented to them?—Well, at all events, from the teacher's point of view, I would certainly say that it would be a great advantage if the teacher were aware of the marks that was necessary in order to obtain his increment or promotion.

9374. The CHAIRMAN.—As a matter of fact, do not the teachers get to know the marks that are necessary for increment and promotion?—They do. It gradually gets out.

9375. I have seen instances of it in their own appeals, that they do know; but the knowledge does not come to them directly?—It does not.

9376. They somehow or other get to know it?—So far as I am concerned, I never had any hesitation in telling a teacher the marks that are required in order to get increments or promotion.

9377. Would you say that those marks that are necessary to get increment and promotion should appear in the published rules of the Board?—Yes; I think it would be better. Really, I think that every rule affecting the promotion of a teacher or affecting the interest of a teacher should be generally known.

9378. Sir HENRY WHITBROOK.—Here is a copy of a letter from Mr. Knight to Dr. Sturkie, dated the 14th of November, 1910, so that was after you joined the Board:—"At a meeting of the Belfast Teachers' Association, held on Saturday, the 12th inst., I was asked to write to you in order to ascertain the following information:—(a) The 'Mark' on Minute showing the general condition of school which is necessary to obtain increment in each grade; (b) the 'Mark' on minute necessary to obtain promotion to second grade, to second of first grade and first of first grade, respectively." Those are the school merit marks, and (c) the personal 'Mark' on efficiency necessary to secure—(1) increment in each grade, and (2) promotion from grade to grade. You will doubtless see that it is fair that the workers should know fully the conditions under which they serve." On the 26th of November, Mr. Bonaparte Wynn replies to Mr. Knight as follows:—"In reply to your letter to the Resident Commissioner of the 14th inst., in which you request to be informed of the character of reports required to warrant the awarding of increments and promotion to teachers in the various grades, I am requested to say that the Commissioners do not consider it desirable to give formal public expression to any more precise rule in these matters than are to be found in Chapter VIII. of the Code." Do you remember that coming before the Board?—No, I never came before the Board.

1st May, 1918.]

Mr. PHILIP WARD, examined.

[Continued.]

9379. That never came before the Board?—No.

9380. Now, looking at that letter and reading it from the point of view, not of a Commissioner, but of a teacher or a teachers' representative, when you find that it refers to a letter addressed to the Resident Commissioner and that the reply is: "I am requested to say that the Commissioners do not consider it desirable," would you consider that as representing that the matter had been put before the Commissioners as a body, and not merely before the Resident Commissioner?—Yes; I often felt a great deal surprised myself at the expression, "I am directed by the Commissioners." The only way that I can explain it is that Dr. Starke sets in the name of the Commissioners from meeting to meeting, and that when that expression is used, he is simply supposed to be giving expression to the opinions of the Commissioners. Again, I must guard myself by saying, of the Commissioners as a whole.

9381. Mr. CONYER.—But that would not be unreasonable, having regard to official procedure generally. It is a printed form that goes out saying: "I am directed by the Commissioners." But this letter which Sir Hiram Wilkinson has put before you stands in an entirely different position. It is a letter from the Resident Commissioner himself or his secretary, saying that the matter was decided by the Commissioners, and you say that it never came before the Commissioners?—Not to my recollection.

9382. Could it have come before the Commissioners and escaped your recollection?—Hardly, I think. I have never missed a meeting of the Board since I became a member.

9383. Sir HIRAM WILKINSON.—There is another matter mentioned in the correspondence when I might touch upon at the present moment, and that was in a letter by the honorary secretaries of the Belfast Teachers' Association, referring to the Board's rules for 1909-10, Rule 55 (a):—"The Commissioners desire to impress upon managers that it is their duty to make every school comfortable, by having it properly furnished, lighted, cleaned, ventilated and adequately heated in cold weather, and they cannot approve of any expenditure for these purposes on monetary responsibility in connection with them being imposed on the teachers of the schools." That was in the 1910 Rules, and they have since been altered: "The duty of seeing that the rooms are cleaned and dusted every day devolves as heretofore on the teacher." And there was a modified rule in the Code of 1912-13: "The duty of seeing that the rooms are cleaned and dusted every day devolves as heretofore on the teacher. The necessary expenditure for any such service should be borne by the managers." Referring to that rule, the Teachers' Association pointed out that there was an impression that the question of the building, taking it generally, did affect the question of the teacher's increment, and they say that prior to that date, the inspectors considered this item when drawing up their reports on the school, and they were confirmed in this belief by the fact that there was no special head in the minute for that, so that the inspector's opinion as to the state of the school building and equipment might be included under the general head as to proficiency, there being no special section referring to this subject. They say: "In view of these facts, our Association hope that you will consider the expediency of having separate sections of the minute dealing with (a) the school building, and (b) the efficiency of the teaching staff." The point really which they tried to get is this, that the inspectors should show on the face of the report the proficiency of the school as distinct altogether from the question of the building, so that one would be quite clear on reading the report that the building matter was not taken into account in lowering the merit mark. Do you consider that that would be a desirable thing to make clear?—Yes; I think it is very clear at present. When I became a member of the Board first, that head was on the sheet on which the inspector made his report. It was generally interpreted to the disadvantage of the teacher; that was the general impression, and I have no doubt that it was true. Since that, I will not say that it was owing to anything that I have said or

done in connection with it; but since that I think it has been made pretty clear, for I was instrumental in getting the wording changed so that it could not be interpreted to the disadvantage of the teacher.

9384. Clause 11 originally was: "As a result of your own inspection, and taking into consideration all the circumstances of the school, including the locality of the school-house, the character of the premises, the equipment of the school, the teaching staff, the social condition and age of the pupils," etc., and then it read on "Classify" (leaving out those words about making due allowance) "the school under one of the following heads: 'Excellent,' 'very good,' 'good,' 'fair,' 'middling,' or 'bad.'" In that form you tell us, and we have had evidence here before us also to that effect, that it would lead one to believe that that was understood as including the character of the premises to the disadvantage of the teacher?—Yes; that was the general impression before the alteration was made.

9385. And you think there was some ground for it?—I do.

9386. Then the alteration, "making due allowance for any adverse circumstances with which the teacher may have had to contend," it has been pointed out, covers the whole point which is sought to be attained. The object to be attained is to prevent the question of the schoolhouse and character of the premises, equipment of the school, the teaching staff, and the social condition, and the ages of the pupils being taken into account, and it has been suggested it would make the matter more clear still if these words were inserted in this way:—"As a result of your own inspection, and taking into consideration all the circumstances of the school, and making due allowance for any adverse circumstances with which the teachers may have had to contend, including the locality of the school-house, the character of the premises, the equipment of the school, the teaching staff, the social condition and age of the pupils, classify the school."—I think that would be an improvement.

9387. The CHAIRMAN.—Altering the arrangement of the words?—Yes, re-arranging the words in the Clause.

9388. Sir HIRAM WILKINSON.—I have included there all the circumstances that are mentioned up to and included the teaching staff; but it has been pointed out to us that at the present moment the question of the teaching staff does come into the Inspector's report, and that the head teacher may be penalised on account of the inefficiency of his assistant teacher?—Yes, certainly; and I just have a note on that. This is what I have to say on that point. I consider it unfair, and indeed unjust, to make principals in every case responsible for the work of the assistants, over whose appointment or dismissal they have no control. I would hold principals responsible to this extent for the inefficiency of the whole school, that they did their best to help weak or incompetent assistants in one of two ways, or both; first, by advice, and pointing out faults and suggesting remedies, and secondly, by giving model lessons occasionally for the advantage of the assistants; otherwise principals should not be deprived of increments or promotion if their own work was effective and of sufficient merit, because of the inefficiency of their assistants.

9389. That exactly answers my question. The result of a teacher being deprived of his increment for a year has been a matter which apparently has occupied the attention of teachers very much, and I suppose these tables which appear in the pamphlet issued by the Central Committee of the Irish National Teachers' Organisation, showing the effect of loss of increment for a year or more years than one, have come under your notice?—I have seen that. I did not go into the figures; but I have no reason whatever to doubt their accuracy, and, of course, it makes the deprivation of an increment a much more serious matter than it otherwise would be?—Certainly.

9390. Now, there may come a case even under your proposal in which the increment might be stopped?—Yes.

9391. Now, in a statement with which we have been favoured by the Education Office of the London

1st May, 1913.]

Mr. PHILIP WARD, examined.

[Continued.]

County Council, it is pointed out that in their case an increment, if stopped, is only stopped for that year, and has not those consequences?—That is, if a teacher does not get the increment scoring this year, he will get it next year.

9802. He will get it next year?—I see, but it will not be retrospective.

9803. It will not be retrospective; but there is no cumulative effect?—I think that is fair enough.

9804. Then, in the same document, we have: "It may be mentioned that head teachers of elementary schools proceed to the maximum of the scale without being subject to any special report on their work." I understand that that is practically your own suggestion?—Yes; provided that all reasonable measures have been taken by the principal to make the school efficient.

9805. Yes, but as I understood your proposal, and I want to make sure that I did understand it, suppose there was no adverse report with regard to the school, the payment of the teacher's increment would follow as a matter of course?—Certainly.

9806. In the absence of an adverse report?—Certainly.

9807. That he ought not to have to be saying to an inspector: "Now, I hope I will get my increment this year, and I hope you will be easy"?—Yes.

9808. The words that I referred to in the London County Council statement are: "In these cases, the teachers suffer a loss of one annual increment only, and not a loss of an increment each year, till the maximum is reached. In this connection it may be mentioned that under these circumstances very few teachers have suffered a loss of increment"—That is very reasonable.

9809. There is a point in which a difference seems to be made in the regulations referring to increment in the London Board of Education, and that is in the matter of junior teachers—they do not come under that rule with regard to head teachers; but that a certain amount of examination or control or inspection or report would be necessary in order to enable them during what might be called their probationary period to obtain the increment. Would you draw a distinction between the head teacher and the assistant teachers in that respect?—I would not, in the case of an experienced assistant.

9810. Could you, from your great experience of the system, suggest a time after which the increment should follow, as we may put it, as a matter of course, and the period up to which the increment would be dependent upon examination or inspection to see that the teacher was continuing to qualify himself for his work as a teacher?—Well, probably the length of time that is at present allowed in order to obtain a diploma, say five years; because a teacher who obtains a diploma is said to be qualified and an efficient teacher. It is a sign that he is so.

9811. And you think that having obtained a diploma as an efficient teacher, it ought to follow as a matter of course that his increment would be paid in the absence of any adverse report?—Quite so.

9812. Mr. HENLY.—Would you award no increment for the first five years?—Oh, yes; I would.

9813. Sir HIRSH WILKINSON.—That is, while they are undergoing their probation?—Yes.

9814. And you consider their probation ends when they get their diploma?—I think so.

9815. And we have it in evidence that increment is awarded sometimes when they have not passed their examination?—It is easier, on the whole, to get an increment than a diploma.

9816. You do not suggest any alteration in the system of increments prior to the obtaining of a diploma?—No; if the work was satisfactory the increment should come.

9817. Mr. HENLY.—Annual or triennial, according to the system?—Yes. I think that is one of the worst features of the awarding of increment, making it triennial.

9818. Sir HIRSH WILKINSON.—You are familiar, of course, with the Belfast case, and I do not wish to trouble you with very much detail with regard to it, but there is one point that struck me in reading this over, that the Commissioners took one view, and one

view only, of that; that it was a question of complaint against the inspectors, and that the question they had to decide was whether the inspectors deserved the blame that was thrown upon them. That is certainly one of the points taken into consideration; but I want to know whether the Board considered another point of view, and that was that in a great number of cases schools were mentioned in which merit marks were awarded, which deprived the head teacher of his increment, and, so far as I can see, in reading the memoranda on the subject, nothing was done to remedy that particular grievance. There were two complaints put forward, whether judiciously or not, a complaint that particular inspectors had raised the standard and that the marks had been consequently lowered, and also the complaint which was involved in it, that in the case of some of the schools, at least, by reason of that action, the head teacher lost his increment. Now, the question of the loss of increment to the individual teacher seems not to have been gone into at all?—That is so.

9819. Did the Board consider that point?—No, it was taken as a matter of course that the efficiency of the school was measured by the mark, and if the mark awarded did not warrant the granting of any increment the head teacher did not get it.

9820. But that was decided in the lump and not individually?—That is so; yes.

9821. And do you not think that there was liability to very serious injustice in doing so?—I do, of course. I believe there is always injustice where there is not good reason for not awarding the increment; because the lowering of that report may not at all depend upon the head teacher; it may have been caused entirely by the inefficiency of his assistant.

9822. In Mr. DeWorth's letter of 2nd of June to \*Mr. Knight, the secretary of the Belfast Teachers' Association, there comes the following paragraph:—"Having carefully considered in all their aspects the different questions involved, the Commissioners are of opinion that while, in view of the facts disclosed, the teachers were justified in appealing to them, there is no evidence to show that there has been any concerted action on the part of the administration to deal severely with the Belfast teachers, or that the present standard of marking is unduly high in their schools. Doubtless the returns indicate that some of the inspectors now in Belfast are stricter than their predecessors; but, on the other hand, there is evidence that for five or six years subsequent to 1900, the standard of marking, at any rate in the County Down, was unduly low as compared with other parts of Ireland; consequently the discrepancy of marking in late years to which the teachers drew attention, is not so surprising as might appear on the surface." Now, do you consider that that was a sufficient answer to the teachers' complaint?—I do not like answering the question. If I said that I did not, I would be exonerating myself from responsibility in connection with that answer, and I would prefer to leave the Committee to put their own interpretation on that letter.

9823. From your desire not to answer it, of course, we must draw a conclusion, and I am not wishing to press you for an answer; but merely want to supplement what you have just said, that you asked the Committee to draw their own inference from that answer?—Quite so.

9824. We also draw our inference from the fact that you do not at the moment like to express an opinion?—Yes. This is my point. There were many divisions taken at the Board on various questions. Sometimes I am in a minority and sometimes in the majority; not so often, perhaps, in the minority, and therefore I do not want to make my view of the matter appear to your Committee in a different light from that of the whole Board.

9825. I will not press it any further; but there is one point which seems to me very strange here. There is an argument addressed to the teachers, which certainly, if it were addressed to me, I should have looked on as very strange. One of the arguments for saying so in the year 1910-11 the standard was not too high was that there is evidence that from 1905 to 1906 the standard was too low. It does not say that there

1st May, 1918.]

Mr. PHILIP WARD, examined.

[Continued.]

is the slightest evidence that in 1906 and 1909 the standard was too low; but that away back to 1906 or 1909 it was too low; and therefore that the teachers need not be surprised that there was a higher standard in 1910 and 1911. I think that the only explanation of that was that in the early years of the new system the same high standard was not expected as in later years. That is the only explanation I ever heard of that.

9416. But there is an interval of five years which is not accounted for at all in this reply?—I understand that very well.

9417. Mr. HANSEN.—Did the Board give any sort of notice to teachers that the full standard would be expected after the first few years of the new curriculum?—I never got such an intimation, and I was then teaching.

9418. There was no sort of understanding on the subject?—Not that I am aware of.

9419. The CHAIRMAN.—I think there was a circular to inspectors?—That circular to inspectors never came to teachers.

9420. Sir HIRSH WILKINSON.—So that if a teacher from 1909 to 1909 or 1906 satisfied an inspector, then, apart from any recommendation which the inspectors might, while giving a good report, make to the teacher, that teacher had a right to consider that he was complying with the rules of the Board, and with the standard that ought to be observed?—Yes.

9421. And from 1906 to 1910, whatever that standard was, they were entitled to consider that the wishes of the Board were being complied with, with regard to the merit marks which they obtained?—I believe so.

9422. So that it came to them as a great surprise when the standard was raised?—I think it came to them as a surprise when they were told that the standard was raised.

9423. When their merit marks went down?—Quite so.

9424. You have given some of the clearest evidence, if I may say so, as to the widespread nature of the discontent amongst the teachers, and, of course, it is the business of this Committee to try and find out whether there is any cause for it, what the cause is, and how it may be remedied, and you will understand that, if any of us should arrive at the conclusion that that was an unsatisfactory reply?—I am quite satisfied if you arrive at that conclusion.

9425. I am glad to get your opinion upon that, and you think that would, in the case of teachers suffering what they considered a wrong, intensify their discontent?—It would, decidedly.

9426. Then there is another point, that they asked for the reports of the inspectors in reply to that complaint?—Yes, they asked for the replies of the inspectors.

9427. The CHAIRMAN.—They asked to be furnished with the replies of the inspectors to their representations, and that request was refused?—Yes.

9428. Sir HIRSH WILKINSON.—Do you recollect anything with regard to that?—I do.

9429. In a letter of the 26th April, 1911, Mr. Knight writes to Dr. Starkie and says—"Since the inspectors were furnished with our statement I think it is only fair and just that the teachers should be placed in possession of any statement submitted by the inspectors, and also of copies of the report of the chief inspectors relative to this whole matter."—Yes, I remember that.

9430. On the 3rd of May, a week afterwards, Mr. Bonaparte Wyse writes to Mr. Knight—"In reply to your letter of the 26th ult., I am requested by the Resident Commissioner to say that the reports furnished by the inspectors in connection with the statements of the recent deputation of Belfast teachers are considered by the Commissioners to be confidential, and they are unable to place copies of them in your hands." Now, there again it is not a statement that the Resident Commissioners consider them confidential, but that the Commissioners consider them confidential. Do you know whether the matter came before the Board?—Yes, because I took a very active part in the matter. They came before

the Board, and that reason was put forth that they were confidential documents, and, therefore, could not be furnished to the teachers; but I may go this length, as it was outside the work transacted at the Board, that so serious did I consider some of these replies of the inspectors, that I resolved to find out how much truth there was in some of the statements of some of the inspectors, and, consequently, in consultation with Dr. Taylor, a Commissioner in Belfast, we met a number of the Belfast teachers, and I took care, and so did Dr. Taylor, to go over every point that was made by the inspectors against the teachers, and ask them how far these statements were true, but that was for our own special information, and I announced afterwards at the Board that I did that. That is all I have to say about that.

9431. Mr. HANSEN.—Would it be fair to ask you what conclusion you arrived at with regard to the accuracy of their statements?—Well, the conclusion that we arrived at was, of course, that the statements of the inspectors and those of the teachers were conflicting.

9432. But you did not arrive at any conclusion as to where the truth lay?—No; if I arrived at any conclusion I do not think that I should like now to say whether I did or not.

9433. Sir HIRSH WILKINSON.—But a point arises on that, and it is this, that in the case of any matter of complaint, what each side says ought to be known by the other?—I think that is but fair.

9434. And any arrangement that could be recommended for the hearing of complaints in future ought to comprise such a security as would make sure that that rule would be followed?—Yes. I hold that when a complaint is made against a teacher he should know exactly what the complaint is, just the same as a complaint against an inspector should be made known to the inspector.

9435. You have referred to the case of reprimand, and they are sent out by the Examiner?—By whom?

9436. By the Examiner?—I was not aware of that. The CHAIRMAN.—Mr. Purcell told us that.

9437. Mr. HENRY.—Reprimands are sent out by the Examiner without reference to any higher authority?—That is a surprise to me. I was under the impression till this moment that all reprimands, every reprimand involving punishment of any kind, whether a mere reprimand, a fine, or anything else, always came before the Board.

9438. The CHAIRMAN.—I can assure you that evidence has been given here that the Examiner deals with reprimands without any reference to higher authority?—I am surprised to learn it, and I am very doubtful if every Commissioner on the Board would not be surprised.

9439. Sir HIRSH WILKINSON.—We are satisfied that one Commissioner, at any rate, was surprised?—That such a thing would be done would never occur to me.

9440. Mr. HENRY.—The Examiner stated that he issued a reprimand even where the inspector did not recommend any action; that on reading the report, if he thinks it necessary, he issues a reprimand himself?—Who?

9441. Mr. Purcell?—Well, I would consider that a very reprehensible arrangement.

9442. Mr. CORRY.—Of course, you understand that Mr. Purcell is in no sense to blame for sending out these reprimands. It has come to him as a tradition?—I am not alleging it as against him, but it is reprehensible whoever it is to blame.

9443. He is simply discharging his duty, I take it, in a very efficient and conscientious manner, but this duty in some way has come to him, and he gave evidence himself that he issued the reprimand, which he considered necessary?—That does not render the practice the less worthy of condemnation.

Mr. KAVANAGH.—A reprimand which did not involve a fine.

Mr. CORRY.—Every reprimand involves punishment in the end?—Yes, it stands as a black mark against the teacher.

9444. Mr. HENRY.—Listen to this (reads question 3428-9)?—That is an extraordinary piece of information.

1st May, 1918.]

Mr. PHILIP WAARD, examined.

[Continued.]

9445. He states there that censures are issued by him up to and including a reprimand without any reference to the higher authority?—That is extraordinary.

9446. Sir HIRSH WILKINSON.—You took part in the Clondraff case?—Yes, I was very much interested in that case.

9447. You know the letter which appeared in the *Independent* of the 30th October, 1917?—I know that letter. I think, practically, that that includes all that I know about the Clondraff case up to that time, and practically all that I know of it still, except what I learned from the memorandum sent out from your Committee to me, with the exception of one point, that Mr. McNeill had been sent down to Clondraff to report on it.

9448. The CHAIRMAN.—That was in March, 1917?—I think so. Mr. McNeill's report did not give the school "good," it was only, I think, "very fair," and the Resident Commissioner sent the report back to Mr. McNeill, which amounted practically to a suggestion or instruction to bring in a verdict of "good." That is the only additional information I have about the Clondraff case that is not embodied in that letter.

9449. Mr. HENRY.—Was it not sent back because that term "very fair" was not one that was not recognised?—Yes, that was the ostensible reason for sending it back, but I believe the real reason was that a school that could get "very fair" should be awarded "good."

9450. Mr. CONVEY.—What reason have you to think that it was in that view it was sent back?—Well, practically the word of the Resident Commissioner to me.

9451. Mr. HENRY.—I think that Mr. McNeill stated here that it was sent back simply because he used a technical term that was not recognised?—There is something in that. That is true enough so far as it goes.

9452. The CHAIRMAN.—That "very fair" not being one of those marks, "good" was the nearest approach to it?—Yes.

9453. Sir HIRSH WILKINSON.—You see familiar with the report of the Pwals Commission?—No. I read a great deal of it years ago.

9454. Well, I will read you a very short part of it. That Royal Commission made certain recommendations, and I shall read some of the recommendations at the end of a report of 518 pages, in which they considered the matter very fully. The report makes 518 pages by itself without the evidence, so there was a good deal of consideration given to the matter. The first recommendation is—"That the principle of an unpaid Board, representing the different sections of the community, is one that ought to be maintained." Well, it has been maintained. That was a matter not for the Board itself, but for the Government. The next is that "The suggestion of a second paid Commissioner of Education does not meet with our approval," and they give their reasons for that. And then the next suggestion is as to the time that the whole Board should meet, and they say—"It is not expedient that the whole Board should be summoned weekly for the consideration of routine business"; but the following four recommendations are those to which I wish to call special attention—"That routine business should be conducted by a Committee of the Board sitting in Dublin, whose names should be known to the public, and that all questions of general policy of the system, such as changes in the rules or interpretation of the rules, should be referred to the whole Board, to be specially summoned." I think you have already fallen in with the suggestion that there should be a Committee for the consideration of appeals?—Yes, but I would not go in generally for Committees of the Board for certain things. I would not be inclined to agree with having a number of Sub-Committees for the purpose of considering special questions. In fact, I objected to that shortly after I became a member of the Board, and got the whole Board made a Committee for many things, and it would be more satisfactory, indeed, I must say, for many things, than to have a whole lot of Committees to meet at special times, and to

report to the full Board, because at a Committee the full Board never turn up; still a certain number of them do, and I think that, unless in very rare cases, that is a more satisfactory way. I found it very unsatisfactory to have certain matters decided by a Committee, and I got it changed, so that there is only one Committee at present in connection with the Board, that is a Sub-Committee for considering publications.

9455. But at any rate, you consider that there ought to be a meeting of a Committee (which you think should be a Committee of the whole Board), at which these matters could be thrashed out?—Certainly.

9456. And that appeals should be brought before such a Committee?—Yes.

9457. It has been suggested that this would not involve a meeting of the Board every week; that they might meet once a fortnight, and that they might meet as a Committee, say on one day in the fortnight, and hold a formal meeting next day; that some members of the Board who live at great distances should have only one journey to make for attending both the Committee and the Board if they so wished?—Yes, I would be in favour of that, and that is practically what we do at the present time, only that the Committee meets early on the same day that the Board meet; and I may mention now that I am strongly in favour of having the whole Board a Committee, because I know that it was not satisfactory at all before when there was a small Committee, which reported to the Board, because the whole Board did not know the reasons that guided the small Committee in arriving at a certain conclusion, and we found that it did not work satisfactorily, and so, with the whole Board as a Committee, and every Commissioner allowed to be present at that Committee, there is no complaint that can be made at the general Board Meeting.

9458. You know, I suppose, that on some Corporations there are Committees of appointed members, with a right for any other member of the Board to attend, but you think the best thing would be to leave the Committee open to the whole Board?—Yes, and that is working well at the present time, and it meets early in the day as I have said.

9459. But you will see, at any rate, that that Royal Commission, while they intended that there should be one Resident Commissioner, considered that there was a considerable amount of business which ought to be taken by a Committee?—Yes.

9460. Then comes the next recommendation—"That it is desirable that any important circulars, letters of instruction, interpretation of rules, or communication issued during the year, should be inserted in the Appendix to the Report of that year?—I am entirely in favour of that.

9461. And you think that these circulars to inspectors should appear in the Report of the year, so that people should know them?—I do.

9462. That it would be desirable, and it might have removed some misapprehension if the circulars of which we have been speaking had been published in the Report of the Commissioners for the year in which they were issued?—Yes, I think it would be more satisfactory.

9463. Then they say—"That the regulations of the Board should be reviewed only once a year, and only after due notice given to all the Commissioners, a majority of whom should be present at the meeting at which the alterations are to be considered?—Yes. Well, of course, the first part of that recommendation is carried out. The second part is not, that is, about a majority of the Commissioners being present. That question never came up.

9464. Now, complaints have been made about alteration of rules, apart from notice altogether, and do you not think it should be desirable that no rule should be altered which affects people so seriously without a majority of the Board attending?—That is true, but I think what the teachers want is not that these alterations should be made by a majority of the Board, but that there should be notice before a proposed rule becomes a rule in practice.

1st May, 1913.]

Mr. PHILIP WARD, continued.

[Continued.]

9465. I am going to read a recommendation on that point, but you would not lay so much stress on a majority of the Board being present?—No, I really would not.

9466. You see it is not making a great claim on the Board if they are making their rules for the whole year that half of them should attend?—I may tell you that in the majority of our meetings there is more than a bare majority of the Board present.

9467. This recommendation is—"That it is desirable to adopt the present practice of the Committee of Council that no alteration of any rule, regulation, or by-law should be put into operation till such alteration should have been laid for one month before both Houses of Parliament, the alteration having been shown in distinctive type"—I am entirely in favour of that.

9468. You might, perhaps, know that there is an Act of Parliament for the publication of Statutory Rules, which requires 40 days' notice of all rules, and that copies of all proposed rules should be available to any public Board. It has been suggested to us that a month or 40 days would scarcely be sufficient in all cases, and that a longer time would be an advantage, considering the circumstances in which teachers and others are placed in regard to getting information and conferring together?—Would what is meant there be that the notice of the proposed alteration should be in Parliament?

9469. No, the requirement is that notice should be given of the proposed rule in the "Gazette." That would be a notice that the proposed rule had been drafted, and that copies of the proposed rule could be obtained at such and such a place, and during those 40 days any public body could send us representations, and the rule-making authority must take these representations into consideration before they adopt the rule?—I see. I think 40 days would be a very fair time for its consideration.

9470. It is suggested that the Teachers' Organisation might wish to have a longer time to consider rules of that sort, and to confer with their members, and it has even been suggested that six months might be given, and a period of three months certainly has been pressed upon us?—I would not object to three months, of course.

9471. Mr. HANMERSON.—Had you any knowledge of the work of the chiefs of inspection?—Very little.

9472. You have formed no opinion as to whether it is necessary that ex-inspectors should be employed clerically in the work of the office, as the chiefs of inspection were?—Whether they should be brought in?

9473. Whether they should be employed to do clerical work in the office as the chiefs of inspection were?—No, I have not formed any opinion on that question.

9474. The CHAIRMAN.—Might I suggest that it was brought before us that the examiners now are doing work formerly done by chiefs of inspection before 1900?—I know. The examiners would not be ex-inspectors?

9475. Mr. HANMERSON.—No?—Well, really, I could not tell whether the duties that these examiners do at present were formerly done by chief inspectors. I do not know.

9476. Now, have you considered at all the question of the present distribution of the inspectors' districts and circuits and general work?—I cannot say that I have considered it.

9477. You know that considerable changes were made in 1903?—Yes, the districts were reformed.

9478. The system was really entirely changed, I understand, and now we have the senior inspector with the circuit inspectors?—Yes.

9479. And the arrangement is such that the senior inspector only sees the majority of schools in his district or division once in five years?—He is at liberty to visit any school in his circuit.

9480. Perfectly true, but he cannot do much more work than that?—He cannot.

9481. Is that, in your opinion, a satisfactory arrangement?—I really do not see that it makes very much difference whether it is a senior inspector or a junior inspector.

9482. It makes this difference, that the senior inspector cannot know his district, and the district inspector used to?—Well, yes, there is something in that; that is true.

9483. We have had it in evidence that the senior inspectors seem to have very slight authority over the circuit inspectors, who are normally under them. It seems to be very little more than a nominal authority that the senior inspector is able to exercise?—I think that is true.

9484. Is that a satisfactory arrangement?—I really have not formed any opinion on it, but I think that the junior inspector should be quite independent, unless some case of difference of opinion arose between himself and the teacher, that he should not be too much under the control or influence of the senior inspector.

9485. You think he should not?—I think he should not.

9486. The present arrangement appears to have entailed in many parts of the country very frequent changes of inspector's districts?—That is so, but those changes were also frequent before 1900.

9487. As far as the evidence before us goes, they have been very much more frequent since the new arrangement came into force?—I think that is so.

9488. But you have not considered thoroughly how the whole of that arrangement works?—I have not.

9489. Now, under the present arrangement the junior inspectors begin with an initial salary of £150 a year, I think?—I think that is all.

9490. Is that sufficient to secure as good men as you could desire?—So far as the men are concerned, I think there are some men who come into the profession quite as good men as if £1,000 were offered; at the same time I consider it too little for the initial salary.

9491. I should have thought so, considering the responsible nature of the work, and we have it in evidence that some teachers have refused promotion, presumably on account of the lowness of the initial salary?—I believe that is so. I have one case in my mind of a thing like that occurring.

9492. Now, we have had some evidence of relations being considerably strained between the Resident Commissioner and some of the older officials, such as an inspector. Has that been considered by the Board at all?—No.

9493. Not in your time at any rate?—No.

9494. Yesterday Dr. Clarke told us that owing to the failure of the chief inspectors in the Belfast case Dr. Starke and Mr. Dilworth were asked to go to Council. Do you know anything about that?—No. I do not think they were asked by the Board. I think they went there as a matter of course by themselves. I do not think they got any direction.

9495. The impression made on my mind was that they were asked by the Board to go?—If so I do not remember. I know that impression is not on my mind.

9496. Do you think that such visits, which must entail the result of overriding the work of experienced officers, are calculated to promote confidence either between the Board and its inspectors or in the eyes of the public?—I never believed that the Resident Commissioner or any of the officers, such as the Secretaries, visited the schools for the purpose of overriding the decisions of the senior or junior inspectors.

9497. We have it in evidence that has been done, at any rate in one case?—It never came under my observation. It may be, but if it has been done I am not aware of it, and I never knew that that was the object. The object, I thought, was to see and to compare the marking of the different inspectors, and to see as far as possible that it was uniform, but I did not think that it was for the purpose of overriding any decision or of acting whether even the decision was a correct one.

9498. I have no doubt that Dr. Starke's visits are exceedingly valuable from his own point of view, and

1st May, 1913.]

Mr. PHILIP WARD, examined.

[Continued.]

he should keep in touch with the schools, and have first-hand knowledge of what is going on in the matter of inspection, but, of course, Dr. Sturges is not an expert?—That is true.

9489. And if he over-rides the judgment of the inspectors, is that likely to command their confidence or to command the confidence of the public?—It is not if he does it, but I do not know. I have no reason to believe that he has ever done so.

9500. We had that in evidence, I think?—Yes, you might have it in evidence, but I have no reason to believe it.

9501. I think, in answer to Sir Hiram Wilkinson, you said that in no case during the inquiries that were made with regard to Belfast or the Clonmel cases, did any individual teacher who complained get any redress?—Yes, there was one Belfast case in which the teacher got redress.

9502. But only one?—Only one, so far as I know.

9503. Was that question considered at all by the Board?—No.

9504. Now, attention has been called to those two circulars of April and August, 1912. Can you tell me with what object those circulars were sent out to the inspectors?—Was that the one in reply to the Belfast complaint, or the circular in which there was something about the merit mark of the teacher not being raised?

9505. I can give you the gist of the first circular without reading the whole of it:—"We wish to impress on the inspectors the importance of cultivating friendly relations with the teachers. We deprecate harshness or irritability on the part of the inspectors, or fault-finding on slight grounds," and it went on in that strain. That was the circular of April. Was that a confidential circular to the inspectors or was it not?—So far as I know it must have been confidential.

9506. You cannot tell me exactly?—No, but I am almost sure that it did not come before the Board. I am almost certain that it did not.

9507. Is it fair to ask your opinion upon a circular of that sort—what would the effect of such a circular be upon the inspectors as a body?—It is not unfair to ask me my opinion of the principle of bringing a circular before the Board. All circulars issued to inspectors should come before the Board, and should have the weight and authority of the Board behind them.

9508. But you prefer not to express your own personal opinion upon this particular circular?—Yes, that has not come before the Board. I have no hesitation in expressing myself that it is very wrong that it should have been issued without coming before the Board.

9509. Now, we have it in evidence that in 1906 the two Chiefs of Inspection at the time, Messrs. Dwyer and Furer, were suspended by the Resident Commissioner. Is that within his power?—I have heard that, but, of course, I have no personal knowledge of it. I really do not know. I think if he did not believe that it was within his power to do so as chief administrator he would not do it. I am not sure if the head of any public department has the power of suspending a subordinate. I dare say he had the power.

9510. Mr. CONNELL.—Has he the power of appointment?—He has not.

9511. And if he has not the power of appointment, how has he the power of suspending?—At present in any other public department of the Civil Service has not the head the power of suspending a subordinate, although he has not the power of appointment?

Sir HIRAM WILKINSON.—Might I just explain the different circumstances under which that might be done. Here in Dublin the Board and the Resident Commissioner are close at hand, but there are cases which involve foreign service, and the head of the foreign service might, under certain circumstances, suspend one of his officers until he could communicate with the office in London, and obtain, it may be, the decision of the Secretary of State, whether the suspension should be continued, or whether it should be removed, or whether it should be followed by more serious action; and the question of suspension here

might be justified if action were necessary between one Board meeting and another. Without attempting now to define what circumstances would render such action possible, one could understand very serious circumstances under which suspension might be necessary, just as persons even not in authority might take action under very peculiar circumstances.

9512. Mr. HANNAH.—I think that we have it that Mr. Furer, some little while before he resigned, announced that he would appeal to the Board in regard to the action taken in the Clonmel case. Did you know of that?—No, not at the time, not till either Mr. Furer himself or the Resident Commissioner informed me. I forget exactly which.

9513. Did that matter ever come before the Board?—No.

9514. It never did?—No.

9515. Would you consider that the inspector had an absolute right to appeal to the Board if he were at variance with the Resident Commissioner?—I would think so.

9516. You think he would have?—Yes, I think so. 9517. In a letter to Mr. Furer Dr. Sturges used these words:—"I am the final authority on matters of administration." Would that be your interpretation of his position?—Well, it is a difficult question to answer, but so far as the Charter constituting the Board is concerned, I do not think that it gave the Resident Commissioner more power in such a case as that than any ordinary Commissioner.

9518. You say that in the Belfast case the general feeling of the Board was against the teachers. Is it fair to ask you what the grounds for that feeling were?—I think the grounds were simply these, that they believed that the inspectors were incapable of doing any injustice to the teachers, and if the standard were raised they were justified in marking down the school when they did not reach that standard.

9519. You were present, I think, when that deputation came up?—I was.

9520. May I ask you what impression was made upon your mind?—It made the impression upon my mind that the teachers had really a serious grievance.

9521. There was a good deal of strong language used on both sides, was there not?—What do you mean by both sides?

9522. Well, a good many charges were made against the inspectors, and the inspectors bit back in return, did they not?—They did. That is, of course, the teachers' complaints were founded on the results of the inspection, and on the reports of the inspectors, and then these complaints were sent to the inspectors, and they brought in a very large supplement of complaints against the teachers.

9523. There were a good many personal charges, were there not, on both sides?—I think not very many personal charges.

9524. About want of courtesy and that sort of thing?—I dare say there were some, but not many.

9525. Did they make any impression on you or not?—Yes; when I hear about personal courtesy being concerned it naturally makes the impression on me that it would on anybody—that it is very wrong that an ungentlemanly course of behaviour or impertinence should be exhibited by either the teacher or the inspector towards the other.

9526. But no doubt there was a good deal of strong feeling at the time on both sides?—Yes, there was. Except from the reports of the inspectors I have no reason to know what was the nature of the feeling on the side of the inspectors, because I did not come in contact with them very much; but I know that there was a very strong feeling on the side of the teachers.

9527. You thought that a good deal of that was quite justified?—I did, for this reason—that from what I know of the character of the teachers concerned they were a high-minded body of men, and efficient teachers, and naturally when their schools were marked down they would feel it very seriously, not only from a monetary point of view, but from a professional point of view.

9528. We have had it occasionally stated in evidence that private or secret instructions were issued to some of the inspectors that the time had come for raising the standard?—I know nothing about that.



1st May, 1918.]

Mr. PHILIP WARD, examined.

[Continued.]

9529. Do you think that such a thing is possible?—Anything is possible.

9530. Well, that it is probable?—I could not even say that it is probable. I am not sure. I know nothing about it at all events.

9531. Well, with regard to the programme and the Notes to Teachers, are they submitted to the inspectors before they are issued for criticism?—I am not sure that they are; but they are submitted to the Board.

9532. True, but the Board do not know who is responsible for the opinions expressed, and for the methods recommended?—The Board generally takes it for granted that the Resident Commissioner and the secretaries and the chief inspectors are responsible.

9533. You have never had a case where there has been a sort of minority report on any recommendation, it having been submitted to a small Committee and the Committee disagreeing?—A Committee of the Board?

9534. No, a Committee of the office disagreeing as to what recommendations should be made either in the way of the programme or of the teaching of the subjects?—No.

9535. You would not have knowledge of anything of that sort?—No.

9536. The new proposals are submitted en bloc to the Board, and they are approved or rejected by them. Is that so?—That is so. I remember on one occasion (I am not sure whether it was the programme of 1911 or 1912, but I think it was 1911) that on a great many points I was called up, and consulted myself by the Resident Commissioner and Mr. Dilworth before the programme was issued.

9537. You were brought in as an expert?—I was.

9538. But there is nothing to show that the Board, as a Board, were asked to adopt them, or how the recommendations originated?—No.

9539. Now with regard to a recommendation that you made that there should be more examination, and that the examination should take place at the end of the school year, I suppose you have considered that that would mean giving up the uniform school year?—I presume that the ultimate result would be to give up the school year. At one time I held very strong views that each school should have its own school year the same as in the results days. I am not so strongly wedded to that opinion now.

9540. You recognise that there are advantages in the uniform school year?—I do.

9541. But if this recommendation of yours is to be carried out in its entirety, that there is to be a fairly full examination each year towards the end of the school year, it is perfectly obvious that there cannot be a uniform school year?—When I said that there should be a fuller examination towards the end of the school year, I did not mean that every school should be examined towards the end of the school year; I meant to say that some of those schools that were inspected during the early months of the year could be put into the last six months of the year in the following year.

9542. Then what you propose would be an alternation of periodical full reports?—Certainly, it could not be otherwise. You could not have a full examination of every school during the school year if you only examined towards the end of the school year.

9543. Would you be satisfied with, say, something like a full report once every three years on the majority of schools?—I would, certainly.

9544. With, of course, a yearly report on schools that were on the border line of inefficiency?—Certainly.

9545. Now you commented upon the difficulty of designating schools by single words, such as "Excellent," "Good," etc. Is it possible to give those terms any definite standard value?—I think it is almost impossible.

9546. I mean to say, let two people be in as close accord as possible, let their ideas of what is "Good" and what is "Very Good" coincide?—They will not.

9547. And therefore you would like to see the reporting under these heads abolished altogether?—Yes.

9548. And the reports couched in ordinary language?—Yes, more general terms.

9549. The *BEST* or *POOR*.—There is one point that I am not clear about. You mentioned the fact that in two years and eight months you had received 3,000 letters from teachers. Well probably more than one of those letters might have come from the same writer. Could you give us any rough idea of what might be the number of teachers that addressed you?—Probably. I could not.

9550. If we were to try to see how widespread was the discontent, it would be necessary to try and make some guess at the number of people who wrote, not so much to know the number of letters you receive as the number of writers?—I understand that. It would be a good deal less, say probably a third less.

9551. That would be roughly about 3,000 writers?—Yes.

9552. All the letters would be more or less letters of complaint, I expect?—Very largely letters of complaint.

9553. Even some of those letters of complaint you might not quite regard as letters of people who were discontented, but as letters coming from people who would write about matters of small complaint, that would not show that the writers were really discontented?—That is quite true, but I find that even in the case of teachers who were doing excellent work, and who had not much complaint to make of how they were going on, and the nature of the reports that they were getting, still there was a spirit of discontent pervading their letters.

9554. So might I infer that 1,500 of those writers would be quite discontented?—I am sure that is so.

9555. It was stated here that the discontent was not general, that there were really areas where the bulk of the teachers were discontented, and other large areas where the bulk of the teachers were contented with individuals up and down who were dissatisfied?—I think there is some truth in that, because I know that there were certain districts from which I received a greater number of complaints than from other districts.

9556. And do you think that there might be considerable areas where there would be only occasional cases of discontent?—Yes, I dare say that is true.

9557. Now in reference to the situation in Belfast, the Chairman was asking you why the Board did not tackle the system itself. The Board apparently tried to deal with the particular case in Belfast?—Yes.

9558. And did not make any attempt to modify the system. Well in that connection you stated that the circular that was sent out was expected to have a good deal of effect, and you used the words, if I caught them rightly, "I expected more from the circular." Now did you personally expect the circular to do a considerable amount of good?—I did.

9559. And in that opinion you coincided with the majority of the Board?—I did.

9560. And you were disappointed when the circular did not produce that effect?—I was.

9561. Mr. Harrison asked you if there was not some disappointment at the fact that the two chief inspectors did not bring about more contact in Belfast. The two chief inspectors went down?—Yes, they did, and not to Belfast alone, but to the two circuits embracing six inspectors.

9562. The Belfast circuit?—The circuits, and they only visited, I think, about a dozen schools altogether, and those dozen schools were selected at random. As a matter of fact, it was I myself who selected the schools, not by name, but by number.

9563. So the selection of the schools was a matter of chance?—It was chance.

9564. They were not selected to be in favour of the teachers or in favour of the inspectors?—Quite so.

9565. Now the statement made by Dr. Clarke yesterday was that seeing that the two chief inspectors had not been successful in Belfast, when the Circular trouble arose, Dr. Clarke himself, thinking the matter out, thought that it would not be a wise course to send down the two chief inspectors again, and he suggested the idea of trying a new plan, and of sending down the Resident Commissioner and the secretary. I think that was the statement made by Dr. Clarke?—I really am not clear that there was any instruction to send down Dr. Starkie and the secretary. I am not

1st May, 1913.]

Mr. PHILIP WARD, examined.

[Continued.]

clear about that. The only thing I know about that is, that I think we made a fearful mistake in dealing with the Tipperary business, and I said that at the time, and I hold it still.

9560. But I suppose you would agree that there was something in the suggestion of Dr. Clarke. It might be a mistake, and it might be an error of judgment, but at least there was some reason?—There may have been some reason for it, but I did not expect it to be a very practical way of dealing with the situation. At all events, that is the way it appears to me now.

9561. In reference to the promotion to teachers you pointed out to us that their schools should be satisfactory in discipline and certain other aspects?—Yes.

9562. And that the character of the school should be "good." Then will that character of the school be determined largely by the report of the inspector, or how will you determine the character of the school?—I do not see what other means you have of determining the character unless through the reports of the inspectors. We have no other machinery.

9563. Can you conceive any other machinery?—Well, I do not know. I do not think I could think of its being done unless through their officers. You must depend a good deal upon your officers for all things of that kind.

9570. I quite agree with you. You see the thing cannot be weighed and measured by any mechanical process, so you must depend on the judgment of some man or other in the end. I suppose the limited style of examination that you were discussing with Mr. Harrison, would come in as a factor in the formation of an estimate of the character of the school for the promotion of the teachers?—The examination?

9571. Yes?—Yes, the result of the examination.

9572. You explained, to my mind, in your answers to Mr. Harrison, what you meant by the examination considerably more than you had explained it at an earlier period. I quite follow what you intend by examination, but in the earlier part of your evidence in discussing examination it seemed to me that you limited the object of the examination to testing the work done in the school, the work of the teacher and the work of the pupil. Am I correct in that view?—Yes, I think so.

9573. Now would you agree with me that there is another very important object of examination and inspection, and that object is to guide and direct the method of teaching in the school?—You mean the inspector to guide and direct?

9574. I mean that the character of the examination will determine in the long run the character of the teaching?—Yes, that is very largely so.

9575. And consequently when you recommend the system of examination you must have before your mind not only the testing of the teaching done for the last twelve months or three years, and the knowledge acquired by the pupils, but also what effects that examination is going to have on the future methods of teaching in that school?—Certainly I would think that, because the result of the examination would naturally be the result of the methods followed by the teachers.

9576. But when the teacher sees that a particular style of examination is followed out in the school, will he not try to adapt his teaching so as to prepare his children for that style of examination?—Probably he will, but if it is more inspection, he will also see that some inspectors will have certain ideas of inspection just as well as some inspectors will have certain ideas of examination, and the teacher will probably work up to that, and that, I think, in itself, is an argument in favour of the frequent changes of inspectors.

9577. So, therefore, we will agree that both in inspection and in examination you must keep your eye on what is going to happen in future?—That is quite true, and also to keep chiefly in your eye what is best for the future of the child and for the future of the nation.

9578. So that therefore we agree that neither inspection nor examination should be merely a test of what has been done?—Neither by itself.

9579. And that you must keep your eye on the future?—Yes.

9580. Now you did not approve, very strongly at least, of the effects produced on the education of the nation by the old results system. You told us that this morning, and that you thought the new system counted more to the intelligence of the pupils?—Yes.

9581. The CHAIRMAN.—I understood you to say that the new system was more practical in preparing the pupils for their future occupations?—Quite so.

9582. The HONORABLE MEMBER.—In giving them more aptitude for the particular work in life they take to?—Quite so.

9583. Not that it trained them for a particular purpose, but that it gave them the aptitude?—Gave them power.

9584. Power and aptitude?—Yes.

9585. That is all that can be done in the elementary schools, I presume?—Largely.

9586. You cannot expect the elementary schools to turn out carpenters or accountants or farmers?—No.

9587. Now I hold here the sixth-third report of the National Board for the year 1895. That would be four years before the new system came in, would it not?—Yes.

9588. And also four years before the advent of the present Resident Commissioner to the Board?—Yes.

9589. Now, the reports of the inspectors, I think, very generally carry out the view that you express to us. They largely show that the instruction in a great many schools was mechanical. That it was piling together and getting into the minds of the pupils a number of words that often have not much meaning. Now here is an extract from that report on page 169:—"Unfortunately the evil practice of storing the memory with empty words is only too common. It is painful to think of the waste of time and drudgery by which pupils acquire a worthless store of knowledge in the attainment of which their intelligence is deadened." That is a report of Mr. O'Connor, the present chief inspector, and I suppose your personal experience would confirm that, and that you would not be prepared to deny that such things occurred?—As a matter of fact, I do not know what is meant by it.

9590. Now this is another extract from the report from pages 62 and 63:—"Such using of words without a definite meaning is necessarily very injurious to the development of the children's intelligence, and renders it nearly impossible to produce intelligent reading among a class of children whose knowledge of literature is mainly confined to the school readers." That is from Mr. Pinner, the chief inspector?—I agree with that.

9591. You recognise that that is a class of reading which is very injurious to the development of the children's intelligence, so that you had not only the fact that the reading itself was bad, but also that it injured the development of the child's intelligence?—I would not go that length.

9592. Now on grammar we have the remarks of the inspector also. Grammar consisted very largely in those days of parsing, did it not?—It did, very largely.

9593. And parsing might become mechanical, I presume?—Well, I do not know. I would not be inclined to agree with anybody that would say that parsing could be mechanical.

9594. I hold it strongly?—That it can be?

9595. Absolutely?—It is very difficult.

9596. My experience of parsing was this. When I was trying to teach young lads a little Latin and Greek, and other languages, while they parsed with absolute accuracy in English, they had no idea of parsing if you wanted to make up Latin words and the relation of those words one to the other?—That might be from not being sufficiently familiar with the Latin language.

9597. This was merely the very rudiments of Latin?—But to show very aptly how really the old parsing made the child think and think intelligently, I may mention that after analysis was introduced under the new system, there was no difficulty at all in teaching the children of a higher standard to analyse a sentence, because they could parse so well before the

1st May, 1913.]

Mr. PHILIP WARD, examined.

[Continued.]

introduction of the analysis; and when the next generation of children got up it was just as difficult to teach them analysis as it had been to teach the others parsing previously.

9597. That was your experience?—That was my experience, and I think it was very largely the experience of other teachers.

9598. Then I think, I might assume that your school was intelligently taught?—Let us hope so.

9599. And they were able to parse intelligently, and if they parsed intelligently, it was, of course, a great help to them in analysis, but if we do agree that parsing could become mechanical, then the parsing would be absolutely useless to them in analysis?—If it could become mechanical, but my contention is, that no subject that requires the exercise of thought can really become mechanical.

9601. That is if it employs the exercise of thought, but that is begging the question. I say it did not require the exercise of thought?—Then, my lord, you and I differ there.

9602. Here is an extract with reference to that from page 100 of this report:—"I have no hesitation in declaring that what is taught under the name of parsing in our schools is of little practical use to the pupils, and it is no exaggeration to say that a very large portion of the time spent on it is wasted. Many who can tell you that 'have written' is the perfect tense, and 'had written' the pluperfect, are utterly unable to say when either tense should be used." Now from mere observation they were able to say "have written" was perfect and "had written" was pluperfect, just as they could distinguish one cow by its colour from another?—But those children that were taught to know these tenses were also taught to know under what circumstances they were to use them.

9603. I am sorry to say when I taught a grammar school, that I used not to meet them. That was written by Dr. Alexander, who was then head inspector in the Cork district; so you do not agree with Dr. Alexander in that. Well, now, on the same question on parsing here is another quotation from page 160:—"At present it is very doubtful, considering the compositions of the fifth and sixth class pupils, if the grammar that they have been taught is of any practical use to them." He finds the grammar defective in relation to their compositions, and that inspector is Dr. Steeds, district inspector in Dundalk?—That may be very largely true, because, after all, we must remember that the children do not put their knowledge of grammar so much into practice as the methods of speaking and writing that they were accustomed to in their own homes.

9604. But if the parsing were intelligently taught, as I have no doubt it was taught in your school, would not that help them very much in their speech and composition?—It certainly should, and it must have, to some extent.

9605. But if the parsing were taught, as I believe it was in a large number of schools, purely mechanically, could it do any good either in speech or in composition?—I hold the opinion still that parsing is a subject that never could be taught mechanically.

9606. Of course, you do not agree with those inspectors. Now with regard to the question of arithmetic, which in some schools was a strong point in the old results system, could not the teaching there become mechanical too—you used test cards to a large extent, and might not exercise day after day in working out those test cards become something of a mechanical process?—The process itself might be mechanical enough, but they must be able to think of the meaning of the question, and see how the result would be worked out, or how you would arrive at a certain conclusion. I hardly believe that arithmetic could be taught very mechanically, and the strongest reason that I have for thinking that arithmetic was not at all badly taught under the results system was the foundation that it laid for those who were studying for the Civil Service examination, and examinations in diocesan colleges, and one thing or another at that time.

9607. A great deal of the Civil Service examinations was pretty mechanical in arithmetic. The working of long tests is a purely mechanical process?—That is very true, but long tests and the thinking out of problems and working out of questions are very different things.

9608. They are quite different things; but take two children, one taught the rules of arithmetic theoretically and practically, who understands the whole rule well, and works out a certain number of exercises to understand that rule, and then passes on to another rule, and does that in the same way. That child has got hold of the principle and practice. Now having taught a child in that way, you submit that child to examination on test cards with another child that has had great training and practice in solving test cards, and which of the two do you say is likely to make the better show at the examination?—It would depend very largely upon the position that both children have had.

9609. I assume that the first child has had very little or no practice in solving test cards. But in solving questions that come under the rules, and that he passed on from one rule to the next rule?—Yes.

9610. And that he has not been submitted to the process of taking a number of mixed questions?—The child that had the most practice will be the more successful in solving the questions.

9611. But which was likely to be the better taught—would not the first child be the better taught?—Because he knows the principles?

9612. The principles with sufficient practice?—If a carpenter is making a chair, and there is another man who theoretically understands every principle involved in the making of a chair, but has had no practice in it, I suppose I would prefer to have the chair made by the stupid carpenter rather than have it made by the man who knew all the principles.

9613. I am entirely with you, but our analogy is not quite perfect. Which of the two children (take them, say, five years away from school) will have the best chance of tackling a problem at the end of five years, and be the better instructed to go to a Technical School or an Agricultural School?—Remember I am not arguing the question; I am not arguing at all that the reasons of the processes should not be taught where they can be taught. I believe that it is perfectly right to do it. It is the correct thing to do to teach the principles along with the practice, but I hold that the principles of themselves are not sufficient, that unless there is a good deal of practice in subjects requiring thought there will not be success.

9614. I am absolutely with you there, and the only question we are considering is this, whether the examination under the results system tended to that style of teaching?—You are referring to the one subject?

9615. At the present moment to arithmetic?—I have no hesitation at all in saying that the teaching of arithmetic was far more practical and led to far better results under the old system than it does under the new.

9616. And that the pupils held their arithmetic better, that it remained in their memory?—Yes, because they were able to apply it afterwards when going to some profession. If that were not so, would we have the number of complaints that we have at the present time, and it is chiefly, mind you, with regard to arithmetic that the complaints are made.

9617. I quite understand the complaints, although I do not attach very much importance to them. I confess to you I have discussed those complaints with some of the teachers of secondary schools, and after the discussion I think they have changed their minds a bit. This is the last quotation I will make on the arithmetic question. It was from page 138—"Instruction in arithmetic tends to degenerate into the mere working of test questions. Teachers procure series of arithmetic cards, and pupils are set to work the isolated conundrums contained in them with very little reference to principles even in the easier classes."—That is quite possible; that might be, but I think if the children did not understand the process it would be a very difficult thing to teach a boy of the Fifth Standard (no matter how much you drilled

1st May, 1913.]

Mr. PHILIP WARD, examined.

[Continued.]

him, if you drilled him the whole year on that one subject, and taught him nothing else) to do the questions of the Sixth Standard.

9018. You and I largely agree that you are not in favour of the old results system, and that you would not go back to the old results system?—I would not.

9019. And also in any examination that you would wish to have carried out, you should see that the examination should be guarded so as not to lead to bad teaching?—Certainly.

9020. And the same thing applies to inspection?—Quite so.

9021. And it is quite as important to see that these methods will not lead to bad teaching as to test acquired knowledge?—Quite so.

9022. Mr. Corbett.—We had a brother Commissioner of yours yesterday, who made the admission to us that he learned a good deal more of the work of the Board here than he had known before, although he had been a Commissioner some five years, and I think we have had it from you to-day that you also learned something that was entirely new to you, that is about the sending out of your reports and censures by an examiner on his own initiative?—Yes, that is new to me. I think that is about all.

9023. Your brother Commissioner was unable to tell me, and therefore I will ask you (because it is a matter that very keenly interests the Committee, and a matter which it would be very important for us to know) if you could kindly give us an outline of your powers and duties as a Commissioner?—Well, first of all (it is a very wide question) they have reference to questions of general policy, the formulation of programmes or the sanctioning of these; the appointments of inspectors and dismissals of inspectors; sometimes the sanctioning of the appointment of teachers and sometimes the dismissal of teachers; the awarding of increment and promotion, even the promotion of clerks in the office sometimes comes before the Board, and so on. It embraces a number of things. Unless I was asked some particular thing that had come within our purview, I might not be able to enumerate all the duties embraced in the work of the Commissioner.

9024. And all the rights?—And all the rights.

9025. Are they defined in any document with which you have been supplied?—They are not, I think, defined in any document except so far as the Charter defines them, which is very general.

9026. The Charter is the only document that has been ever supplied?—Yes, so far as I know of.

9027. Under the Charter each Commissioner in the administration of education has exactly the same rights and powers?—Yes, I think so.

9028. Then, legally, every Commissioner has the same power and the same authority, but, in practice, have they not largely divested themselves of their power, and passed it on to the Resident Commissioner?—In practice, that would appear to be so, and, of course, when I was appointed I fell in with the prevailing practice, and I was often, I confess, more concerned with what I could do for an individual teacher by going to the Resident Commissioner than I was really with the privilege that I possessed as a Commissioner.

9029. Those rights of the Commissioners were handed over to the Resident Commissioner by a Board's Order of the 7th January, 1902?—Yes, I heard something about that. I know nothing, of course, about it except what I heard.

9030. You saw it referred to in Mr. Bosworth Wynne's letter?—Yes, I think so.

9031. Have you since referred to the minute of the Board of the 7th January, 1902, to see exactly what it contained?—No, I have not.

9032. But since that time a very much larger volume of power appears to have passed into the hands of the Resident Commissioner, that is since 1902?—Probably no more power has passed into his hands recently than was in his hands when I became a member of the Board.

9033. No additional power, to your knowledge, has passed into his hands since you became a Commissioner?—Yes. I mean no additional power.

9034. I referred yesterday to the evidence given by Cardinal Cullen many years ago at the Forster Commission, in which he, with far-seeing wisdom, anticipated the danger of the Commissioners allowing the Resident Commissioner and the secretaries to become, in reality, the Board. Do you think from what you have seen of this Clooduff case, and the conditions entailed upon the inspectors, and the relations between inspectors and teachers, and the claim made by Dr. Starke, that he is the final Court of Appeal in all questions of detail in the administration of the Board, that Cardinal Cullen's anticipations have materialised. The Commissioners in accepting office accept the responsibility for the fair and just administration of the system of primary education?—Yes.

9035. Are they not then responsible for taking precautions to ensure that no injustice shall be done to a teacher?—Yes, and I think it was a very sensible and very sensible policy to allow that power to go out of their hands.

9036. Rule 96 of the Commissioners' Rules, with which you are acquainted gives nominally the power to a teacher who has any well-grounded cause of complaint against an inspector to appeal to the Commissioners directly?—Yes.

9037. But, as a matter of fact, is there any appeal to the Commissioners, as the teachers and the public are allowed to think, under that rule?—Yes, I think so.

9038. Is there any appeal open to the teacher who complains about an inspection—has he any appeal to the Commissioners in reality since 1902?—In practice he has not. Rule 96 gave him the privilege of appealing, but, as I said, such appeals never come before the Board.

9039. So he has, in reality, no appeal to the Commissioners?—No; it is evident that the appeal lies with the Resident Commissioner, and that he acts in the name of the Commissioners. That is the meaning I take out of it.

9040. So that the nominal right of appeal has been nullified by a private regulation of which you, even as a Commissioner, knew nothing till last year?—That is so.

9041. Do you not think that the Commissioners are responsible, and that you yourself are responsible, to that extent, that when you become acquainted with that regulation you did not try to have it rescinded?—My acquaintance with it, or my knowledge of its existence, is of so recent a date that the opportunity did not present itself to me of taking any action with regard to it.

9042. Do you not think that the Commissioners have placed themselves, as men of great standing and men looked up to in the country, in a very undesirable position before the public by this private decision disabling themselves beforehand from hearing appeals or knowing what was going on in the country?—If you ask me what is my opinion of the resolution that was passed, I do not want to make any remark about particular Commissioners of the present day, but I think, as I said, that it was an unwise thing for them to allow the power to go out of their hands.

9043. Now the trend of my question is not to suggest any limitation whatever of the Commissioners' power, but I think having regard to the anomalous position in which the Commissioners have placed themselves, that it might even be desirable to give the Resident Commissioner more absolute power, and to leave the whole of the administration of the Board in the hands of the Resident Commissioner?—That might be your opinion, but it would not be the opinion of the country.

9044. But do you not think there would be some advantage in it?—No.

9045. Do you not think that it would be better than the present anomalous position that the Commissioners occupy of giving their nominal approval to matters of which they know nothing?—I have already expressed my opinion as to giving their nominal approval to any individual. Further than that I won't go.

1st May, 1918.]

Mr. PHILIP WARD, examined.

[Continued.]

9646. We had it from Dr. Clarke yesterday, and we have had it from you to-day, that you always found the Resident Commissioner and the secretaries most willing to give information?—Yes.

9647. And to give consideration to any matters that you submitted to them?—Yes, and often I give them a great deal of trouble.

9648. But do you think that it is desirable that a Commissioner should have to apply privately to a brother Commissioner, though he is a paid Commissioner, for consideration of any particular case?—Yes, I think it is a pity that that is so, that those matters could not be brought before the Board. I dare say that if that complaint were made, Dr. Starke would say, "Well, you are quite at liberty to bring all these complaints before the Board," but the Board might say, "We have made a different arrangement, and Dr. Starke knows more about this than we do, and it would be better to see him about it." That might be the view that they would take. I am not saying that it would be, but it might.

9649. But do you not think that it is a very invidious position for a National Commissioner to occupy, that he has to go by the back stairs to a junior inspector like Mr. Bonaparte Wyse to try to get concessions for the teachers?—Well, in going to Mr. Bonaparte Wyse, it is not to get Mr. Bonaparte Wyse's own opinion. He is simply seeing for the Resident Commissioner. And he is a very courteous, nice gentleman. There is nobody, as I said, giving him more trouble than I do about individual cases. He is really seeing for Dr. Starke, and he consults Dr. Starke in every instance, so that we are not really going to Mr. Wyse, but to the Resident Commissioner.

9650. But is not your action in going to him or to the Resident Commissioner an admission that you recognise a higher authority in the Resident Commissioner than you do in yourself?—Well, I would not exactly put it in that way, but he comes into more practical connection with these cases and with the teachers than the ordinary Commissioners, and therefore he has a better knowledge of the cases, and if a Commissioner goes to him, it is sometimes not only to press his individual view with regard to a case, but to find out from the Resident Commissioner what is the official opinion about a case, what he really knows about it, because sometimes when an individual Commissioner might have erroneous notions as to the merits of a case, he would have those erroneous notions corrected by an interview with the Resident Commissioner, who knows more about it, having got a report direct from the inspector.

9651. Have you ever considered, during your time on the Board, whether, if you so desired, or if any other Commissioner so desired, and had the time available, you could take a part every day in the administration of the office as Dr. Starke does?—Have I ever considered it?

9652. Have you ever considered whether you have power to sit with the Resident Commissioner every day, and examine papers, and express an opinion as to any papers submitted to him?—Well, in reality, I dare say every individual Commissioner would probably have that power, but you must consider that he, after all, is the administrator of the system directly responsible to the Lord Lieutenant.

9653. Are you aware that there was an opinion on which two Commissioners sat in the office?—No, but I see nothing anomalous in it.

9654. Two Commissioners sat in the office for weeks, whatever length of time they wanted, and had inspectors and other people before them in connection with the details of administration. You did not hear of that?—No. What was the object of it? Was it for the purpose of seeing how the system was worked?

9655. I cannot tell you what their object was?—But I wanted to learn something.

9656. It seems to me to be an extremely difficult position to understand. We had it from Dr. Clarke yesterday, that he knew very little of what was being done in the office, and we have it to-day that you yourself knew nothing about the reprimands and

concessions to teachers?—Yes, I know a great deal about them, but I know nothing about an examiner sending them out. I know a good deal about censure and reprimands and fines, and all that. A great number of those things come before the Board, but I did not know there was any other authority that had power to do this except the Board.

9657. Censure and reprimands come before the Board?—Yes.

9658. Are those matters which involve fines?—Yes, and all reprimands without any fines. I did not restrict my answer to cases of fine.

9659. Of course, the idea that I suggested about the handing over of the whole administration to a single paid Commissioner is one that I am not to be taken as favouring myself, but it occurs to me that where the Commissioners have had the power taken out of their hands to so large an extent, it would be a natural outcome to let the Resident Commissioner administer all?—Of course, I am not going to express any opinion on that. I know that they have not let all the power out of their hands.

9660. But they have let a good deal go, and Dr. Clarke told us yesterday that he thought that things were going very smoothly between the teachers and the inspectors, and he grounded that statement on the fact that two teachers who seemed to have no complaint called on him lately to discuss matters at the suggestion of the inspector, and that they told him that they were satisfied. Do you think that any importance should be attached to such an incident?—No. If they had no grievance, what did they come there for?

9661. They were sent by the inspector. Now, in reply to Mr. Harrison, you said that you did not admit that the Resident Commissioner was the final authority on administration?—Yes, I think that that is so.

9662. The Chairman.—Would it come to this, that the Board could reverse an administrative decision of the Resident Commissioner if it chose?—I think so, because Dr. Starke is frequently in a minority at the Board in a division.

9663. That means that the Board sometimes goes contrary to his opinion?—Quite so.

9664. Mr. CORRY.—His lordship asked you in reference to the discontent whether it was confined to certain districts. I would be glad to know whether those communications expressing discontent and dissatisfaction reached you from all parts of the country?—They did, certainly, but from some districts more than others.

9665. But they are very general?—They are. I think there is scarcely a county in Ireland that I have not received complaints from.

9666. Are you a constant reader of the *Irish School Weekly*?—Fairly.

9667. Do you think the articles in it fairly express or represent the feelings of the teachers, for it is regarded as a sort of organ of the teachers?—I could not say. I am not inclined to set very much store upon leading articles in an educational journal or in a political organ.

9668. The Board has legal advisers?—One so far as I know. Cases are referred specially to counsel now and again, but not as a standing legal adviser. They have a standing legal adviser or solicitor.

9669. Could you take any steps to ascertain whether the Commissioners acted within their rights in 1908 in making that regulation in regard to appeals and nullifying the published rules?—I really do not know; I would have to obtain legal advice.

9670. But could you take steps as the Board?—I could take steps, of course. I could ask what could be done about the matter, or I could give notice of motion to have the regulation rescinded.

9671. Do you claim the right to discuss educational matters with an inspector?—Certainly.

9672. And you could not for a moment imagine that an inspector would be sitting wrongly in discussing with you questions of schools and examinations and merit marks?—Not at all. I do not think he would think it outside his duty, or that he would be acting irregularly in doing so. In the memorandum that you sent me of Mr. Purser's evidence, something to that

1st May, 1913.]

Mr. PHILIP WARD, examined.

[Continued.]

effect occurs in a remark of the Resident Commissioner's, but I do not at all agree with the Resident Commissioner in his statement.

9675. The CHAIRMAN.—What was the statement precisely?—That Mr. Purser has no right to discuss matters of detail with an individual Commissioner behind his back, meaning myself as the individual Commissioner.

9676. You do not agree with that?—I do not.

9677. Mr. COFFEY.—In that letter of June, 1912, he says, "It was still more strange to find him discussing the details of administration with a Commissioner?"—As a matter of fact, he did not discuss details. It was the broad question of paying an increment to this particular teacher. We did not go into details at all; but apart from that altogether, I think that I would be entitled, and that it is my privilege, to discuss matters of detail with the chief inspector, or with an ordinary inspector, or with Dr. Starke himself.

9678. In connection with the Glenduff school that was referred to in one of those published letters, did Mr. Dilworth tell you that he thought the school was undermarked by Mr. Cusack?—Yes, I think he did tell me. I am not certain, but I think he did.

9679. And did the Resident Commissioner say it was undermarked?—I am not sure whether he did or not. One thing I know he said, that Mrs. Kelly was a very fine teacher. He had not a very high opinion of Mr. Kelly, but he had a very high opinion of Mrs. Kelly as a teacher, as assistant in the school. But I really could not tell whether he said the school was undermarked.

9680. On question of discussion with a Commissioner. Sir Patrick Keenan, when he was chief of inspection, was examined before the Fowls Commission, and in reply to a question of one of the Commissioners, he said, "I have an opportunity of hearing the general view of the Commissioners from the Resident Commissioner and from other Commissioners with whom I have opportunities of discussing matters," so that nobody ever thought of keeping an inspector from discussing matters with an individual Commissioner, and, of course, an individual Commissioner would not concede any such power to the Resident Commissioner as to deprive him of his right to discuss matters with the inspector. Is not that so?—I think that is so. I do not know what the opinion of other Commissioners is, but that is my opinion.

9681. I do not think I need ask you anything in connection with the work of the schools, as your statement is very clear and very full on that head. I am glad to find that you favour examination to a larger extent than at present. Is not that so?—Yes.

9682. It would be better, too, even from another point of view. There are a great many inspectors, as I have already stated, who do examine pretty fully at present, and there are others who do not. Now there cannot possibly be any uniformity so long as that difference of method exists?—No.

9683. We have it in evidence from Mr. McNeill, and, indeed, also from Mr. Dilworth, that under the instructions issued to inspectors it is quite within the right of a senior inspector to go into a school and lower the mark without asking a single question. We have that in evidence. Do you think that is defensible?—It is not.

9684. Mr. KAVANAGH.—Now with reference to the answer you gave to Mr. Coffey, would the other members of the Board of National Education agree with you that the Board has handed over its power to the Resident Commissioner, and that all power has passed to the Resident Commissioner?—I could not say, but I think I did not say that the Board handed over all its power to the Resident Commissioner.

9685. Are you prepared to say that, as far as you are concerned, you have handed over the consideration of appeals to the Resident Commissioner?—No. I found that state of affairs existing, and there has never been any change. I stated at the beginning what appeals really come before the Board, and what do not come before the Board. What I say is, that reports come before the Board, but no appeal from the decision of the inspector comes before the Board.

9686. That is to say that they are all handed over to the Resident Commissioner?—Yes. I do not know whether you could rightly say that they are handed over or not, but they never come to the Board.

9687. But we have had it in evidence that they are laid at the table of the Board at each meeting?

Mr. HENRY.—Only those that involve fines?—Oh, yes, these. I have stated the matter in these words—this is my statement in regard to that.—There are two classes of reports that come before the Board: first, cases of inefficiency, of irregularity, or of personal delinquency, which involve direct punishment, come before the Board, but ordinary reports such as the raising or lowering of a school mark or a personal mark do not come before the Board.

9688. Mr. KAVANAGH.—That is, reports, but I am talking of appeals?—That is, an appeal from the decision of an inspector in raising or lowering a report never comes before the Board.

9689. You are quite certain of that?—Quite certain.

9690. All appeals are considered only by the Resident Commissioner?—Yes, that is so.

9691. I asked you the question whether the other members of the National Board would agree with you in that?—I do not know.

9692. You were talking of the lowering of reports in the third year as naturally very damaging to the teachers?—Yes, and sometimes even in the second year.

9693. We had in evidence that the inspectors are inclined to be more lenient in the third year, the year that would affect the salary of the teacher—is that your experience?—I could not answer that question for this reason—I have had a number of complaints from teachers that a report was lowered, therefore depriving them of their increment, but no teacher would write to me to tell me that an inspector was more lenient, nor would an inspector write to me to tell me such a thing. I really could not give a categorical answer to that question.

9694. But the inspectors have told us themselves that they are inclined to be more lenient in the third year, when they know it would affect the salary of the teacher?—I have no right to doubt the word of an honourable man.

9695. Now with respect to the grievances of the teachers, you say you had about 3,000 letters of complaint?—They were not all complaints. Some of them might be letters saying that their increment was about to become due, and asking for an extension of service when their time was almost up, and so on. They were of various characters.

9696. Dr. Clarke said he was also inundated with correspondence about the same thing. Do you think that the teacher should have the right of a re-inspection on appeal?—In every instance. I stated that clearly that the teacher should have a right to re-inspection, because I hold it impossible for any conscientious man to make an appeal for a re-inspection if he did not believe that he had a really tangible grievance.

9697. You think they ought to have a right to re-inspection?—I do.

9698. By a different inspector, of course?—By a different inspector, and if possible either by a chief inspector or some inspector outside that circuit in which the school is situated, although there would be a difficulty there, because it would be felt rather to be an indignity put upon the senior inspector if you brought in another senior inspector, perhaps of shorter service, to decide upon his work.

9699. But could not the Board have a standing referee, an inspector who would do nothing else?—I am sure Dr. Starke will likely tell you when he comes before you what he proposed to do, and what the Board sanctioned, to make an appeal to the Treasury to grant as the power of having four divisional inspectors, one in each province, whose duty would largely consist in hearing appeals.

9700. Acting practically as referees?—As referees. I may tell you the Treasury has not sanctioned that proposal.

9701. The CHAIRMAN.—What would that cost altogether?—I do not know exactly now, but I know it would not involve a very big sum of money at all.

1st May, 1913.]

Mr. PHILIP WARD, examined.

[Continued.]

9709. Mr. KAVANAGH.—Could it not be done with the present staff?—It could; we proposed to do it with the present staff, and to have four senior inspectors for the purpose, to lessen their duties in their present office, and give them this additional duty.

9701. How would that increase the expense?—We proposed to give them an increase of salary, and then, of course, the travelling expenses would be increased.

9702. As the present time the teachers seem to think that they cannot get the ear of the Board. Is not that so?—Yes, I think that is the impression.

9703. And therefore they think that the only way is to write to individual Commissioners to pass their case?—Yes.

9704. Do you think that is a good system?—It is not.

9705. It is enough to make teachers dissatisfied with the system?—Yes. It is very bad for a Commissioner, who is a very busy man, perhaps otherwise, to assist a teacher in that way. I may tell you candidly that I have really been busier since I became a Commissioner than ever I was as a teacher.

9706. You are in favour of automatic increments as a matter of course?—Yes.

9707. Do you think that would take away the inducement to many teachers to improve?—But they would not get the increment unless the school was up to a certain standard.

9708. They would get it unless the school got a bad mark?—Unless it got a bad mark.

9709. Would that lessen the inducement to improve if they had only to get "fair"?—"Fair," as we know it now, would not carry an increment; but I held that in every school where the character of the work is designated as "good," that should carry an increment.

9710. The CHAIRMAN.—Or "satisfactory"?—Or "satisfactory."

9711. Mr. KAVANAGH.—Automatically?—Automatically, of course.

9712. Would you be in favour of yearly increments?—Certainly.

9713. A lower one?—A lower one than at present.

9714. Would you rather have a low annual increment than a larger triennial one?—Yes, certainly, because there is a chance of only losing the one annual increment. There would be the chance that if an increment were lost that year it might not be lost the following year, whereas the losing of a triennial increment is a very different thing.

9715. Mr. HARRISON.—In the proposed to make divisional inspectors, were the divisional inspectors to have a district?—Well, it was not very accurately defined, but I think the intention was that there should be one in each province.

9716. But would they have their own small district as well as the larger one?—They would, but their own work would be lighter; they would have fewer schools than they have.

9717. Mr. HENLY.—You stated that you made a mistake (that is the Board) in dealing with the Clonmel case?—I do.

9718. What was the mistake?—That we should have tried to give the teachers more satisfaction at that time.

9719. In what way?—That we should have shown to them that we were more sympathetic with them than we appeared to be, and have acknowledged even that reports were generally lowered unnecessarily, because I think from all that I know that if we had taken up that attitude, in all probability we would have dissipated the strong feeling of the teachers, and they would not be inclined to have that extremely bitter feeling of grievance that they have.

9720. And the Inquiry might not have taken place, I suppose?—Perhaps that might be so, too.

9721. It was stated by Dr. Clarke yesterday that when two inspectors failed in bringing about peace and contentment in Belfast, it was thought by the Board desirable to send down Dr. Sharkey and Mr. Dilworth. Now, you have stated that, as far as you know, they were never authorised by the Board to go down?—I do not remember that they were, because

they would not make a general report (and they never did) to the Board, in the same way as the chief inspectors made their report. Therefore, I say it would be more or less meaningless to send them down in that capacity.

9722. I have here a letter from Dr. Sharkey to Mr. Pomer in 1902, in which he says—"The Board have recently decided that the departments of the Chief Inspector and the Secretary are distinct and independent." Now, if these offices are distinct and independent, by what authority would Mr. Dilworth go down to review the work of inspectors?—Of course, I could not answer that question.

9723. There was no authority delegated by them to the Board?—Not that I know of. I know that Mr. Dilworth has gone out with the Resident Commissioner (or rather I have often heard it stated, but I have no evidence of it further than that) to different parts of the country; but it was not on the instructions of the Board, that is, unless those instructions had been given at an earlier period, before I was on the Board, and that those instructions were based upon as general.

9724. Now, I think it has been stated here in evidence that in that Clonmel case the old marking more nearly represented the actual state of the schools?—Possibly that may be true.

9725. How was that determined that it was the more nearly correct?—I am only saying that that may be true. I could not tell you.

9726. Do you think it is right that a new inspector coming into a district should be allowed to change the marks suddenly (and I do not want you to express any opinion, nor do I want to express an opinion myself adversely to Mr. Walsby or Mr. Browne). Supposing an inspector took one standard, and the teachers fulfilled all his requirements, and a new inspector coming in, and acting honestly according to his lights, took a different standard and lowered the marks, do you think it would be right to allow that lowering of marks to go on, suddenly as it did in that case?—No, because it suddenly affects a great number. I think it is a very big mistake.

9727. What do you think should be done in a case of that kind (and I ask you independently of the present instance, for we have those differences always). What would you suggest, so as to prevent this sudden change of standard, no matter what made of marking you have in that case, for whether you abolish the merit marks, or you have a general report, you are liable to the same thing?—I do not know what system you would adopt, except that the inspector should himself have sense enough to look upon it as a very foolish thing to do, to change suddenly the marks of a whole district, or nearly so.

9728. Would you approve of a regulation suggesting to the inspectors that there should be no sudden changing of marks for a year, till the teacher should have had an opportunity of becoming acquainted with the inspector's standards?—Would that help to prevent it?—It would, although I would not consider a suggestion of that kind should have to be made to an inspector, for I think that a man who knew his duty as an inspector thoroughly would not require such a suggestion as that.

9729. Had you not a fall of 5 per cent. in the Belfast marking of schools, and, I believe, a fall of 50 per cent. in the Clonmel schools?—Yes.

9730. And would not some suggestion of that kind be needed?—I confess something of that kind would be needed in those cases.

9731. And has there not been a sudden fall in other districts too?—I do not know of any other wide area, except the Tipperary group and the two Belfast groups—because, talking about Belfast, there are two groups and six inspectors, two general circuits, with three inspectors in each; and the two circuits were affected.

9732. Up to 1900 we had in the office the two chiefs of inspection, and it was their duty to read the reports, and note the action that was to be taken on those reports, and in case the action was in any way serious, to refer it, as at present, to the Resident Commissioner, by whom it was dealt with in Committee. Now, whether do you think it would be better

1st May, 1913.]

Mr. PHILIP WARD, examined.

[Continued.]

to have men thus trained, appreciating the work of the schools, and dealing with those reports, or to have an examiner doing it (and it is only right for me to say this, that for my part I do not want to say an unkind word or an unfriendly word, or convey the least expression of disapproval of the action of Mr. Percell, who simply discharged the duties entrusted to him)—whether do you think it would be better to have men trained to appreciate and judge of the work, or to have the reports dealt with as they are at present by men who are only clerks, and who never examined a school?—It is very wrong that they should have the power to do such a thing.

9773. Then you think the reports should be judged and appreciated by the chiefs of inspection?—Yes, by the chiefs of inspection, and if they recommended any action, of course, it would be with the approval of the Resident Commissioner, and then likewise would come before the Board.

9774. We had it in evidence of Mr. Hynes that, in his opinion, had the chiefs of inspection been dealing with these reports, the troubles that have arisen at Clonsilla and Belfast would never have arisen. Would you agree with that?—From what I know of Mr. Hynes himself, I believe that he would do nothing to allay the strong feeling.

9775. Do you think he would not?—He would not.

9776. And what about Mr. Pomeroy?—I think Mr. Pomeroy probably be inclined to do everything possible to smooth down matters. What I mean to say is, that I think his action would tend in that direction.

9777. We had the evidence of Mr. Gill, of the Department of Agriculture and Technical Instruction, that it is their senior inspector that reads all the reports, and to that fact he attributed, at least partly, the smooth working of their inspectorial system. Would not that seem to confirm the idea?—It would.

9778. Mr. Harrison asked you a question with regard to the chiefs of inspection doing clerical work, but I do not think they were, for I do not think reading the reports, and noting the action to be taken upon them, was clerical work?—Do not take me as objecting to the suggestion that probably you intended to make there—would it be for the advantage of peace in such cases that the senior inspectors should read these reports and take action. I am entirely with you in that question generally, that is about the chief inspectors. I am entirely with you with regard to that, but in the particular instance that you gave, I say that it would not have tended to peace.

9779. Speaking generally, you think it would?—Yes, it would, certainly.

9780. Now, in the case of a reprimand, we have it in evidence from Mr. Downing, that when His Grace Archbishop Walsh was on the Board, he insisted that all reprimands should go before the Board before they were issued. Do you think that that would be desirable at present?—I think it would.

9781. And if he were able to get such a regulation as that adopted, would it not be desirable to make an effort to get a similar regulation made now?—Certainly.

9782. You think that a re-inspection should be granted in every case?—I do.

9783. At the present time it seems to be determined by the reading over of the reports whether, in the opinion of the examiner, such a thing is necessary or not. Now, do you think that the teacher should get notice of the formal inspection of his school?—If the arrangements were such as the one suggested here, on which I was asked a question by some member of the Committee who previously examined, that when the inspection is very formal, the teacher should get notice as well as the manager, then I say in the case of appeal the teacher should also get notice.

9784. But there is a general inspection held in every school once a year?—Yes.

9785. When that general inspection is going to be held the teacher now gets no notice, and the manager gets a notice on the morning on which it is to be held?—Yes.

9786. Do you think it would be advisable that the teacher should also get notice?—I think it would.

9787. You said that you thought it desirable that the teacher should have all his pupils present, did you not?—Yes, I think that the teacher should have an opportunity of putting the best face possible on his year's work.

9788. And you have also given us evidence that in your opinion that general inspection should be held towards the end of the school year?—Yes.

9789. Now, I have taken note of a few cases that were sent to me (because although I am not getting thousands, I get an occasional communication), and I just give one or two as instances. Here is one inspection a short time after the boys returned from their harvest work on the day of the Limerick races. Another mentioned inspection on the day of Confirmation in the adjoining Church, held in Newcastle, in the County of Waterford. In another I have inspection a fortnight after the Summer holidays; in another the day after the opening of the school, and so on. Now, do you think it is an advantage either to the teacher or the pupils to hold these general inspections, and judge of the teacher's year's work a few days after the opening of the school, or it may be, we will say on a boisterous day, or on a day when a large number of pupils are absent, either at work or at some amusement in the locality?—It is very wrong to hold an inspection in such circumstances, and no inspector, if he were an angel, would be able to judge of that school with sufficient accuracy.

9790. The Chairman.—You speak of the absence of pupils on a rough or stormy day, but if the inspector has given long notice of this inspection to the teacher or manager, is he just to drive up to the school and to drive away again?

Mr. HERRIN.—In the time of the results pupils were notified that the examination would be on a certain day, and they came no matter what the weather was. Now, if there is a wet day, and it were known that the inspection is coming on, and if the teacher has not got in sufficient pupils for the examination let him suffer. If these examinations or general inspections are to be held towards the end of the school year, would it not, as suggested by Mr. Harrison, necessitate the giving up of the school year?—I think not necessarily. Still, in my mind I lean toward a school year for each school.

9791. Now, I see in the report of the Belfast deputation, that they dwell on that, and they point out that when the examination was late in August of 1907, the mark was "very good"; next year the marking was in April, "good"; in 1909, June, "very good," and the last year the examination in March, "good"; so that you see the marking varied there according to the time of year in which the formal inspection was held?—It is my contention that if that school were inspected, and all the circumstances taken into consideration, the marking awarded in March or February or January should be as high as the mark awarded in June.

9792. And Mr. Thompson later on stated, in reply to the Resident Commissioner—"Let every school complete its school year before it undergoes the examination." Do you agree with the view put forward by Mr. Thompson?—I do agree that it would give more satisfaction to the teachers if every school had its own school year.

9793. Would it not be better to have the teachers satisfied than to have the discontent that we have all over the country at the present time?—It would.

9794. You are in favour of more examination?—Yes.

9795. His Lordship has tried, and I think successfully, to bring out that the question of examination dominates the teaching, and that the natural tendency of all examinations is to get the teachers to work in accordance with the examination?—Yes.

9796. That the teaching is dominated by the examination?—Yes, that is that the teaching is worked up towards the examination. I think that is true.

9797. And his Lordship endeavoured to show that under the results system, in some cases at least, the examination and the teaching become mechanical?—I cannot agree with him that the teaching becomes mechanical in all subjects.



1st May, 1913.]

MR. PHILIP WARD, examined.

[Continued.]

9758. But in some cases?—In some cases; but it may become mechanical under more inspection, you know.

9759. Is the teaching is dominated by the examination, and if the teaching, as a result of that, becomes mechanical, is not that an objection to the style of examination, and not to examination itself?—That is quite true.

9760. Is it not an argument because there may be an abuse of a system, therefore the system should not be used?—Yes.

9761. Now, do you think that under the present arrangement the pupils are properly tested in arithmetic?—I do not. Above all subjects, I think they are not tested in arithmetic.

9762. You know Mr. Kelly, the senior inspector, I presume?—I do.

9763. He said: "I gave an arithmetic test" (this is from the 76th report of 1908-10, page 60), "an arithmetic test on the same day in the fifth standard in two schools, which have always obtained 'very good' or 'excellent,' and yet there was a difference of nearly 60 per cent. in the answering." Now, do you think it desirable that two schools should be marked with the same marks, and yet that when they are tested on the same day, there appears a difference of 60 per cent. in the answering in arithmetic. Do you think that is satisfactory?—I do not. Of course, the circumstances of the two schools should be taken into consideration.

9764. But he says the two schools have got the same mark, and therefore they are of the same standing under your present arrangements?—I hold that one test in arithmetic is not sufficient—that one boy might answer highly in one school and one test and a boy in another not.

9765. I do not think that that means one question. What he says is: "I gave an arithmetic test on the same day."—Of course, Mr. Kelly is known very well to be a very painstaking inspector and one who goes very minutely into the question of examination, and gives more of an examination than most inspectors.

9766. Now, I will give you another example also from Mr. Kelly. He had 88 schools, and those 88 schools included 10 infant schools, and this is an extract from page 145 of the Appendix to the 76th report. Mr. Kelly classified those schools according to the answering. He gave 3.4 per cent. "excellent"; 10.2 "very good"; 23.9 "good"; 25.0 "fair"; 25.0 "middling"; and 12.5 "bad." That is according to the test in arithmetic. And then he eliminated the 10 infant schools from the number, and then he got these percentages for the remaining schools:—0.0 per cent. "excellent"; 5.2 "very good"; 18.2 "good"; 22.2 "fair"; 27.1 "middling"; and 37.6 "bad." And then at the same time that is in the Belfast column he gives the number of "excellent" and "very good," and the percentage works out to be considerably higher than the average of all Ireland. The percentage for all Ireland is 3.5 "excellent" in all subjects, and 19.5 "very good." Now, when those schools in Belfast, which are much better than the average schools of the country, give such an exhibition as that in the case of arithmetic, do you think that is satisfactory?—I do not.

9767. Now, Mr. Kelly says: "These returns appear to me to be disappointing, and in the case of the higher standards they are decidedly unsatisfactory. I found that these standards completely broke down, even in some schools which were regarded as highly efficient. It convinces me amongst other things that progress in arithmetic cannot be gauged by mere inspection."—That is certain.

9768. Would you agree with that?—I would.

9769. He goes on to say then: "As a case in point, I may mention that I gave the same arithmetic tests to two schools which had much the same record. A portion of the test was given on the same day to the two schools and the rest on consecutive days, and the result was a difference of as much as 55.0 per cent. in the fourth standard, 67.2 per cent. in the fifth, and 62.5 in the sixth." Now, anyone visiting these schools might say, on a superficial inspection, that there was little difference between them. The necessity, therefore, of combining examination

with inspection, in the case of arithmetic, is manifest. The written exercises which I have in my possession throw a flood of light on this subject. Errors abound, some due to ignorance of principles or methods, some to ignorance of tables, and some to sheer inaccuracy, arising probably from the want of concentration or sustained effort. If time and space permitted, much more might be said on this subject." That does not reveal a very satisfactory state of things as regards the teaching of that subject under the new system?—It does not. I am strongly inclined to agree with that.

9770. With Mr. Kelly?—Yes.

9771. And if we are to have more examination, would it not be reasonable to have it towards the end of the school year?—Quite so.

9772. And I suppose you will not dispute that, that the ultimate test of all methods must be the effect produced on the pupils?—Yes.

9773. And therefore that we must measure the effect to some extent by examination?—I do not dispute that.

9774. To look back to Clonmel for a moment—I would like to know do you think it a satisfactory thing to have Dr. Stankie go down and look into a number of the schools, and then to hand thirteen of them over to Mr. Hynes for reinspection, where there were so many complaints?—Was it after he visited that he sent Mr. Hynes?

9775. There is no doubt about that?—I think it would have been more satisfactory to have visited them all.

9776. And you aware that Clonmel was in Mr. Purser's circuit?—Yes.

9777. And that he did not retire till some time towards the end of October or November?—Yes, that is so.

9778. Now, could you tell us why he was not sent down in the interval?—No, I cannot.

9779. You never heard any reason assigned?—No. I did wonder in my own mind, knowing that these schools were in Mr. Purser's portion of the country, why Mr. Purser was not asked to make a report.

9780. Then, of the schools that were assigned to Mr. Hynes to examine, there was one, at least, that was not a school that complained. Were you aware of that?—Yes, I think I heard that.

9781. There were some?—Yes.

9782. And then, according to Mr. Hynes' report, his judgment differed from Mr. Wely's in six cases out of thirteen?—Yes; I suppose that is so.

9783. That would be about 46 per cent., would it not?—Yes.

9784. Now, should not that have suggested to you the necessity for investigating the whole of the cases?—Yes, I think it should.

9785. And I understand that when the teachers from Belfast complained and when the inspectors went down there, there was a difference again of something about 66 per cent. You are aware of that, of course?—Yes.

9786. And yet you took no steps to redress the grievance of the teachers in Belfast on the one hand or Clonmel on the other?—No.

9787. Now, was it not natural that under those circumstances the teachers should feel deeply aggrieved?—I suppose it was not unnatural that they should.

9788. And that it was natural that they should lose their temper a little bit over it?—Oh, yes; I think so.

9789. And therefore if there were any exhibition of feeling, do you not think that that should have been taken into consideration under the circumstances?—Yes.

9790. But it was not?—I do not know.

9791. But you know that up to this they got no redress?—That is so.

9792. Now, you had some little dealings more or less with Mr. Purser about the Clonmel case?—Yes.

9793. You know that he visited that school and reported that the school was undermarked?—Yes.

9794. You know that from himself, I presume?—I do.

9795. You know that that report of Mr. Purser's did not go before the Board?—Yes, I did know that.

9796. You had a right as Commissioner to call for that report if you pleased?—Yes, at the Board.

1st May, 1913.]

Mr. PHILIP WARD, examined.

[Continued.]

9798. Why did you not do that?—Well, because I heard all about it from himself and from Dr. Starke, and therefore I did not think it was necessary to call for papers at the Board, because the question never came before the Board in any shape or form.

9799. Why did you not have it brought before the Board?—For what purpose?

9800. To get justice for that teacher?—Oh, I thought I was getting justice for him.

9801. But did you?—Well, not as fully as I expected, as there was a difference in opinion, and of course Dr. Starke could have maintained his point when a difference of opinion existed between us, even at the Board, as to the time from which the increment was to be paid.

9802. The CHAIRMAN.—That was the difference between April, 1910, and April, 1911?—Quite so.

9803. Mr. HENLY.—It was stated by Dr. Starke in the correspondence which has been published that Mr. Purser's visit was unauthorized and irregular?—Yes.

9804. Are you aware that it is part of the directions given to chief inspectors that they have liberty to visit any school in their circuit at any time they think desirable?—That is another document of which, I am sorry to say, I am ignorant.

9805. I think you will find this in Clause 5. I asked Mr. McNeill was he free to go and visit any school he pleased any time he thought necessary, and he said yes?—That was the impression on my mind until this matter came up.

9806. Then, where could the irregularity have been in Mr. Purser's visiting that school?—I say that is a matter for Dr. Starke himself to clear up. I really do not know anything about it.

9807. Now, you told us that the education given in the schools at present is more practical. I would like to know in what way?—Well, we have more science in the schools now than we had before, to begin with. I think that drawing, particularly drawing from objects, is practised more generally than formerly, and I believe that the reading is of a better character and children are induced to read more generally than they were previously.

9808. How far is science taught in the school (to take the first subject)?—It is taught in more schools under the new system than it was under the old.

9809. But the number of schools teaching science?—Take object lessons, for instance. If science is not taught under that name, at all events, object lessons are taught, and I consider the teaching of object lessons a very good exercise for children, and it is taught very generally and in almost every school.

9810. You say that merchants and teachers of secondary schools complain that pupils are not as well prepared?—Yes.

9811. Would not merchants want them practically prepared?—They would; but I believe that the complaint made is very largely concerned with their want of full knowledge of practical arithmetic.

9812. They are not practically prepared in that?—They are not.

9813. You say the reading is better. We have heard that in a great many cases. Now, you, of course, have the great advantage that you have taught for many years, and taught most efficiently, and can you tell me how much of that apparent improvement may be due to the easier character of the reading books you have at present?—I would not say that it is owing to the easier character of the reading books, but I think that it is owing very largely to the more interesting matter in the reading books.

9814. That it is brought more down to the capacity of the little child?—Yes, and there are stories of such a character as will induce them to read and to look for more, and I think that is in itself a very great improvement from the time that the only book that you found in a house was the one school book, *The Reader*. Now, you find several little books, and children are inclined to get more books, and to ask their parents for more books.

9815. You have told us about the number of letters that you get, and Dr. Clarke has told us about the number of letters that he gets. Now, as far as you know, do all the Commissioners receive letters in the same way?—I really do not know. I could not tell you.

9816. Because if they do, it would reveal an awful state of unrest?—I think more of the burden comes upon myself than upon any other Commissioner.

9817. Do you think it is a proper state of affairs that men should have to be appealing to you and troubling you individually to seek what they have a right to get through the ordinary channels of the office?—I think it is a misfortune.

9818. Could you make any suggestion now to alter it?—No; I might alter your report.

9819. Mr. CORRY.—We had it from one of the chief inspectors that he had come to the conclusion that the visits of the Resident Commissioner to schools were a disturbing element rather than a soothing element in the work of inspection. Have you formed any opinion on that?—No; I would not like to express any opinion on that. I think that is more or less a matter for the chief inspectors and Dr. Starke. I have formed no opinion on the point, and I would not like to express any opinion, and I think that Dr. Starke must have done it with the very best motives.

9820. But do you think that when you have confidence in the inspectors it is a desirable thing that the Resident Commissioner should go into a school and leave observations there of an entirely divergent nature from the observations of the inspectors?—I did not know that he was in the habit of doing that.

9821. I do not know about habits, but if he has been doing?—Dr. Starke showed me some of the observations which he left in the observation book or in the report book and they were of a very meagre character.

9822. But if observations expressing an entirely different view from the judgment of the inspectors were left by Dr. Starke, would you think that very undesirable?—I would, no matter on which side they were.

# TWENTIETH DAY.—TUESDAY, MAY 20TH, 1912.

At 23, Kildare-street, Dublin.

Present:—Sir SAMUEL DILL, M.A., LL.D., LL.D. (Chairman); The Most Rev. DENIS KELLY, D.D., Bishop of Ross; Sir HIRAM SHAW WILKINSON, LL.D.; Mr. JOHN COFFEY; Mr. HENRIAGE, E. B. HARRISON, B.A.; Mr. JEREMIAH HENLY; Mr. WALTER MCMURDOUGH KAVANAGH, D.L.; Mr. THOMAS MICHAEL KITTLE, B.A.; and

Mr. ARTHUR J. DONNELLY, M.A., B.Sc., Secretary.

Mr. FRANCIS C. FORTH, Associate, Royal College of Science, Ireland; Principal of Municipal Technical Institute, and Director of Technical Instruction, Belfast, examined.

9823. The CHAIRMAN.—In what year were you appointed Principal of the Municipal Technical Institute in Belfast?—In the year 1906.

9824. What suggested to us the invitation to you to come here to-day was, I think, a recollection of mine that you had stated at a public meeting that you found the boys coming for admission to your Institute were very insufficiently prepared to take advantage of your schools. Is not that so?—That is so.

9825. And I had before me a sentence from one of Dr. Starke's addresses:—"It is a charge often brought against our primary schools that they are too literary, and that they turn out a sort of pupils who are quite unfitted to enter a Technical School," and then he quoted you as his authority for that. That was, I think, what you said at a meeting in the Town Hall of Belfast once in the year 1909. This passage is from an address which he gave in Cork?—That was last year.

9826. Yes, an address on Technical Instruction?—I was present, and I heard him say that. I do not agree with all that Dr. Starke says.

9827. Not on that particular point?—I do not agree with that particular point.

9828. You do not?—No, and I do not agree with him that I said that.

9829. Would you kindly tell us what you did say?—What I said, and what I have said frequently, and what I say now, is that the education given in the National Schools is in many ways defective. That is a different thing from saying that it is too literary.

9830. The impression left on my mind was that you thought the boys were not sufficiently trained for admission to your Institute?—I still say that.

9831. And what age did you refer to—was it 14?—Those who present themselves at all ages from National Schools.

9832. But coming from the National Schools they would be about 14?—There are only a very limited number who come direct from the National Schools.

9833. In what year did you open the Trade Preparatory School?—About 1908. It has been open ten years.

9834. At present do you get any considerable number of boys entering direct from the primary schools, that is, who do not pass through your Trade Preparatory School?—Will you pardon me if I do not answer you directly in the way of question and answer? I had anticipated from the letter of inquiry which I got that you wish information along the lines that you are now asking me about.

9835. That is so?—And I have prepared a number of notes, and in these notes I have facts and figures which I think will answer the questions you have put and other reasons of the same kind. I think that will perhaps save your time and the time of the Committee. I do not know whether it is permissible for me to give it in this form, but if it is I think it will be better.

9836. Very well, and, of course, questions may be put to you for elucidation afterwards?—I think I will give the information that I gather you are seeking for by three questions, and that I can bring before you that information somewhat more directly than I could by mere question and answer. I want to say

first of all, that I am prepared to give evidence under all the following heads:—Elementary education in day schools in Ireland in its relation to the work of Technical Instruction, taking as the first division the Technical Institute of the Municipal Technical Day Trade Preparatory School of the Technical Institute, Belfast, the Day Apprentices Classes held at the same Institute, the Evening Science, Art, Technology, and Domestic Science Classes held in the Technical Schools. Then I propose to take as the second broad division the relation of elementary education in day schools in Ireland to the Evening Preparatory Classes conducted by the National Board, and the relation of those Evening Preparatory Classes to Evening Technical Instruction. Then I will take as the third division the education given in National schools in its relation to the preparation of boys and girls for employment. Then if it is desired, I am also prepared to offer certain observations on the efficiency of National schools with themselves but that is a little outside, perhaps, the object with which you have asked me to come here.

9837. The CHAIRMAN.—No, it is not?—I am quite prepared to offer some observations on that. Then, to make plain my authority for speaking on the subjects mentioned, I should like to say that, as I think you already know, I am principal of the Technical Institute of Belfast. I am also Vice-Chairman of the Council of the Irish Technical Instruction Association, and I am a member of the Children's Care Committee, and the Juvenile Advisory Committee of the Belfast Branch of the Labour Exchange. It is from information gained in these different positions that I speak to you this morning. Now, as you will understand, it is the results of the system of National Education that come specially under my notice, not so much the National schools with themselves, and I can speak of the results of the National schools programme from direct knowledge of the product, and from many conferences with principals of other Technical schools. To explain the magnitude or measure of the problem that we have to deal with in Belfast, I may say that we have a population of 400,000 in round figures, and that we have enrolled in classes of the Technical Institute for the current session about 6,400 students, taking all departments—day and evening. The ages of these students vary from 12 years of age upwards. There are students on the books over 60 years of age; but the greatest number of students of an age is found at 17 or 18. There are about as many students over 20 years of age as there are below 20 years of age. I have brought a number of documents which I think will help me to set the time of the Committee, and with your permission I will hand these round as I come to these points. I have diagrams\* (produced) which explain my point about the ages. There are two diagrams; the smaller one shows the enrolment of students in the first session of the Institute's work, and the second shows the enrolment of the students in the seventh session. These are prepared for comparison. If you take the first diagram, you will see that the highest column is marked 17; this column indicates the number of students of an age. It shows the number of students enrolled who were of the age of 17. Then the highest column of the second diagram is marked 16, and, of course, there were a great many more students in the 7th session than in the first session. Hence the reason for the much larger diagram. There are some interesting points about this which bear on the subject of your inquiry. First of all you observe

that in the second diagram the highest column (that marked 18) shows that students joined the Technical Institute at an earlier age than they did in the beginning, and that the work of the Technical Institute is coming into closer relation to the National schools.

9848. Does that include the boys in your Trade school?—All departments, taking the whole enrolment of the Institute. Another interesting point which is germane to the inquiry is that the number of our students has much increased, particularly the number of men. The dotted line in the diagram represents the number of women and girls, and the thin black line the number of men, the outer black line representing the total of those two together. I put that in just to explain that the students attending the Institute are of varying ages, and they are not children by any means; in fact, we wish they were.

9849. Mr. HARRISON.—I see that in the second column the number of children between 10 and 12 has gone down. What is the reason for that?—The reason is this, that as the Institute progressed we found that children, who were enrolled in National schools, were coming to the evening classes, and we discouraged that. We discourage it as much as we can.

9850. They must be mostly children attending Day schools and also putting in an attendance at the evening?—Yes, and we discourage that.

9851. The CHAIRMAN.—Have you a limit of age for your Trade Preparatory school?—Yes, I will explain that in a moment. The only section of our work to which we admit children attending National schools is the Art work. We do not admit to any other section of the work children attending National schools. We think it undesirable in the interests of the child itself.

9852. That is, to be in actual attendance at both?—Yes, to attend the evening classes on account of the late hours, half-past nine and ten o'clock.

9853. Mr. HARRISON.—But that was not the case in 1905?—No, we were finding our feet then. Those things occurred, and we discovered them afterwards.

9854. Mr. HUNT.—Is there not a rule that they are not allowed by the Department to attend?—The rule takes the form that the Department won't pay grants on those children; but they do not prohibit us from admitting them. The Department says: "We will not pay grants on those children"; but it does not say: "You must not admit them."

9855. Mr. HARRISON.—How long do they generally suffer for—that is the normal course, how many years?—You refer to the students who join the Institute?

9856. Yes?—That depends on whether they join the day division or the evening division; but I will give you a little information on that further on. I think I can explain it rather better under another head. Now, I will take the relation of day National school work to the day instruction of the Technical Institute as the first division.

9857. The relation of day National school work to the day instruction given in the Technical Institute?—The day division of the Technical Institute includes the Trade Preparatory school, the higher Day Technical course, the Art classes, the Technical and Science classes. Those grades are attended in the main by students who are giving their whole time to study. This day division also includes some classes for engineering apprentices, for printing trades apprentices, and for grocery apprentices, and those students only give part of their time to study, a half day per week or a whole day per week; then they are employed for the rest of that week, and the employers allow them to attend the Technical Institute. The only part of that that I wish to give evidence upon is the Day Trade Preparatory school and the Day Apprentices classes. Now, I think I can explain the programme of the Trade Preparatory school to you quickly by passing round these reports, and I think most of the questions you have asked, Sir Samuel, will be answered by these (witness hands in reports). The Day Preparatory school admits boys of 12 years of age. There are a number of regulations which are shown on pages 16, 17, and 18. Amongst these it is stated that boys 12 years of age and over may join the Trade Preparatory school.

9848. The CHAIRMAN.—They must not be less than 12?—Must not be less than 12.

9849. And they must have been enrolled in the 6th standard of a National school?—Yes; the point of that is that they must have a standard of education equal to the 6th standard, and they are required to pass an entrance examination when they come to the school. The examination that they are required to pass is set out in those examination papers of which I hand to copies. Those are the papers that we set to candidates, and from those papers information can be gathered as to what is required from the boy entering the school. He is required to have a knowledge of English, a knowledge of arithmetic, and to be able to do elementary freehand drawing.

9850. Is that all?—Those are the only three subjects of examination. The standard of examination is, I think, indicated very clearly by the questions.

9851. Is there any upward limit of age, as there is a lower limit of not less than 12?—There is no upward limit of age. We do not prescribe any.

9852. You have boys of very various ages in the school?—We do not, as a matter of fact, prescribe any upper limit.

9853. What would be the highest age of a boy in the Trade school?—17, that is, concluding his course. This course is of three years duration, so that it means that a boy entering at 12 or 13 completes the course at 15 or 16, and he is then ready for employment. The programme begins on page 19, and you will see there that in the first year students are taught mathematics, English, experimental science, manual instruction in woodwork, and a modern language—German. They are also taught drawing, and also put through a course of physical training. On page 20 you see the second year's programme, mathematics, English, physics, chemistry, practical geometry, mechanics, manual instruction in woodwork and physical training. Then the third year's course begins on page 21—mathematics, English, physics, magnetism and electricity, mechanics, mechanical laboratory, practical geometry, machine drawing, manual training in metal work, German, art and physical training.

9854. The literary studies come in the third year. I observe, except German. In the third year's syllabus you have literature, British history and geography?—Yes, but you would include under the head of literary subjects, Sir Samuel, English and a modern language?

9855. Yes?—We carry these subjects right through, because we believe it is important that a boy's general education should be followed up, and that he should get a specialised training along with that.

9856. You have no French?—No; we do not teach French, because in technical work we find it is less useful as a language than German. German is taken purely for its utilitarian value, to read books on science. That is the programme, and, of course, if you want into the details of it you would notice this, that under the head of English in the first year, commercial geography is included, the commercial geography of Ireland mainly. That is specialised in the first year. In the second year the British Colonies are taken, and in the third year we go further afield, and during the whole of this teaching of English the commercial aspect of the use of English is kept too. The boys are taught to write business letters, and the commercial aspect of the question generally is attended to.

9857. What are the total numbers in the Trade school?—That is a point I am just coming to. It is here that we really come into touch, or I may say into grips, with the National school. We find every year that some 160 students present themselves for enrolment in this Trade Preparatory school. The number of applicants for admission varies, it may be 150 or 170, but 160 is the average figure. We find that on an examination paper such as that which has just been handed in, and which is about the level of the 6th standard of National schools, very many of the pupils fail to pass. I should tell you also that the great bulk of applicants are from National schools. It is only rarely that students present themselves from secondary schools.

20th May, 1913.]

Mr. FRANCIS C. FORRE, examined.

[Continued.]

9658. Did I understand you to say that the great bulk of the applicants fail?—No, but the great bulk of applicants come from National schools.

9659. But you have many failures?—That is so. A few come from secondary schools, a very few, but the proportion of failures is usually about 40 per cent., although the examination is the examination of the 6th standard, or only very little more difficult than that.

9660. Those are the failures at the entrance examination?—Yes.

9661. Mr. HENRY.—Do you mean that the number of candidates for actual entrance is 150 to 170 after the elimination of the 40 per cent.?—No, those who lodge their names desiring to be admitted number about 160. They are submitted to examination, and having been through the examination there are usually about 40 per cent. of them who fail to reach the standard for admission, and no student can be admitted unless he reaches the standard required for admission. It is not a matter of payment at all, there is no other consideration whatever than that of reaching the standard.

9662. Mr. HENRY.—What percentage do you require on that examination?—A boy will be passed into the school if he reaches 40 per cent. of the marks.

9663. Now, can you tell us on what subject most of them fail, or is there any difference?—We do not usually make the drawing a failing subject unless the boy is hopelessly bad. The failures are on English or on arithmetic.

9664. The CHAIRMAN.—Is that the subject where they fail, the general cause of failure (because that affects greatly the question of the preparation given by National schools)—perhaps you have a note on that?—Well, I was about to remark that those candidates, having been examined in three subjects, fail generally in English or arithmetic, or in both; but we do not make drawing a failing subject, because that is not so important for the programme of instruction. If the boy cannot reach the standard that we require, then he cannot cope with the instruction given in the school, and we have to keep that instruction up to a proper level, for to lower the standard would mean that the school would miss its object altogether.

9665. Is that percentage of failures rising or falling within the last ten years?—I should say that it is about stationary. I cannot recall that there is any marked difference. The caliber of the pupils coming in each year fluctuates somewhat, that is, their mental capacity.

9666. The SENIOR or BOSS.—The standard of your examination is about the same as the 6th Standard in the National school?—Yes, approximately.

9667. Do any students present themselves to you that have not gone through the 6th standard of the National school?—They do. Candidates sometimes tell you that they are either in the 5th standard or 5th second.

9668. Can you give me any idea what is the proportion of them, because if your standard is the 6th standard of the National school, and if students who have not come up to that standard present themselves, they would naturally fail?—I cannot at the moment supply exact figures, but the number is very small. Some in the 5th second standard present themselves.

9669. Mr. HENRY.—There is no fifth second at present, not since 1905?—There are many boys who state that they have been in the fifth second, and we take their description of themselves. That is another point on which I have to say a word with reference to National Schools generally, that is the question of grading of pupils. I should like to say we require boys to be in the 8th Standard, but suppose a boy has left the National School, and says he was in the fifth second, and applies for admission to the Trade Preparatory School, we would take him then for examination; we do not want to exclude him. Of course, many boys go to schools where there is not anything higher than the fifth second, and to say, "You cannot come into this school," would be unjust to the boy, because we do not want the boys to leave the National School until they have exhausted the programme of the National School, that is the real reason for doing that. We say,

"Let the National School do its work to the very limit, and let us join on after that, but do not let us overlap the National School," but we do not exclude a boy that says in his form of application that he was in the Fifth Standard. Now about the Trade Preparatory School, this Trade Preparatory School is the best work the Corporation of Belfast is doing. It is the best work that has been done under the head of Technical Instruction. It is the most profitable work, not only at the time, but afterwards, and I want to draw attention to the very small number of candidates who come forward from National Schools for this grade of instruction. I want to emphasize that. There ought to be at least every year in a city of the size of Belfast quite 500 pupils desiring admission to a school giving this grade of education.

9670. The CHAIRMAN.—Instead of 160?—Yes if we take the proportion of pupils going to such a school in other centres. I also want to say that I believe that this is a grade of education which the National Board should supply itself. It is not strictly the duty or the province of a Technical School to provide this grade of education, and if the National Board would provide it, I believe my Committee would be willing to hand this work over to them, because this work needs to be done, and there is no other authority to do it. I should also like to point out that the Corporation offer scholarships to admit pupils to the Trade Preparatory Schools. A pupil who does well in the examination may get a scholarship that gives him free admission to the school, and it provides him with books, but not more. He may then pass in the second year, and get another scholarship and get free admission for the second year, and be also provided with books, and he may then pass on to the third year, and get a scholarship which is of the value of £10 per annum.

9671. Have you many of those scholarships?—Very few, for the reason that the boys trained in this school are in such demand by employers that the school is depleted at the end of the second, and very few boys left in it for the third year. I think it is the most profitable work of the Corporation. It is the most profitable in every way, educationally to the pupil as well as profitable to employers in the town, because it supplies them with boys with a training such as is required for business.

9672. There is a great demand for your boys?—A great demand for the boys.

9673. And do you receive applications from the employers?—Many employers apply to us. We are called upon by engineering firms particularly, and we have so many demands that I do not think this year we will fill one-third of the places allotted to us to fill, simply because we have not enough boys sufficiently trained to take the places.

9674. That confirms what you say about the want of 500 pupils?—Yes, to supply the places. Then with regard to this I would also like to emphasize the smallness of the number of pupils passing from National Schools to Secondary Schools in Belfast. I saw the other day a statement of Mr. Pease, the Minister of Education in England, that one boy out of every sixteen passes into a secondary school in England. Now I do not believe that there is one boy in sixty in Belfast passing into a Secondary School. This figure wants checking, but that is a rough calculation I have made. The number passing from National Schools to Secondary Schools is exceedingly small in Ireland, and I believe it is smaller in Belfast than it is in other parts of Ireland—certainly smaller than it is in Cork.

9675. Mr. Graham Balfour points out that in his book on Education in Great Britain and Ireland he emphasizes that point very strongly?—That leaves me to make this observation, that there is a great need for more scholarships being offered to elementary schools to enable boys to pass from the National School to the Secondary School. On the other hand, if secondary education of any kind is considered suitable for boys, of course, in an industrial district the school should be perhaps a Trade Preparatory School. We have a great deal to do in Ireland to improve the connection between the National School and the Secondary School, and I take it that that is perfectly well known.

9876. I think there has been some provision lately given for the founding of these scholarships, has there not?—I heard that £10,000 was provided by the Government for scholarships.

Mr. HENRY.—It was to be so, but it has not been. Of course, these scholarships were offered on the condition that they would then proceed to the University, that they would get a University scholarship from the local authority, and the local authorities are not satisfied to award them on that basis.

9877. The BISHOP OF ROSS.—Your point is to prepare the boys for business and for manufactures, and you do not send your boys on to the University at all?—But I do not know that I would object to that.

9878. The CHAIRMAN.—I think what Mr. Forty said was, that there was a great need of provision of scholarships to carry boys from the Elementary School to the Secondary School?—To any Secondary School, including a Trade Preparatory School.

9879. Sir HIRSH WILKINSON.—I think the condition of the offer of £10,000 is this, that the scholarships offered to pupils of the National Schools are intended to take them through the Secondary Schools up to the University, and that the condition of granting that sum is that County Councils will afford to those scholars the means of going on to the University?—I think that is the condition.

9880. The CHAIRMAN.—But you wish scholarships to enable boys to go from the Elementary Schools to your Trade Preparatory School?—To Secondary Schools, and I would include the Trade Preparatory School among the Secondary Schools. In other words, you have a certain quantity of talent in the Elementary Schools, talent which is absolutely lost, because there are no means whereby that talent may be brought out. There are no means by which boys may be brought to a Secondary School of any type. The boy must go to work, because he must live, and because his parents cannot afford to keep him longer at school, and I would have that talented boy passed into a suitable Secondary School, not necessarily an Intermediate School.

9881. I should be sorry myself to see those scholarships to carry boys up to a University career. I have seen a great deal of it in England, and I have seen the failure of it in two-thirds of the cases to do any good. That is my experience of it. But you would have scholarships to advance a boy to a higher Trade School?—Into a Secondary School or a higher Trade School, or whatever he is fitted for. I would not want to force a boy into a groove if his bent did not carry him that way. One would not want scholarships with class distinctions between the boys. I would like somebody to be responsible for seeing that boys took up the kind of education that they were suited for.

9882. Now will you continue?—Then as I have just said I want the Committee really to understand that I think there should be a great many more scholarships for pupils who have exhausted the programme of the Elementary Schools to enable them to go to a Secondary School. I think there ought to be a multiplication of these Trade Preparatory Schools or schools of that type over the country, that there should be an increase in the number of them. I believe if the system of the National Board was satisfactorily administered (I do not think it is now), these schools would be better under the National Board than under a Technical Committee.

9883. That is what Dr. Starke has been talking of for seven years, that there should be higher grade schools?—He spoke of that in his address in Cork, going to Scotland for his illustration when he might have got his illustrations in Ireland as well. The very type he refers to in Scotland exists in Ireland.

9884. Sir HIRSH WILKINSON.—I believe there are twelve of these Trade Preparatory Schools in Ireland?—There must be at least twelve.

9885. They are mentioned in the last report of the Department of Agriculture and Technical Instruction?—I do not know the number of them, but the number needs increasing.

9886. Mr. HARRISON.—Are they all provided by municipalities?—They are all under the Technical Instruction scheme at present.

9887. But who provides the funds for starting them?—The Department of Agriculture mainly.

9888. Not any local body?—The municipality contributes towards them approximately one-eighth of the cost and seven-eighths of the cost is borne by the Department.

9889. The eighth is the initial cost or upkeep?—There is not any initial cost usually, because the building and the equipment of the Technical Committee and the staff of the Technical Committee are all there, and these are simply utilised for the work of the Trade Preparatory School.

9890. Where does the Corporation get the funds to provide the eighth?—It takes it from its general income. Every Corporation that gives Technical Instruction gets a grant from the Department of Agriculture. It has first of all an endowment grant. It then receives an attendance grant, and it has a rate which is levied on the district.

9891. It does not get part of its funds by a special rate levied for that purpose?—It must do that; it must levy a penny in the £, and it may levy twopenny, and some places do levy twopenny—a few. My point was first of all about the need for more scholarships, that the number of scholarships should be increased, and that the Trade Preparatory Schools would be better under the National Board if the National Board could be trusted to work them efficiently; which, I say at once, it could not at present.

9892. The BISHOP OF ROSS.—You referred more to the Trade Preparatory School as a secondary school, did you not?—Yes.

9893. You would not properly call it an elementary school?—No.

9894. But would you think the National Board the proper authority to deal with it, as the National Board is the authority dealing with National Schools?—I think the National Board should deal with it, because it could coordinate the Trade Preparatory with the National system. I would have one education body for the whole country.

9895. You would absorb the Intermediate system, of course?—I would.

9896. Then if you had one educational authority, it would not be an elementary education department, but a general education department?—My idea is to have one education authority for the whole country, and I would let Trade Preparatory schools be worked in conjunction with the elementary schools for this reason, that it is a mere matter of funds. What happens at present is this. There are many boys in elementary schools who are eligible for the Trade Preparatory schools, but are held back from admission to the Trade Preparatory schools. I know that, and I know of cases which I could quote to you where the Trade Preparatory schools have been spoken of disparagingly, and boys eligible for the Trade Preparatory school and who have exhausted the programme of the elementary school, have been kept making time in the elementary school.

9897. The CHAIRMAN.—Does that happen in Belfast?—This happens in Belfast, and it happens in Cork. Dr. Starke said so, and he gave a case and supplied an instance there. As long as you have these two types of education controlled by different authorities that kind of thing will go on, and the best will not be done for the child.

9898. The BISHOP OF ROSS.—We have the University authority and the Intermediate authority and the Elementary authority, and the Technical authority. Would not the Intermediate be the more reasonable body to be the educational authority over all these secondary schools?—You would not then gain the advantage I speak of.

9899. I quite see that, but we are not in a position to discuss the setting up of a single educational authority?—I understand.

9900. Sir HIRSH WILKINSON.—Might I ask you this? You can tell me, of course, what is the cause for keeping these boys in the National School, and the question arises then whether, even if they were under the

20th May, 1913.]

Mr. FRANCIS C. FORTY, examined.

[Continued.]

control of the National Board, that some cause would not operate, for I understand the reference to these cases suggests that the boys are kept there in order to keep up the number of the pupils in the school, so that the schools in which these cases occur may still be up to the standard entitling the teacher to the highest emolument. That cause has been suggested. Were you thinking of that cause or were you thinking of some other cause that operated?—I was thinking of that cause for one. I was thinking of what is a very natural desire on the part of the teacher to keep a kind of cream on his school.

9901. How would you suggest the elimination of these scholars, or the passing of them on from the National School—has any practical course suggested itself to you as to how these scholars should be sent on?—Only in this way, all these schools are subject to inspection, and when it is found that a boy has exhausted the programme of the school he is attending, that boy should not be allowed to continue in that school for another year marking time. It is somebody's business to see to that.

9902. A cause suggests itself to me (I do not know whether it would appeal to you), which is that the teacher of a National School who sent his scholars into the Trade Preparatory School, should be allowed to count those scholars as belonging to his school for a year after they had left him. Do you think that that would operate to some extent in removing one of the causes. One cause is a selfish cause and one is a very unselfish cause, one being monetary and one being the natural ambition of the teacher to have the best scholars in the place. The course which I suggest would meet one of the causes, I think. Do you agree?—That seems a workable arrangement. I have not thought of that; but it seems a workable arrangement, and your suggestion has just caused another thought to come into my mind, that the teacher might be given something in the nature of a bonus on the number of pupils he succeeded in passing forward.

9903. Mr. HENLY.—How would you deal with the cases of those schools up and down through the country where they have no preparatory school to go to? Would you compel the inspector to remove the pupils from those schools?—Of course, when I speak before you to-day, I should like you to keep in mind all the time that I am speaking for a limited area; I am not able to speak for country districts.

9904. The CHAIRMAN.—You have no experience of country districts?—I can answer your question in this way. We have attending our school a number of pupils who come from country areas, and these cases are dealt with in this way (it is the County Down I speak of). The County Down Technical Instruction Committee gives scholarships to boys who live in country areas, and these are sufficiently valuable to support a boy living in town, or if he can reach town by train, to give him a railway season ticket, or even train fare, but that would not reach those very remote districts. Some of them come to Belfast from a distance of 25 miles. Boys come from Portlerry, which has to be reached by train and long car (a motor now). I wish to speak also with regard to the apprentice classes, which I mentioned at the beginning. These are classes which we conduct for apprentices to engineering and apprentices to the printing trade, and apprentices to the grocery trade, and that again is a very useful work, though not nearly as good as the Trade Preparatory school work.

9905. They only give part of their time during the week?—The grocers' apprentices give half a day per week and the engineers' apprentices give a day per week. Now, there is a direction in which a great deal of useful work is to be done; but that is again perhaps outside the scope of this inquiry.

9906. Are you connecting that in any way with the teaching in National Schools?—What I want to say in regard to that is that the boys coming into these classes are boys who have been in elementary schools, and that we find the standard of education very low in those pupils, so that whether we speak of the Trade Preparatory school or these day apprentice classes, the standard of education is low.

Mr. COOPER.—That is, of boys coming from National Schools?—Coming from National Schools.

9907. The CHAIRMAN.—Those apprentices, many of them, would not have passed through your trade school, of course?—Not at all.

9908. None of them, probably?—No; it would not be necessary to come to these classes if they had gone to the preparatory school.

9909. So that they are the production of National Schools?—Yes, and the standard of education is low.

9910. Mr. HENLY.—In what respect is their education low?—The work they do in these classes is of two kinds. We divide the period allotted to study into two parts. In one part they are instructed in arithmetic, in simple calculations relating to their business and usually in the writing of letters and work of that kind. In the other part of the afternoon, they are taught purely trade work, and the apprentices to the printing trade do work connected with printing, and the grocery apprentices do work connected with their business, and the capacity of these pupils for making the most elementary calculations in connection with their business is deplorable. Take a printer, for example; he has to make certain calculations in connection with his business, and we try to make the arithmetic instruction as practical as possible, and as closely applicable to daily work as we can, and we find a proportion of the pupils almost hopeless, for apparently they have no grounding in elementary arithmetic. This does not apply all round; but it applies in too many cases, and sufficiently generally to be worthy of comment. Of course, a number of them have been away from the elementary school for several years.

9911. The CHAIRMAN.—Have you noticed any upward or downward move in the last twelve or thirteen years?—These schools have only been in existence for five three or four years, and we have seen no great change in that time that I could generalise upon.

9912. How does the model school in Belfast stand in relation to this? Do you get many pupils from the model school?—For the Trade Preparatory School?

9913. Yes?—Yes, we do; a number every year.

9914. You have not observed whether the teaching there is better than in the ordinary National School?—I think there is a table in this Report that will give information. This is the Report referring to the Trade Preparatory School, and on page 15 and page 14 you see a list of pupils who have entered in the first year, with the names of the schools that supplied the pupils. I notice nine names of pupils from the Model School, Belfast, but probably there are more than that. A number of these secure admission. I would like to speak next of the evening division of the Technical Institute and the relation of the National Schools to the evening division, and if you would turn to page 22 of the prospectus of the Institute, you will find there a list of the departments. It is headed "Course of Instruction," and you will find mentioned there under the head of "Day Division" of the Trade Preparatory School, Technical Course the Engineer Apprentice Course, the Printing Trades Apprentice Course, the Women's Work, Art, and University Course. The Municipal Institute of Belfast is co-ordinated with the Queen's University, Belfast. In the evening division there is a preparatory section which I want to speak of here. If you would now turn to page 56, you will see there under the heading of "Evening Division, Preparatory Section" this statement:—"The Preparatory Department has been organized with the object of ensuring that students shall obtain a sound basis whereon to build up their subsequent studies in science, art, or technology. It is essential that all students pass through this department, unless satisfactory proof can be produced that an equal educational standard has been already attained." Then there are two groups of classes in this department, one for youths and men, and one for girls and women. We do not wish to divide our section in any other case; but we do here largely, because the arithmetic for boys differs from the arithmetic for girls, and the boys want to learn arithmetic for the

purpose of using it in trade and the girls want to learn it for the purpose of using it in dressmaking or house-work, or some other occupations as are taken up by the girls. Now, I should like to deal with the Preparatory Section. We hold an entrance examination, and I have brought here several entrance examination papers for the Evening Division. I will explain how it is all done. When a student comes to join the Evening Division at the beginning of the session, he is either a former student, in which case he is allowed to proceed from the point that he reached in the previous year, or he is a new student, whose qualifications we have to ascertain. If the new student produces a certificate of the Intermediate Board, or of a matriculation course of a University, he is then admitted without an examination; but if he cannot produce a certificate, he must undergo an examination, and every year we examine hundreds of pupils—pupils who come not able to produce any certificate or any evidence that they have got a particular standard of education, and these are mainly pupils who are coming from National Schools, not directly, unfortunately, but who have gone to work, and then after two or three or more years, think of improving their education. If one of these boys is taking up the trade of engineering, say, we examine him on a paper relating to his trade. If he is a builder, we examine him on something connected with building; and if he is in an office, we examine him on something connected with office work; and so we have a group of examinations on every night of a week for about a month. These are some of the test papers, which I now hand in, and you will observe they are all different; but one will illustrate very well what is required. We devote a fortnight to examining the new candidates, and during that time there is no instruction given at all—nothing but examination. A candidate comes forward and says: "I am in an office; I want to join the Technical Institute and take out a commercial certificate." We send him to the commercial department to be examined. He finds there awaiting him the questions deemed appropriate to commerce. If he is an engineer, he goes to the engineering department, and so on with all the other departments. Every group of trades is provided for. We set questions in English and in arithmetic, which have some sort of relation to the particular trade or occupation. For example, if he is going in for engineering, he might find some exceptional difficulty in a question about butter and eggs; but a like question stated in language he knew with respect to rivets and bolts, and so on, he will do quite easily; and so we have the examinations suited to the occupations of the boys; but the examinations are not technical (that is the great point), except in their phraseology.

9915. They are to test the boy's elementary education rather than anything else?—That is purely the object of it.

9916. The questions are expressed in terms that he has brought before him in his daily work?—Yes; we try to use phraseology that the boy will be sure to understand, so that the language of the question need not present any difficulty to him; but there is no technical point involved in the question, such, for example, as he can only be expected to know after he has gone through the technical course. We do not introduce any technical points. There is a drawing examination, too. If the boy has not any special occupation, and has not gone to work we give him a paper of a general kind in which he is examined. If he is an engineer, we give him a drawing of some engineering, some piece of machinery. If he is a builder we give him a hammer or pinners, or something connected with building. If he is engaged in a mill, weaving, or spinning, we give him something to do in the drawing which is connected with some weaving detail. If he is a chemist, he gets a drawing example relating to chemistry, such as test tubes or glass bottles, or anything that is connected with chemistry. If he is engaged in an office we give him something that is connected with office work, a copying press, or a date rack, or a ink pot. If the candidate is a woman going in for

domestic science, we would give her pots and pans and scissors, or something of that sort. We try to give something relating to what each shows an interest in.

9917. In these tests there is no drawing of objects?—Not at these examinations. We do lay great stress on drawing from object; but you see as we have hundreds of candidates to examine every night for a fortnight, the difficulty of getting through the examinations is very great. The papers are all marked, the results known, and the candidates enrolled before he leaves the Institute.

9918. Mr. KERR.—What happens if they do not succeed in passing the examination?—There is a place for everybody, whether they pass or not. A candidate who gets 70 per cent. of the marks gets a specialised course. If he is an engineer, an electrical engineer, or goes in for book-keeping and typewriting, he gets a specialised course in those subjects. He may take book-keeping and type writing if he is a commercial student. He may take chemistry if he is a chemistry student. If he is a building student he gets building instruction and instruction in carpentry and joinery, anything that relates to his branch. That is for those who get 70 per cent. of the marks. If the student gets anything between 70 per cent. and 40 per cent., he will then go to the introductory section. If he gets anything below 40 per cent. he must go again to the preparatory section.

9919. The Broom or Broom?—When was that preparatory system introduced—in what year?—We have had it ever since we have had the examinations, and that is held a dozen years ago. In our early days, 12 years ago, we admitted a candidate to whatever subject he wished to join, but a few years of that showed the folly of purveying that practice, because we had a class of 40 or 50 students, and at the end of the session perhaps about 10. Many of the 40 or 50 were incapable of doing their work. They could not calculate. They had not the necessary elementary science knowledge provided by technical instruction, and after a few weeks they began to drop off one by one. We found it was wasteful and extravagant, and then we introduced these entrance examinations that compel the students to fall into definite groups. We had great difficulty in doing this and there was a great deal of public opposition to it, and we were attacked freely through the correspondence columns of the newspapers for introducing the entrance examinations.

9920. The CHAIRMAN.—These divide the students into three sections?—They compel the student to begin at a particular point. My Committee adhered to the position they had taken up, and I believe the public have come to see that it is a reasonable and proper thing. If a student gets fewer marks than 40 he must go to the Preparatory section, and that is where we teach the National school. The programme includes English, Arithmetic, and Drawing. Arithmetic is specialised a little, as you will see in the Prospectus. It is referred to on pages 56 and 57. In English we have Grammar and Composition and Reading. In Arithmetic we have the ordinary work of Arithmetic, and then there is Geometry, and also Mensuration, which we treat as a branch of Arithmetic, and then there is Freehand Drawing. We send to the Preparatory section the residuum of the students, those who are left over and cannot be put anywhere else. You will find students of all ages, boys of 14 and men of 40. Now, this is a section on which the Department of Agriculture will not pay any grant, because they insist that the students whom they pay grants for must have reached a certain minimum educational standard, the standard required for the introductory section, that is the section in which those students are placed who have obtained from 40 marks up to 70 marks.

9921. What number would you have in your Preparatory section?—This is work for which we do not get any grant from the Department of Agriculture and Technical Instruction, but we have put this portion of our work under the scheme of the National Board, and



20th May, 1918.]

Mr. FRANCIS C. FORTN, examined.

[Continued.]

the classes are now carried on under the evening continuation school scheme of the National Board. For the current session we have 471 pupils enrolled in the Preparatory department. The year before we had 478; the year before that we had 625, and the first year we tried this kind of work, the year 1902-1903, we had 970.

9922. The Bazaar or Bazaar.—You began it as early as 1902-1903, then, did you?—Yes; we carried it on for four years, and then we discontinued for two years, and afterwards resumed it, and it has been going on now for five years, all under the National Board.

9923. Now, that work is technical work, that ought to have been done in a Technical school.—Yes, it is work that should have been done elsewhere, and under other auspices, and it is done in the Technical school for the reason that if you say to these young people who obtain fewer marks than 40, "You cannot come here," they are simply turned out into the street, and they have nowhere to go to obtain education. Now, as to the work of the Preparatory section, and the work of the National Board in relation to this, I have got here a couple of charts. We compiled these charts for our information, but I brought them here thinking they might be of some help in this Inquiry. (Witness exhibits charts.) These charts being out some of the difficulties that occur in carrying on these preparatory classes under the National Board's system. The marks along the bottom line indicate the marks. This vertical line indicates the number of students enrolled. When the class first met it had 40 on roll, then 41, and then 44, and so it goes until it had that number 54 on the roll. The black line indicates the number of students present at each lesson. This is closely related to the question of the evening capacity of these classes. If the whole of the students had joined at the first lesson and continued in attendance that rectangular area would represent the amount that would be earned. The amount of grant lost by irregular attendance is indicated by the blue colour. Of the 927 students who were enrolled for the current session in the Preparatory section, one recorded himself as having left the National school in the 2nd Standard, 15 as having left in the 3rd Standard, 75 as having left in the 4th, and 247 as having left in the 5th Standard. They have to say on their entrance form what standard they left school in; 135 recorded themselves as being in the 6th Standard, 14 in the 7th Standard, one in the 8th, six in the Preparatory Grade of the Intermediate Grade, one in the Junior Grade, and two as having attended schools in England; so you see the great bulk of these students were below the 6th Standard. You may ask, how does it come that a student of the 7th Standard should be in this Preparatory Grade at all, and that he could not pass a simple entrance examination. The answer usually is that he has been away from school so long that he has forgotten most of what he had learned, and has to begin again.

9924. Mr. COFFEY.—He could not be so long away from school, for the 7th Standard is a recent introduction in the National schools?—It is surprising how much some boys forget in three or four years. Three or four years is a long time for a boy who has not done any study in the meantime. We carry on these classes under the National Board.

9925. Under Chapter 35 of their Rules?—The Rules and Regulations for 1918 of the National Board give this scheme on pages 56 to 61, and the various conditions which are set out there explain the scheme. To understand this scheme thoroughly would necessitate a special education, it is so complicated. However, in practice it is easily understood.

9926. The National Board pays a grant on these schools?—Such schools, evening elementary schools, can be established by any manager or any principal teacher who makes application. As a matter of fact—I am speaking here of my own district, but what I say I believe applies to the whole country—there are very few of these evening elementary schools carried on under the National Board Scheme. It is quite certain, and the Board's own returns show this, that there is

not anything like an adequate enrolment of young people in elementary evening schools throughout the country, that is, adequate in proportion to the school population of the country.

9927. In the Report of the National Board for 1909-1910, and in 1904, you will find statistics as to the numbers under each subject?—Yes.

9928. Were you referring to the very small numbers in certain subjects?—I am referring to the small number of young people who are attending the evening schools.

9929. I do not see the total number, and I was going to ask you about that. The sum that they expend on these schools in Ireland is £10,570 a year. That is the amount paid to evening schools in 1909-1910?—The interesting fact is, though, that in the year 1906-1907 the National Board got £23,000 included in the Civil Service estimates for these schools, out of which they spent £12,000, and they returned £11,000 to the Treasury.

9930. I wish we could turn up the Report which gives the exact statistics of these evening schools, as to which I should like to ask you a question. What struck me was the extraordinarily small number learning to draw?—I have not got the figures for individual subjects, but I know that the number of pupils going through the evening elementary school programme altogether is far below what it ought to be in relation to the school population.

9931. Do you know how many evening continuation schools there are in Belfast?—I have not got the exact figures, but I know there are very few. I should half-a-dozen, and that would be about all. Of course, that is not ascertainable very definitely for the present year. The reports always come out so late that they are not really of much value when they do come out.

9932. There is no report out for last year yet?—I have not been able to get it.

9933. Sir HIRSH WAXMAN.—There is one point with regard to the statement of the amount that was estimated, and the amount that was actually expended, to which I wish to draw your attention. This Board can only be blamed if they have not taken proper measures to increase the number of schools or the number of pupils for whom grants might be made. Do you assume that they have estimated for a certain number, and that unless they accomplish a certain number they have therefore failed?—I do not quite follow that.

9934. I was referring to your statement with regard to the estimates made for evening schools in 1906-1907, and the amount stated to have been returned to the Treasury?—Yes.

9935. And you condemned the Board for returning that money to the Treasury, which amounts to this, that you condemned them for not having made arrangements for an increase of evening schools, or an increase in the number of pupils, so that the money which they expected to expend should have been expended for that laudable purpose?—That is my position; yes, I do condemn them for that.

9936. Can you explain at all in any way how it turned out that the amount actually expended was so much below the Board's estimate?—I think I can. I will try to do so. The National Board have had in operation two schemes for payment of grant. One, which I will call the first scheme, was in operation, and it is still in operation, for those who desire to adopt it, by the way. That was in operation, I think, in 1902-1903 for the first time. The National Board then brought into operation, I think about 1906, a second scheme, which is alternative to the first scheme, a scheme of payment of grants. Now, one reason that the Board were not successful at the time this money was returned is this, that the basis of payment for the work done gave an altogether inadequate return to the teacher. That is the reason, the main reason, and I will give you the figures to support that opinion. We carried on a class in 1902, or thereabouts, really, under this scheme, on which the grant yielded

30th May, 1918.]

Mr. FRANCIS C. FOSTER, examined.

[Continued.]

us 2s. 8d. per head on the pupils enrolled. Now, supposing that the course lasts 50 weeks, as ours do approximately (this last year we have reduced it to 25 or 30, but there used to be 50), and supposing that you had 80 pupils in the class, that means that you get 2s. 8d. per evening that a class meets.

9937. For teaching the whole class?—Supposing the average attendance was 50, and that in the season each pupil costs 2s. 8d., then if the class meets on 30 occasions we have 2s. 8d. per evening for teaching a class. That takes no account whatever of the costs of heating, lighting, cleaning, supplying of pens and ink, and all other incidental expenses connected with the class. The next year we earned 2s. 1d. per pupil, and the next year 2s., and in the year in which the £13,000 was returned to the Treasury we earned 2s. 8d. per pupil; so my answer to the question is—that the Board is blameable to the extent that it does not calculate the payment of teachers, and of those who do the work, on a reasonable scale.

9938. Mr. KERRIE.—Do you know whether it was the Board or the Treasury that fixed the rate?—Surely it must have been the Board. I cannot imagine the Treasury fixing the rate of payment.

9939. My idea is that it was the Treasury?—I do not know.

9940. Sir HERMAN WILKINSON.—Is it your idea (I do not know really what happened, but it would be in accordance rather with what happens elsewhere) that the Board submit to the Treasury a statement of their expectation of a certain number of pupils at a certain rate, and ask the Treasury to supply that money, or simply that the Board got from the Treasury as much as they could have got, and that being free to expend that money, they failed to expend it, although it was very much required in the interest of education—those are two alternatives?—Of course, I have no internal knowledge which would enable me to offer any observation on that point. All I know is what actually happened.

9941. That the money was estimated for, and that the money was not expended, and that it should have been expended upon proper objects, so as to give a sufficient amount or an adequate amount in a proper way to the teachers?—To the teachers. That is so.

9942. Mr. KERRIE.—Why did they lower the rate per head each year?—It varies for reasons which are set out in the rules, and very complicated reasons they are.

9943. Sir HERMAN WILKINSON.—Could you reduce the complication in any way by a general statement?—No, I should also like to say that I referred to the money returned in 1904-1905, when there was about £11,000 returned, and that being the case, you would have thought that the Board, having learned from that, would not in the next year have returned another £10,000 or so. They returned £10,000 or £11,000 that year, and the next year £14,000, and the next year between £8,000 and £4,000 to the Treasury. The reasons why the evening school scheme did not work were well known, because the teachers did not get anything like reasonable remuneration, and that being the case, you would have thought the Board would have rectified the mistake. However, they did learn in 1908-1909, when they brought in this alternative scheme, and we in that year earned 6s. per head. We stopped these classes two years. We then earned 6s. per head under the second scheme.

9944. The CHAIRMAN.—After two years of discussion?—Well, we discontinued the classes ourselves, because there was a deficit in all those years, and we had to stop them because we had no money to meet the expense.

9945. Did that go on all over the country?—Everywhere. It means this, that if the teachers are to have a reasonable payment, as they have with us, the local authorities lose money; so if a teacher took classes as a private speculation, he got no money. When the new scheme came in we decided to take this second scheme, and we earned in the year 6s., and 6s. 8d.

the next year; the next year 6s. 8d., and then 7s. 8d., and this year we have dropped down to 6s. 1d. Now, I am going to explain that by showing certain anomalies in the Board Scheme. One of these anomalies which make this scheme difficult, and, indeed, prevent teachers from establishing it, is that the basis of payment under the second scheme is one under which you get a certain rate per head of the pupils, if your average attendance is so much. If your average attendance falls below a particular figure you get less. If your average attendance is 30 throughout the season you get paid at a certain rate per head. If it falls below 30, say 28, you get less a lower rate per head. We generally fix our classes at about 45 or 50. We wish to keep them small, because when the class becomes big the teaching cannot be efficient, and this late enrolment, and this absence from classes, is something that nobody can help—people who join late and are rather old and work out of tempo; and there are many very good reasons why they do not attend; and what one has to do is to try and fix the enrolment figure, so that your average will keep up above 30. But suppose that for no reason at all that the school can help the average falls below 30, the school gets at once penalised, and paid on a lower basis, although doing thoroughly good work, for reasons which it cannot control in any way, no matter how it may try. At the 23rd lesson in one of these classes to which these charts refer, we were entitled, if we had stopped the class, to 69s. for teaching English. We carried the class on to the 24th lesson, and at the end of the 24th we had earned 60s. We lost 9s. by doing more work. At the 25th lesson we had earned 66s. 6d., and we had to work on to the 28th lesson to get up to the amount that we had earned at the 23rd lesson. In all that time our expenses were increasing. We had to pay teachers and pay for lighting, and everything else. Here is another case. At the 20th lesson in another class we had earned 60s. At the 21st lesson we had 52s. 6d.; so we lost 7s. 6d. on the transaction, and we had to work on in that class to the 24th lesson to get back to the 60s. These are the reasons why the National Board returns money to the British Treasury, and these are some of the reasons why these classes are not taken up, and why teachers will not carry on the work.

9946. Sir HERMAN WILKINSON.—Suppose that the basis of the grant were, that there should be a payment for each pupil who had attended a certain number of days, that anomaly would not exist?—That is, suppose there is no limit as to the number of pupils. I would not like at the moment to say what effect that would have. I would have to think about it. Tell you begin to study this scheme you have no idea of the mass you get into. One could not tell off-hand what would happen; I could not tell at least.

9947. The grant is made, as I understand, upon the individual pupils, is it not?—It is made on the individual pupils in conjunction with the average attendance of the class. The two things go together.

9948. For the student who attends the whole time you do not get anything more than the student who attends the average number of times?—Not for the individual. The whole of the attendance is just thrown into a lump for the average, and the good student is no better than the indifferent student. If he makes fewer than ten attendances, he is cut out altogether, and you get nothing for him. And as a matter of fact, I might have carried these illustrations further, to show you how Gilbertian the whole system is, by mentioning one class in which our average dropped till we got no grant at all for the class.

9949. There is a rule (and there seems to be some reason for the rule) that in schools which are under a certain number, the salary of the teacher should be reduced, in case there is a very small attendance, so that a teacher who is teaching a small number may not receive the same as a teacher who is teaching in a very large school. It would seem as if possibly this limit was applied to a totally different set of circumstances, and therefore, to use your own words, produced a Gilbertian result?—Yes, the illustration is drawn from the day school regulations.

20th May, 1913.]

Mr. FRANCIS C. FOSBER, examined.

[Continued.]

9953. I suggest that the day school regulation has been applied where it has no application?—That is very possible.

9954. The CHAIRMAN.—What point are you on now?—We are still dealing with the National Board's evening continuation scheme. First of all, the point I am trying to place before you as clearly as I am able is, that a great number of pupils who present themselves for technical instruction are unable to take advantage of it, and cannot be admitted to it, and are excluded from it, and must go to the Preparatory section.

9955. Sir HENRY WILKINSON.—And this introductory school is a National School?—It is a National Evening School.

9956. The CHAIRMAN.—And it is inspected?—It is as such inspected by the National Board Inspector. It is actually under the National Board, although in another building than a National School.

9957. Are you present at the inspections?—Yes, frequently.

9958. Do you get notice of them?—Oh, we never get any notice; the inspector just comes in.

9959. Is he the inspector of the day schools in the district as well?—I believe so.

9960. Does he examine the boys there?—I do not think so; I do not think he tests the class.

9961. Does he test the class or watch the teacher teaching?—He does the latter. I have never heard him myself taking a question of the class. He is there very often when I do not know that he is there at all.

9962. He does not send for you when he calls?—No; I may afterwards see his name in the register. Our building is so very large, with so many class rooms and 150 classes going on that anybody might be in the building and I might not know. The point I want to bring before you is this, that a great number of National School pupils attending these evening classes, or rather ex-National School pupils, have a very low standard of education. If work is to be done in the Technical School which ought to be done under the National Board scheme of evening schools, it ought to be paid for adequately, and on some basis quite different from that which I have referred to. These schools in big urban areas, such as in Belfast or Dublin or Cork, ought to be carried on on a totally different plan. I do not think that for large areas the elements of success lie in either of these schemes, and I should like to have that recorded, and I will explain to you why I think so. At present one of these schools is established purely on the initiative of a manager or teacher. A manager may do it (let us take the place of clerical manager), because he wishes the young people to be brought within the influence of these classes in the evening; but a lay man will not bring his head about it, and if a teacher does it on his own initiative, I do not think it is imputing unworthy motives to a teacher to say that if he does establish a class of this kind, it is in order that he may earn more for it, and that would be usually the moving reason. Now, classes established in that sort of way, specifically, without any definite regard to the educational requirements to the district, are clearly not going to be a success, and there are all the other reasons against their being successful. But there are broader reasons, reasons which are more important from the point of view of public benefit that I want to make reference to. In a large city area districts require education of a particular kind provided for them. For instance, we have an area in which young engineers reside, that ought to have instruction relating to their daily business, even though it is only preparatory instruction. They will not come at all unless the instruction is made interesting and useful, and shown to be profitable. Young engineers won't come to be taught to make calculations about better and eggs, but they want to be taught about engineering. And then there ought to be some rela-

tion between the schools that are established in the different districts. There ought to be some means provided for establishing communication between them, and circulating apparatus from one school to another, to make the school useful, for no one school could have all that is required, and there ought to be a complete co-ordination between these different schools that are established in the evening. The present system does not admit of that and there are no means of doing it; and until there are some means of doing it the elementary evening school is not going to be a success or to be of any value at all for the purpose for which it was established. I say that in respect of urban areas a scheme should be devised which would allow schools to be established where they are needed. These schools should be properly co-ordinated; there ought to be some authority put in charge of them, a Technical Instruction Committee, or a body of managers, anybody you like, in whom the community at large has confidence. There should be an arrangement for the proper supervision of these schools by this authority, and instead of having payment made on the unsatisfactory basis, which involves enormous clerical labour, in addition to what I have already stated, there ought to be an arrangement whereby the National Board would place a sum of money in the hands of this local authority and tell them: "There is that money. That is all we can give you. You do the very best you can with it. Submit to us first of all a scheme of what you propose to do. You must not set until we approve of the scheme. We will inspect the schools, but do the best you can with that sum of money." That is practically what the Department of Agriculture does. It provides so much money every year. It gives an endorsement and the local authority makes the best arrangement it can.

9963. Mr. HENRY.—Does the Department lay down the scale of salary?—No. It indicates its view, but, so far as I understand, it does not fix what salary we shall pay. It claims the right to approve of the salaries fixed, or to agree to them; but it does not stipulate what the amount shall be.

9964. But in the case of the agricultural instructors it does?—I am only speaking for my own Institute.

9965. The BARNES or ROSE.—That arrangement as to the Agricultural Instructor is that he is directly paid by the Department, and therefore his salary is not fixed by the local committee. In that case it is fixed by the Department itself?—Naturally, the Department fix the salaries of their own officers; but I am speaking of our own case. On this question of evening schools, I want to say that in 1908 Dr. Scudamore came to Belfast to inquire into another question in connection with National Schools, and I then had, at his request, an interview with him. As a result of the interview I formulated a scheme which I submitted to him for consideration, in which these ideas that I have just outlined to you were outlined to the Resident Commissioner. I sent this letter on the 6th of May, 1908, and on the 20th of August of the same year, I got a letter saying that this scheme had been considered, but that it was not possible to entertain the proposal, and then this second scheme that I have been speaking of here for the payment of a grant came out shortly after that, which is a much more favourable one than the first one. Another reason which I might put before you why these schools are not successful, is that young people do not go readily to an evening school with regularity, when it is felt that it is just merely day school work. Many, who seem to have a great repugnance to day school work, are not anxious to take it up in the evening, and I know from conversation that that motive actually operates. I have got a great many figures about the attendance in other schools of this kind across the water. Here is one set of figures which might perhaps be interesting. I was formerly connected with the school of Technology in Manchester, and I got some figures from Manchester as to the number of young people attending the evening classes in that city. There are 44,500 on the roll of evening classes of all kinds. Now, if you take the population of

20th May, 1913.]

Mr. FRANCIS C. FOSTER, *continued*.

[Continued.]

Manchester it is double that of Belfast. It has a population of 800,000, and therefore on that basis we ought to have at least 12,000 attending evening classes, but I doubt if you could gather up in Belfast more than 1,000 evening students outside the Technical Institute. Well, that is all that I wanted to say on schools and their relation to evening classes.

9953. You mentioned that you started this preparatory section in 1902-1903?—Yes, about that time.

9954. So, therefore, you found pupils about that time unprepared for your work?—We did; we have the experience, of course, every year.

9955. You still find them unprepared?—A portion of them, as then, so now.

9956. Do you know whether they are more or less unprepared, whether matters have grown better or worse?—They were bad in 1902-3, and they are bad at present, but I cannot make any comparison.

9957. The CHAIRMAN.—You have already told us that you did not notice any change in the percentage of failures?—I did say that, but when I answered that question, I was speaking of the Day Trade Preparatory School, not of the evening section. I will try to answer his lordship in this way. We have this year 497 persons enrolled in this evening preparatory section, and in 1902-3 we had 976 at the beginning of our work, and that number has more or less steadily gone down since, but I attribute that fact to the fact that there are a couple of good evening preparatory schools in the city, and many of the students who formerly came to us are going to those preparatory schools.

9958. The CHAIRMAN.—Which are they?—One in particular is carried on in the Y.M.C.A. at Wellington Place, Belfast.

9959. Sir HENRY WILKINSON.—And the other?—At the Ballymacarett Y.M.C.A.; but there is one which I have not any particular information about carried on by the Catholic authorities somewhere about Falls Road.

9960. The BANNER or ROSE.—Do you notice any difference in the aptitude for work which they showed in 1902-3, and the intelligence with which they applied themselves to the work at that time, and in 1910-11-12?—I think I can say this, that the whole standard of work that we come into contact with is rising rapidly.

9961. The standard of intelligence is going up?—Of those students that we come into contact with. We are now doing work in the evening on nearly a University level in our technical department, work that we could not have attempted in 1902-3; but, of course, we have students in the school now who have been there five, six or more years.

9962. The CHAIRMAN.—And who began in your Trade Preparatory School?—No, who began in evening classes. There are some who began in the Preparatory School, but they are not numerous, and those who began in the Trade Preparatory School passing into the evening department are the best pupils.

9963. Mr. HENLY.—Those were your own pupils from the beginning?—Yes.

9964. The BANNER or ROSE.—You get boys coming to the Trade Preparatory Schools from other schools, and in their first year in the Trade Preparatory School they are greatly affected by the training they got before coming to you?—Yes.

9965. Now take the pupils that entered this preparatory section that you have—can you draw any comparison between the intelligence of those pupils and the others, eliminating the question of acquired knowledge—can you draw any comparison as to the intelligence and the rapidity with which they accept your instruction as between the present body of pupils and the body you had in the earlier years; in other words, do you think the intelligence is going up or down?—Do I understand you to mean the native intelligence of the pupils or the intelligence based on instruction?

9966. Native intelligence developed by whatever instruction they have got. I do not think you would have much change in the natural intelligence, but in the development of it by the instruction they have

got?—I think I can answer that in this way, that I believe the whole intellectual standard of the pupils who are passing through our school is rising steadily. I do not know whether that answers your question.

9967. It throws a good deal of light on my question, because if you take the whole mass they evidently were better at the beginning, and they continue to be better all through?—I certainly can say for Belfast that the intellectual standard of our students is rising very steadily and very noticeably, and for a whole variety of reasons. You have pupils from different parts of the town, all sections of the community, meeting in these class-rooms, rubbing shoulders together and learning together, and getting to know each other, and that is of very great value to the community if you talk of nothing else, if you leave out instruction. It is due to the fact that these young people are brought in from all sections of the community, and that they are all learning, and the best man of the class is the man who has got the most brains, and there is no other standard applied to them, and I would go further than that, and I would say that in Ireland there is probably no more useful work of a school kind being done anywhere than the work in technical schools, because of its effect in the way of bringing pupils together. I think that all that in turn acts and re-acts, and widens the outlook of people—they meet together in their societies, and they read papers and discuss them, and all this tends to raise the intellectual standard.

9968. The CHAIRMAN.—I think what his lordship wanted to bring out was, whether you had observed any pupils coming originally from the primary schools in the last ten years with more highly-trained intelligence than previously?—I could not say that, if his inquiry related specifically to pupils coming from elementary schools.

9969. It has been driven home to circulars to the minds of inspectors and teachers that the great object of the new system is to cultivate tone and intelligence and good mental habits rather than the acquisition of knowledge, if they can be separated, and what the Bishop wished to ascertain was whether you had observed the effect of that on the intelligence of the pupils coming to you—whether their mental habits were better at entrance than they used to be?—I have not observed that that is so.

9970. The BANNER or ROSE.—Take two boys coming in who have the same amount of intelligence, but one boy has been better trained than the other. They start with the same amount of knowledge, but the better trained boy will advance much more rapidly in your schools than the badly-trained boy, and I ask if you have noticed that there is any difference in the intellectual training of the boys?—I cannot observe that it is so. I am told by a National School teacher that it is not so.

9971. Mr. CONNOR.—You have not observed it yourself?—I have not observed it, but I am told by teachers who ought to know.

9972. Mr. KERR.—There is evidently no very marked difference?—Nothing marked, nothing noticeable.

9973. Mr. HENLY.—Now of those 497 pupils that you put into the lowest place in your school, could you tell us in what subjects or in what respect their education was defective?—The entrance test is in English, arithmetic, and drawing. Drawing we do not make a failing subject, but English or Arithmetic we do.

9974. Either English or arithmetic or both?—Yes, possibly there are more failures in the arithmetic than in the English.

9975. The BANNER or ROSE.—The larger number of the 978 failed in the very same subjects?—I do not think I can speak so definitely as to that time, because we had not organized the entrance examination in 1902-3.

9976. Mr. HENLY.—As you started your Technical Institute in 1900, would there not be a large residuum, the collection of years, coming to you for admission?—Yes.

9977. So that the 978 would represent the number that under normal conditions would be coming in in the sequence of years?—Yes.

2015 May, 1913.]

Mr. FRANCIS C. FORTN, examined.

[Continued.]

0088. Provided the place had been open?—Oh, yes; we began on what you might call virgin soil. There were some few evening classes held before that; but I think we might put the number at 300 or 400 of those who annually obtained evening instruction in Belfast prior to the introduction of the technical scheme.

0089. Mr. KERRIE.—Will you kindly read in what you consider the most difficult papers in English and arithmetic—just one of each?—In that case I think the most useful example would be a general paper which does not apply to any particular department of the school, which would show the standard. There are many students who come who are not definitely labelled engineer or builder, or chemist or clerk, and we give them a general paper. I will hand that to us as an example of the kind of paper set.

0090. The CHAIRMAN.—Have you finished the point you were at when we adjourned, and do you now take up the time-table?—Before going on with that I should like to hand in also two other time-tables. This is a time-table of classes held in the Technical Institute, Belfast, it shows the range of work that has to be provided for, and up to which we wish to bring the National school pupils, or into contact with which we wish to bring them. It is by way of supplement to the prospectus, which has already been given to you.

0091. This is a time-table only?—Yes. And I should also like to hand in this publication, the report of the Annual Congress of the Irish Technical Instruction Association, which was held at Newry in 1908. I think on page 16 and the following pages these views which I put before you relative to evening elementary classes are set out more fully.

0092. Will you hand that in?—I will hand that in. Then I proceed with the subject of the education given in the Institute in the relation to the education of boys and girls for employment. I speak here as a member of the Juvenile Advisory Committee of the Labour Exchange. This Committee has gone into the question of the employment of children who have just left National schools. It has gone into that question rather fully.

0093. They would be children over the age of 13?—A child, as I understand it, will leave the National school when he or she has passed out of the 5th standard, whatever age the child is. He may be only 11 or 12, so that he may not leave the National school till he is 14, as I understand it, if he has not reached that 5th standard, so that the age will vary. This Juvenile Advisory Committee has worked out a very elaborate scheme. I do not know whether you have had evidence on it.

0094. We have not?—A committee is first of all formed, representing a great variety of interests, religious interests, industrial interests, Corporation interests, and so on, and it is arranged that when a child leaves the National School and wants work, the teacher of the school, that is, the principal teacher, shall fill in a card and send this to the Labour Exchange with the child, that is, if the child desires to get employment through the Labour Exchange. The teacher in that card gives particulars of the child's education and general disposition, and such information as will help the authorities to select suitable employment. On the other hand, employers apply to the Labour Exchange for young people for different kinds of work. It is the business of the Labour Exchange to bring the child and the employer together. To do this the Labour Exchange has to make enquiries and compile a great deal of information. Recently a deputation from the Juvenile Advisory Committee visited on various employers' associations, and urged upon the employers the necessity for taking more interest in the young people they employ, and urged upon them the desirableness of applying to the Labour Exchange when boys were wanted. They also broached the question of whether it would not be possible for employers to give some portion of time off per week from working hours, during which the young people could go to a day school, something like the apprentice classes that I have referred to, but no encouragement was given to that suggestion at all, and that is germane to the matter here, inasmuch as it shows that any continuation instruction must be provided in the evening. There is no hope of the em-

ployers giving up time in the day, as matters stand at present; at least no hope of its being done generally. There are a few employers who allow their apprentices to attend day classes.

0095. These young people who go to the apprentice classes get the leave of their employers?—They do. They are very, very few in number, perhaps 100 persons all told. Now, these employers, in reply to the views put before them, made a number of observations which I want to bring out here. They said first of all, or rather some of them said, those who had tried this experiment that in connection with their work they had established evening classes, but the evening classes had not been successful, and the reason that they gave why they were not successful were these:—First of all, that parents took no interest in the education of their children; secondly, the young people were indifferent towards any improvement in their education. One very broad-minded employer, who had spent a good deal of money in attempting to improve the education of his work people, spoke in a very pessimistic way about the whole matter. He said he had ceased now to hold classes separately, because his junior employees thought that the classes were being held simply for his benefit, and so he ceased to hold the classes. Those employees who did attend the classes were given bonuses or prizes at the end of the years for success. He also spoke about the ill-preparation of the young people for the daily work, that is, their educational preparation. Then other employers complained that in many cases they found those young people, after remaining longer or shorter time, for a week or a few weeks, would leave without giving any notice, and there was a great deal of trouble owing to the tendency of young people, boys, to move from one place to another, and this lack of moral sense was rather bitterly commented on by some employers. Now, our report that I think has been before the Advisory Committee deals with the way in which children who are employed outside school hours at a variety of occupations, and it also states what a tax that makes upon the children's energies and the resulting injury to their studies while they are at school. The report was brought up to find out whether this Committee would authorise the officer in charge of this work to supply boys or girls for casual employment outside school hours, and the Juvenile Advisory Committee decided that that was not proper work to be done, and they are not going to do it. And this report contains a number of instances in support of the argument that children are employed to a large extent outside school hours in work which militates against the proper pursuit of their daily studies.

0096. Mr. HANCOCK.—Does not the English Act apply to Ireland, under which it is optional for local authorities to regulate the employment of children?—Children who are at school?

0097. Yes; it is an optional Act that may be adopted by any governing body that wishes. It has been adopted in nearly all the large towns of England and regulates the employment of children while of school age?—Children who are at school are certainly employed quite extensively in Belfast outside school hours.

And such employment was very extensive, indeed, in England, until this Act was passed.

0098. Mr. KERRIE.—That is not the half-time system?—No, the half-time system is rather different.

0099. The half-time system also interferes with educational improvement?—Yes, it does; the half-time system is one under which the child goes to school for half a day and to work for the other half. Here the children are at school all day, and are employed either before going to school or after going from school, and they work for small wages, may be two or three shillings a week.

0100. Has the half-time system, as it exists in Belfast, not a tendency to lower the standard of elementary education?—It tends to keep it down. Certainly it does that; because if a child is only at school half a day a good deal of his energies is exhausted by the work that he is engaged in and he does not give attention. I understand that there is a growing tendency all round on the part of employers to dispense with half-timers.

10001. Sir HERMAN WHITING.—In the case of the operation of the Half-Time Act, is it not the fact that boys actually attend schools and business on alternate days in some cases?—I cannot answer definitely Yes or No; but some weeks they go in the mornings and the next week in the afternoons. They go alternately one week in the morning and the next week in the afternoon.

10002. I was under the impression that it was alternate days?—That may be the case. There may be cases of going on alternate days, but I think the practice is rather to go in the mornings for one week and in the afternoons for another week.

10003. The CHAIRMAN.—Are you handing in this report?—I will hand this in if you think it sufficiently important. I usually wanted to bring under your notice the reason why elementary education is not so satisfactory. I will hand in this if you wish. Then there are many important points in this which I need not delay you with now. Then I should also like to tell you that it is a satisfactory feature that employers with us are increasingly taking an interest in their employees and encouraging them in various ways to attend the evening classes. They are not holding classes of their own, as was formerly the case, but they are in some cases paying the fee for their employees.

10004. I suppose you know the evening classes started by Sir William Mather in Manchester?—Yes.

10005. Those classes have been most successful?—Yes, I know the Sir William Mather system very well. I have got here another report, also in connection with the Juvenile Advisory Committee, in which a return is made of replies to 170 applications that were made to employers to know to what extent they were encouraging their employees to attend the classes, and from those 170 there were 80 replies received, and this return goes to show that quite a number of employers, and all of different branches of industry too, are now encouraging their employees in some way or other, by paying fees or by giving prizes, or by doing both. I have that information. I do not know whether you care to have that information or not, about the extent to which employers are doing this.

10006. I think so?—Now, here is another point, which, as I can see, relates directly to your enquiry. I have got here a return for the month embracing the half of March and the half of April of this year. There were 26 vacancies notified to the Juvenile Advisory Committee by employers during this period, amounting to a month, and of those 26 were filled. During that same month there were 183 applications for employment, but the Labour Exchange were only able to fill 57 out of 98 notified cases. They could not find amongst their candidates young people sufficiently educated for the places.

10007. That is, there were only about a third of them properly educated?—Only a third of those who applied were put into places, and there were 86 places which could not be filled, because the applicants, of whom there were a great many, were not sufficiently educated.

10008. Two-thirds were rejected, in fact?—Some of these places were places that children with quite an average standard of education might have filled; but I need not trouble you with that.

10009. Will you hand that in?—Yes. This Advisory Committee is doing very valuable work. Now, I have here an analysis of returns received from 120 schools. This is a return of 2,130 children who left school during the year 1911. I may summarise this. During the year out of those 2,130 children there were 40 children that had left school at the age of eleven. There were 840 at the age of thirteen, and 840 who left at the age of fourteen. Now, if we take any of the 840, take the average of thirteen as a sample, out of the 840 who left school at the age of thirteen, 17 were in the seventh standard, 168 were in the sixth standard, and 458 were in the fifth standard, 37 were in the fourth standard, 74 were in the third standard, 24 in the second standard, and 5 were in the first standard.

10010. At the age of thirteen?—Children of the age of thirteen. You will notice that a large proportion of these 840 were in the fifth standard or lower. Out of the 840 leaving school at the age of thirteen, 17 were in the seventh standard. Out of the 840 who left school at the age of fourteen, 29 were in the seventh standard, 171 in the sixth standard, 195 in the fifth standard, 191 in the fourth standard, 136 in the third standard, 35 in the second standard, and 14 in the first, and these were 4 actually classed as being infants at the age of fourteen. I will make a remark about that later on, a remark which I think is worthy of this Committee's attention in regard to the whole question. This is also summarised. I may, perhaps, give you the actual replies made by some of the employers' associations to the Juvenile Advisory Committee. This is the reply of the Belfast Employers' Association for Engineers (that is, the Belfast Branch of the Engineering Federation, really).—"The object of the deputation having been set forth as on the previous occasion, the Chairman, in reply, stated on behalf of the members of the Association, that facilities had been afforded to apprentices in the engineering trades from time to time, but had not been availed of by them to any great extent, and inducements of various kinds to encourage attendance at evening classes had been offered, with most disappointing results. While the members of this Association thoroughly sympathised with the Juvenile Advisory Committee in its desire to encourage education amongst the children who come under its care, and were themselves endeavouring to stimulate their apprentices to take a personal interest in the matter, they were quite opposed to the consideration of any scheme for day classes for juvenile workers, as they were of opinion that such classes would materially interfere with the proper training of boys, at least in the engineering business, as contemplated absence of apprentices for portion of the day would lead to a tendency on the part of the firm to entrust only inferior work to such boys, reserving the more skilled and important work for the apprentices whose time would not be so encroached on." This is a very important declaration, because there is a tendency just now to impress on employers the desirableness of allowing their apprentices off work during the day. This is a valuable statement of opinion made by employers, and I thought it might be well to have it before you. Here is an observation, by the way, relating to these cases of situations that could not be filled. The officer of the Labour Exchange reports that it appears within the last month there were a number of vacancies notified which could not be filled. This was owing, in many cases, to the small wages offered; in others, to the lack of suitable applicants, so that there are two factors operating. I spoke just now of the lack of suitable applicants; but it is important that I should modify that by drawing attention to the fact that small wages also entered into it. The youngsters would not take work at the wages offered. Well, under that head I have nothing to say.

10011. Sir HERMAN WHITING.—With regard to the last observation, is there any indication there as to whether the employments offered at low wages were such as to lead to better wages?—The report does not show that. I can get the information; but this, of course, is quite generally true (I am sure it is known to you already), that one reason why so many young people enter on "blind-alley" occupations is that the wages are so much higher than for skilled occupations. A boy will get as apprentice engineer perhaps 4s. a week, when he can by running messages, or standing at the door of a picture-house get 3s. or 10s. a week, and he keeps on at that until he is discharged for another boy, and there has been a great tendency on the part of parents to put children into occupations which are immediately remunerative. There is no doubt that that tendency is very strong. This report does not show that; however, it is well known that it is so.

10012. The CHAIRMAN.—What is the next head you are proceeding to?—Arising out of this there are some particulars that I collected to lay before you since I sent in the Memorandum. I should like to make some miscellaneous observations on the general question of education. I have spoken of ways in which I think the

evening elementary scheme of the National Board could be made more effective, but I want to say, what I am sure must be obvious to everybody, that this evening elementary education, no matter how good it is, is a very ineffective substitute for day instruction, and it is indeed a very ineffective substitute. You cannot compel young people to attend evening schools as matters stand at present. In Scotland they have an Act of Parliament by which that can be done; but I am very doubtful myself as to the expediency of applying compulsion to young people to attend evening classes, and yet I think improvement is to be brought about by increasing compulsion where it can be applied, that is, in connection with day schools, and there seems to be a real necessity for the raising of the age of which a child can leave school. Under present conditions a child can leave at eleven, which will always result in an unsatisfactory system of education in the country and you cannot get away from it, if a child can leave in the fifth standard. It is too low a standard to allow him to leave at. You will have many children who immediately have passed out of the fifth standard, will seek work, or their parents will seek work for them, even if the child does not itself, and there seems to be no remedy for that except the raising of the leaving age. What happens now is this. It is a doubly vicious arrangement. A bright child, a clever child, a child who is endowed with intellectual capacity for benefitting by school instruction, reaches the fifth standard, say, it is immediately thrown out of the school and sent to work, and runs on messages, while a duller child, one on whom the school teachers are exercising their powers to least advantage, is kept on at school, and I do not see how you are going to get away from that unless there is some method adopted for raising the age. The child ought not to be allowed to leave school at eleven, even if it has reached the fifth standard, and I would like to put that before the Committee for consideration, and I have a return prepared by the School Attendance Committee of Belfast, showing that. Here is the School Attendance Committee's report for the year 1912, and I only want to draw attention to the table on the last page but one. This gives you the average on the rolls in each month of the year, and you see that in the case of Belfast the numbers are very large, and the problem is an extensive one in Belfast. Of course, it is not more important than in a smaller community, but it is extensive. Take 1912, the month of January. We are there 65,705 pupils enrolled. You note the number in 1912 is lower than in 1911. That does not mean that the school population has decreased, but it does mean that there is a new system of registration introduced and new regulations applied, whereby a child who was on the roll, and who is away for four weeks, must be struck off. Formerly a child was kept on for three months. Then you get on the last page, 58, a table which shows the percentages in average of daily attendance. The average number on the roll, as you will see, taking in all these years, somewhere in the neighbourhood of 75 per cent., taking above and below, and that again is a matter which needs public consideration, the very low average attendance of the school, that out of every 100 children, 25 are absent all the time and only 75 percent, and something needs to be done to remedy that.

10013. What is the average in Scotland—is it not 80?—You will get in English schools over 90 per cent. I do not know the conditions in Scotland particularly well, but certainly 80 per cent. is quite common across the water.

10014. Mr. KAVANAGH.—Is the School Attendance Act enforced very strongly?—It is not, and that is also a point to which I will refer presently, and as to why it is not. Now, here is another point that I think ought to be mentioned. As matters stand at present, under the present organisation we have in Belfast, some hundreds of National Schools. Every one of these schools is, if I may put it so, tied by a string to Dublin, each one tied by a separate string. There is absolutely no co-ordination between these schools in regard to common action on any point whatever, and I do not think we will ever have efficiency until we get close connection between the National Schools within the same area.

10015. That is not a question for us; that is a question of local authority?—It is a question of some arrangement acceptable to those concerned. I have no scheme, and I merely mention it.

10016. Sir HERMAN WILKINSON.—I take it that you are not proposing any particular method of bringing them into contact with each other, but suggesting that contact, whether voluntary or statutory, would be of advantage?—That is my point.

10017. That a voluntary arrangement between them would suit your ideas so long as it was effective?—Quite so; so long as it is done. I know of a broader question, a political question, a highly contentious one, but I am not touching that. What I am merely mentioning is that there ought to be some method by which groups of National Schools are brought into some connection, union, co-operation, and co-operation, let that be done in any way that is acceptable to the people.

10018. The CHAIRMAN.—There is a proposal in Belfast at this moment, is there not, for that amongst the Protestant schools?—Not for that, sir; it is another matter; it is a question of buildings. Then, I think I have already said that I think there ought to be some regular connection, by means of scholarships, between National Schools and Secondary Schools, and I want to reiterate that. I have also spoken of the desirability of having more preparatory schools in the country, or having secondary schools under the Intermediate Board, if that is preferred, as it has been suggested that there might be some drawback in having these secondary schools under the Intermediate Board. It has been said that in most of the districts you have no industries for the pupils to go to, and as all know that that is very true. Then the need for these scholarships are most amongst the poorer class of the community, and that is one reason again why I think that scholarships ought to be associated with the National Schools, because we may take it in general that we find the poorer class of the community in National Schools. I have also wondered whether this Committee could do anything to stir up more interest in public education in Ireland, not only amongst the municipalities, but amongst parents. Parents are terribly indifferent to the whole question of education, even to the education of their own children, and lastly, the children are indifferent, and they take no interest in study, and look forward with pleasure, and even delight, to the day when they will be released from attending school.

10019. The CHAIRMAN.—Is that lack of interest increasing?—I do not think I can say that. It is probably decreasing slightly.

10020. Sir HERMAN WILKINSON.—Might I suggest one cause of it, namely, the absence of home lessons and the consequent want of interest on the part of parents to supervise the education of the children at any part of their school time at all?—We, of course, in the Trade Preparatory School, do give home lessons; but I do not know whether they are given generally or at all in the National School.

10021. I understood that the teaching of home lessons is not very much encouraged in the National Schools, and looking back on one's own experience, one can remember the time when people at home, finding that penalties were imposed on members of their family in being kept in and otherwise for deficiency in preparation, looked after the preparation of the children, and took an interest, not only in the preparation, but in the children's general progress. Now, you are of opinion, that if home lessons were eliminated, one means of interesting the parents would be thereby stimulated?—I should agree with that. I think there is no doubt that when a child has home lessons to do, although the parent does not take an equal interest in them, the child will harness the parent into taking an interest by asking questions about how to do the home lessons.

10022. Mr. CORRY.—If the parent does take an interest in the child's education and disapproves of the curriculum, is there any way in which he can make his disapproval effective?—I cannot answer that question. I do not know the National School system sufficiently well.

20th May, 1918.]

Mr. FRANCIS C. FORTH, examined.

[Continued.]

10023. Would not that be one reason of the absence of interest on the part of the parents? You see the whole school curriculum is framed up here in Dublin by a body of gentlemen who are not responsible in any way to public opinion, as represented by the parent, and I suggest that that is a very evident cause of the indifference?—It may be; but I could not offer an opinion on that.

10024. The Bazaar or Bazaar.—I have heard several persons say that the total abolition of school fees has lessened the interest of the parents, and that when they were paying some very small fees they took more interest in what they were paying for?—It has been suggested in Belfast that certain classes should be given free, and my Committee have always stood out against that proposal, and I am personally not in sympathy with either. I believe that the fees should be very low, or at any rate so low as not to be prohibitive, and fees ought to be charged in order to give the student a stake in what he has taken up. They are never prohibitive in our case, and if we know of a case of hardship, we admit the student without payment of fees; but I certainly agree that there should be some fee paid.

10025. The CHAIRMAN.—Now, will you proceed to the next point?—I should like to bring before the Committee also this point. There is a very great need for an improvement in school buildings in my area. The system on which a number of schools are carried on at present is subversive of all education. You cannot educate children under those conditions. The new schools are being built on a better principle, and being well built in our district, but there is a great need all round for improvement of school buildings, and there is with us a great need for an increase in the number of school buildings, and that is a point that was raised recently by Protestant gentlemen in Belfast and Presbyterian ministers, that the Corporation should take in hand the provision of school buildings. That was pressed by a deputation of the heads of the various religious bodies.

10026. There are children running about Ballymacarrett who cannot get into school; it is said that there are about 15,000 of such children?—It was stated by Dr. D'Arcy, the Bishop of Down and Connor and Drogheda, that there were 15,000 children of school-going age in the city of Belfast who had no school to go to, and that is an answer to your question as to whether the Act is enforced. It is not for that reason, because if it was enforced they would have no school to go to. I have been told this, that in the case of a school with accommodation for 200 children, there has been found to be a number in addition to that on the rolls, so that the school has more on its rolls than it has accommodation for, but there are so many of the children away each day that the actual number attending falls within the number allowed.

10027. The CHAIRMAN.—But if all the children on the school roll of attendance come the room would be absolutely overcrowded?—If all the children actually presented themselves at the school doors there would be no accommodation in Belfast for them.

10028. Mr. HENRY.—Was not the floor space provided for children 8 feet?—Yes, so I understand.

10029. And it has been recently raised to 10?—Yes, so I understand.

10030. And that has caused some of the difficulty that you have in Belfast and some other parts of the country?—Yes.

10031. The CHAIRMAN.—What is the next point?—Well, I should like to put before you the question of the present school day. The custom at present is to have what is called a single school day. The children attend school approximately from half-past nine to half-past two with an interval, it may be, of 20 minutes or half an hour. During that time the children may have lunch. They are allowed to go out to the playground or into the field, or stay in the school. Now, it seems to me that that is a matter which demands consideration from anyone concerned with the education of the children of this country. That might work perfectly well, and may be a necessary arrangement in country districts where

children have a long way to go to school and go home again, and where they must be home before it is dark in the later months of the year, but it does not seem to me to be at all necessary in an urban area, where the children are fairly close to the school, and I think it is most injurious to the health of the children, and it is a great impediment to their educational progress to remain so many hours at school. I think some of the evils of this are obvious, for instance, the diminution of mental alertness in a four hours' attendance to begin with. We do not allow it in our Technical schools or Universities. We do not keep the students at work for four hours at a stretch without any motion, and the half hour cannot be much, and I would say also that in crowded schools the long attendance leads to physical deterioration of the children, because it cannot be possible to keep up that freshness of the atmosphere during a number of hours that you could obtain by having shorter hours, and throwing the whole school open in the meantime, and my suggestion is that it would be a very important subject to consider, whether it would not be possible to introduce in the urban areas a two-period day.

10032. Mr. HENRY.—Are you aware that it is open to the manager of any school to have two attendances in the day if he wishes, by making an application to the Commissioners—that the machinery is there if he likes to use it?—That is true, but one may have machinery which he may not be able to put into operation partially, and you must put it into operation wholly or not at all.

10033. Any man can do it if he wishes?—He may, theoretically, but practically he cannot, and I will explain why. First of all, I want to say that I have spoken to Mr. Philip Ward, who is a National Education Commissioner, on the subject.

10034. The CHAIRMAN.—He has been before us?—I do not know whether he made reference to that two-period day. What I want to quote from him is this, that he knows of a school (I think he was head master or principal of a school in which this was in operation), and he says the system worked very well, and it gave a better average daily attendance than he could get with the single-period arrangement. There may be other reasons in the district. I know that in Mr. Ward's district they have an exceedingly active and able parish clergyman, who does a great deal to keep children at school, and to whom a good deal of the educational success of the district is due. That may be a factor also, but Mr. Ward attributes part of the good result to having a two-period day. Now, one reason that this could not be put into operation is this, and it is the explanation given to me by school teachers, that there are parents who want children home early in the afternoon to run messages. There are children who want to go to work in the afternoon I have mentioned just now, and if one school introduced the two-period day they would have to carry on the instruction to a later hour in the day, and this would drive the children from the school, and no teacher wants his attendance to fall down, and no manager is going to introduce a system by which he would diminish the attendance. On the other hand, if it is general, the manager might agree to it, but he is practically prevented from doing it by the conditions.

10035. Mr. HENRY.—The practical difficulty, then, is that it would be unpopular?—Anything that is new is unpopular, no matter whether it is for the good of the people or not, and it would be sufficiently unpopular to make it unworkable.

10036. The CHAIRMAN.—You would cut off a couple of shillings a week off the child's earnings after 4 o'clock?—Yes, and I think that is the great reason why parents want the children home earlier in the day.

10037. Sir HERMAN WILKINSON.—Have you considered what would be the proper two periods?—The system ought to allow the children to go home for the mid-day meal, and allow them to be mentally reconverted. I suppose an hour and a half would be as little as would suffice for that purpose.



2015 May, 1013.]

Mr. FRANCIS C. FORTH, examined.

[Continued.]

19038. And would you say from 9 till 12, and 2 till 5, or something of that sort?—I think the statutory time is 4 hours, but I think the children are usually in school about 5 hours.

19039. The CHAIRMAN.—Would you say 9 to 11 and 1 to 5?—At present they go to school about half-past nine—that is the average time. I would keep the same hour for beginning, and let the child remain until half-past twelve, and then resume at two o'clock, and remain from 2 to 4. That seems to me to be a working arrangement. Moreover, that would have the advantage of allowing the child to go home and have a mid-day meal with the family, which would be distinctly to the benefit of the child's health.

19040. Mr. HANMON.—Is not that impracticable in Ireland in the case of the country schools?—I am speaking of urban areas, and I do not think it is quite necessary for country areas.

19041. You would make a distinction?—Yes. I put that before you as one of the reasons why our National school education is not as popular with the children as it might be, and one of the reasons why I do not believe you will get full value out of such education as is given. I am sure our individual experience will tell us that to keep young people, especially young growing children, studying for what is practically four hours, is too much to expect. I know with grown students, young men, you will find a serious diminution in mental sharpness at the end of the third hour in the morning or afternoon.

19042. Mr. KERRIN.—With regard to the need for the provision of school buildings in Belfast, there are some very striking extracts from inspectors' reports that I wish to bring under your attention. This is so recently as 1899-10. In an earlier report, I think it is Mr. Kelly's report, speaking of one school, he says that the air-space in it works out as rather less per head than the air-space per head in the Black Hole of Calcutta. Mr. Keefe, in his report, page 51 of the Appendix to the Commissioners' Report for 1906-10, says—"Serious cases of overcrowding continue to occur. One school supplies space for 291 children. At one visit I found 286 present. In one of the rooms, with accommodation for 47, 102 infants spent their school day. At another school, where there is accommodation for 212, 324 children were in attendance, while 78 pupils were taught in a room for 44, and 118 in a room for 47. Part of the time there were about 50 of the 118 referred to were taught in a vile unheated passage, and that occurred on a snowy day in winter." And so he goes on through a list of similar figures, and that is Belfast?—Does not that strike you as a statement that the National Board, charged with the education of the children of this country, should have been ashamed to print. Do you not think that the National Board ought to hide their heads after that striking evidence of their administration of the system that they have in charge? They are responsible.

19043. If they had funds?—But they are responsible; they have charge of it.

19044. "At a girls' school, accommodating 206, 408 were enrolled, and I found 311 present; 323 had been in attendance the previous day. In a room for 60, 100 children were under instruction." In one with floor space for 291 pupils, 386 were present, and the number present was actually greater than the number on the record. A paragraph explains at the foot that there were many children present whose names were not on the record, so it looks as if the children were huddling in?—Of course, much of that is true. I believe some of it is overcrowded. That being the case, I say what is the National Board, the Body charged with the provision of education, doing when they allow this to go on—whom do they expect to act in the matter of siting this state of things?

Mr. HANMON.—I think we ought to be just to the Commissioners. If they have applied to Parliament, and if the money has not been given to them, and if the managers have done their best in collecting money from the people round about, then I think it is not a case of blaming the Commissioners or the managers.

19045. The CHAIRMAN.—If I remember aright, the Board have again and again applied to the Treasury in vain for assistance, and the building grants were actually suspended for two or three years?—But, then, whom do the Commissioners expect to remedy this kind of thing. They are the body charged.

19046. The BISHOP OF DUBLIN.—Are you quite correct in your statement that the National Board are charged with the education of the country, charged with the provision of elementary education in Ireland, for if I understand rightly, the National Board are charged with aiding education, and the local authorities are bound to find portion of the money?—The local authorities; but may I ask who is meant by local authorities?

19047. The local managers and the parents of the children, and all those people; but, first, it is correct to say that the National Board are charged with the provision of the education of the country, or is their position this, that they are to aid that education?—Is the National Board not a Government Department, controlling the elementary education.

19048. They are the public Department aiding National Education, and as far as their aid goes, they control it?—Then on whom do they wish to put the blame for the condition of the schools?

19049. On the parents and the managers?—Then as the parents have no means of seeing to the matter, and there is no organization for acting in the matter, there is no authority through whom the parents can act, and so what is to be done? We are in an impasse then clearly.

19050. Exactly; where we have been ever since 1850; we have been in that impasse the whole time?—Well, that sums the situation up apparently.

19051. That is the situation actually?—I think the country looks to the National Board to remedy the defects in elementary education.

Mr. HANMON.—They can remedy some defects, but that is a defect beyond their power.

19052. The CHAIRMAN.—They cannot be responsible for that?—But their grants are supplied by vote of assistance from the Treasury. They have actually been suspended for some years.

19053. Mr. KERRIN.—Whoever is responsible, you will agree that that is a state of facts that ought to be brought home to public opinion?—I agree fully with that, but what I disagree with is the National Board printing that document, and by implication throwing the blame for it on the City of Belfast or Cork, or wherever it might occur. That is what I take exception to.

19054. Sir HERMAN WILKINSON.—You are aware, perhaps, that in some places, there is no manager, and that you would have to create a manager?—In Ballymacarrett there is a district where there is no manager, because there is no school to manage. That is the best way to bring it home. You take a new district like the east side of Belfast, and you find there are rows of houses built, and new areas opened up, and workpeople go to reside there, and there is a number of children requiring education, and there is no school. Who is going to move in the matter? A Church may be established belonging to one or other denomination, but the clergyman cannot do it. Surely in these days, when the public at large ask to control everything, the public at large should do something to build a school. Why should the burden be thrown on to some clergyman or some lay manager who has no responsibility to do that work? What I would take exception to in that document is not the charge, because I believe it is true, but the implication that the National Board make that the City is responsible. The City has no organization to do it.

19055. The CHAIRMAN.—Now, will you proceed to the next head?—That is all I wanted to say on those miscellaneous heads, but there are just some points I should like to mention about the efficiency of day schools within themselves. May I proceed to make some observations with regard to that?

10036. Certainly?—Now, I want to explain to you, first of all, that I, of course, in appearing here in the capacity in which I come before you to-day, have not any direct association with National schools, that is, I have no responsibility of any kind for the schools, but I am very much in contact with the teachers we ourselves employ on this preparatory evening work. National school teachers are brought in to do that work, and from visits to the school, and from conversation with the teachers, both the teachers of our own and other teachers, and from conferences with managers, and with the School Attendance Officer of the School Attendance Committee, certain points have come before me which are very interesting, and which, perhaps, I might lay before you, but I want it quite clear that I do not speak here with the direct knowledge that I do with regard to the other matters.

10037. I think we have received that kind of evidence from managers. I remember it distinctly that we got information that they had collected from conversation with teachers, so I think you may continue that?—With regard to the information which I have here, some of it is real and some of it is written. I have here amongst my papers a document that was shown to me, quite apart from the fact that I am appearing before you to-day, and which sets out some of the points of view of the teachers in regard to the difficulty of doing their work. I have, of course, frequently discussed with teachers, "Why do you not give us better pupils?" I will explain to you what this document is first of all. Some little time ago I was speaking to a teacher over the question of evidence being given before you by the teaching body, and this teacher told me that he had taken part in preparing a document, which would have been submitted had the teachers attended before you, and he gave me a copy of that document, and he said, "You may read this," and I have spoken to him since about that, and I told him I was coming here, and he said, "You may use anything you like out of that that may be of interest in connection with your work;" so that I have this document which was prepared to be submitted to you if you had seen the teachers.

10038. I think we might allow you to read it?—I have not been asked to submit this, but it was simply given to me for information.

10039. I understand that you are doing it of your own will?—The teacher told me I might do what I liked with it. I am not prepared to be examined upon this or to stand over it. I am neither prepared to stand over it, nor have I been asked to submit it, and I will be very glad to hand it in, and if you think some of the outstanding paragraphs would be worth while reading I can read them.

10040. I see you have some of the paragraphs marked these?—Yes; and I may say that this document deals very largely with inspection and the inspectorial system. I think that sums it all up.

10041. Make just two or three selections from it to give us an idea of the line that it takes?—I have from time to time, when I have heard arguments put forward by a teacher as to their difficulty in doing certain work, discussed those points with the teacher, and when the teacher told me that he was not at liberty to adapt his programme to his work, "According to the documents which I read you have a perfectly free hand in drafting your programme," and he said "Yes, theoretically we have according to the documents, but if we teach from a programme drawn up by ourselves, and which we believe to be the best, our work is not examined on that programme that we have taught."

10042. That is, that if they exercise their own method the examination does not take that line?—Yes, and the result is that the pupils, being examined on other lines than that on which they have been taught, do indifferently, and the teacher gets a lower mark than he feels he is entitled to, or that the work he has done entitled him to do. And that is one answer that has been given to me by teachers repeatedly.

10043. Mr. HENLY.—Does that refer to what is known as the Progress Record?—The teacher is

required to have a Day Book from week to week—what is called a Log Book in England—indicating what he is doing. The inspector takes that, and sometimes examines on something different, although he is supposed to examine on the work that is specified. This shows that the teachers are compelled to adopt the system of organisation dictated by the inspector. It also shows that there is an absence of uniformity in the method by which the inspector attempts to estimate the character of the work done in the schools.

10044. Mr. HENLY.—I will read an extract from a letter sent to me on Sunday last:—"I had a visit from X on Wednesday last. At the end of 45 minutes, 30 of which were spent in showing the manager round, he told me that I should change the method of the school organisation. I remonstrated without avail. I showed how the inspector, with one half-hour's alteration of classes, would disorganise the whole school. No use, the change ordered by him must be made."

10045. The CHAIRMAN.—Are there any other remarks you wish to make upon that document?—I do not know if he wished this to be handed in.

10046. Mr. HENLY.—You think that represents generally the views of a number of Belfast teachers?—It was given to me by a teacher who is on our own staff in our evening work for my information, and with a statement that it was a document that would have been sent forward had the teachers agreed to come.

The CHAIRMAN.—I am afraid that nobody is responsible for that, and I do not think that that would be evidence.

The BRIDGE OF ROSS.—It is not evidence.

10047. The CHAIRMAN.—Would you pass on to another point?—You asked me some little time ago, in the early part of the day, whether the National Board inspectors examined these preparatory classes, and my answer was that I had not seen them examining the classes. Here, again, I want to make some observation, which is founded more or less on general information, and not one of those things for which one could produce evidence, but simply from conversations with inspectors. I did not find the inspectors of the National Board so helpful to those they are inspecting as they might be. I am inclined to say that the attitude of the National Board inspectors towards the work they inspect needs radical reformation.

10048. Mr. CORRY.—That is your own view?—That is my own view. It is evidence founded on observation of the work which we do ourselves. I am not speaking of the day school, but of the evening preparatory classes. I do not think it should be the main function of an inspector merely come into the class and examine the register, and see that the register is correctly added up. It ought to be the business of an inspector to come into the classes for the purpose of helping the classes, and seeing the authority he represents is not being abused or being dealt with unfairly in any way, but also to let him come and help the teacher, and to help the class, and forward the work which he is inspecting. Now, I am satisfied from our experience that that is not the attitude with which the inspectors come, but that they come with the hope or intention to search for something that may be done wrong. We in our classes resent that attitude, and if the same attitude is shown in the National schools, where the teachers are more under the domination of the inspector, I think one can see there is some reason for the unrest and dissatisfaction which exist in the National schools. We want the inspectors to come as the inspectors of the Department of Agriculture and Technical Instruction come, to criticise our work and point out defects, to give us the benefit of the experience which they gather up in going all round the country, and seeing different schools and different methods, and to bring that information with them, and he spreads of the light, if you care to put it so, but not merely to come and pick holes in our register and check lists, which is, after all, the duty

20th May, 1913.]

Mr. FRANCIS C. FORTY, examined.

[Continued.]

of a clerk; and I do not feel myself that the National Board's inspectors, in the association that we have to do with them, give us that help which they might give; but I also say that I am not blaming the inspectors, as I have a feeling that the inspectors of the National Board are acting under directions, and that they are simply carrying out orders they have got. We do not feel that there is that free exchange of opinion between inspectors and teachers that ought to exist.

10065. I understood you to commend the system of the Department of Agriculture?—I do, sometimes. Although I suffer from it I can commend it.

10070. You referred to that as really well conducted?—Yes, I did. The business of the inspector there is to go and inspect your work, and not merely to correct the fee of your register, whether you put a 0 or a 4; and they give most helpful and suitable criticism; they assist the teacher and the school authority responsible for the school, and then, of course, their criticisms are serious and severe enough, and one feels all the while that behind all that there is a real desire to further the work of the institute.

10071. To what classes exactly would that apply—of course, to those preparatory classes with which you are connected in the evening school, but to any other? The observations regarding the Department's inspectors refer to classes above the evening elementary classes.

10072. They do not take the evening higher classes at all?—No, all that work comes under the Department of Agriculture and Technical Instruction.

10073. And your experience of inspectors is small?—We have ten evening preparatory classes a week, and that has been going on for years.

10074. How many have you seen?—I suppose four or five.

10075. You are generalising from four or five?—From the work which is done in our Institute.

10076. But you are making this general charge against inspectors from your personal experience of four or five of them?—Am I making a charge?

10077. I think so. It is very like it?—I am speaking from the experience I have in connection with the work.

10078. You are, of course, in the position of manager of these preparatory classes, are you not?—Well, I act for the committee.

10079. The inspectors have never asked to see you afterwards, and taken you into their confidence, and told you what they had found fault with, and made any suggestions for improvement?—If I said never, I have not meant it, but I doubt if more than once or twice I had a talk with the inspectors.

10080. They have never asked you, and you have never asked them?—No matter what sort the inspector is I always feel that there is a certain reserve, that I do not get the facts of the case. I have had conversations with inspectors. When any inspectors come to me from the Department of Agriculture they say, "Now, that class is not working satisfactorily," and the reason is this, that I am there, and that never happens with a National Board inspector, and our school is an evening school.

10081. You say that you have not really come into official contact with more than four or five National Board inspectors?—Yes, and I limit what I say to those. Let us be quite clear.

10082. The CHAIRMAN.—Have you finished the subject of inspection?—Yes, except to say that I think a great deal of useful work might be done if inspectors would come in to criticise the work, and to put their views plainly before you on anything they do not like. This kind of feeling is not a personal feeling. We have had our grants from the National Board for these preparatory classes reduced, but I never had the slightest hint till the grants were received that there was anything wrong with the classes.

10083. Did you make any representations to the Board about them?—We have written once or twice about these things, but one does not write much to the National Board. One does not get satisfaction.

10084. Did you try?—Yes.

10085. What was the result of the attempt?—What we expected, no change.

10086. Did they send down anybody to re-examine the whole question?—No, but this is actually our experience, and I am not here making any charge. The word "charge" was used, but I am not making any charge against the inspectors. Just as in commenting on the defects in the National system, I am not making in any sense any charge against the teachers. What I say is that there is something wrong with the system, and whatever it is that is wrong, whatever is not working satisfactorily, is the cause of the diminution of efficiency of the system.

10087. Then you imply that at one time it was more efficient than it is now?—What I want to convey is the diminution of possible efficiency. Let me put it in another way if I may. I believe that whatever causes are at work to prevent us from reaching that standard of efficiency which is possible in our schools under a better system, and that we might easily reach a much higher standard of efficiency.

10088. You are looking forward and not looking back?—It is not much use looking back.

10089. You said "diminution." Will you withdraw that expression?—Yes. I do not think we reach the standard of efficiency we might.

10090. It has been constantly pressed on us to consider the question, whether the present system, introduced in 1905, is or is not an improvement on the old results system, and I thought you were, perhaps, suggesting an opinion that it was not?—I did not know the system before 1905. Although 40 years ago I was a pupil in a National school, I did not know anything about the system. I hope you will allow me to make that quite clear again, that in any observations about inspectors, I do not want to make any charge against inspectors. I merely comment on certain obvious signs which I interpreted as being due to the system, and I say the same thing with regard to the teachers. They are working under great difficulty, and do not realise all the possibilities of the work. Now, there is just one other point which I made reference to just now. I believe one serious difficulty of our present system of elementary education is this, that it provides in urban areas no machinery for dealing with children who are not able to participate in ordinary instruction in any school. You have children who are classed as mentally defective, epileptics, and other children of that kind. There must be in every community a proportion of those children. It exists elsewhere, and, I presume, also with us, but where is there any organisation at all for educating a child who cannot progress in school. A child of 13 or 14 years of age is in the infant standard. There have been cases of children being kept on at school to 13 or 14 in the infant standard. Now, children of that age cannot be in that standard unless there is some mental deficiency, and there must be in every large community a number of those children, and there ought to be some system of dealing with those children. What is the plan to put them in?—We have none, and that is the explanation of the figures I have given you of children being in a very low standard.

10091. Mr. KAVANAGH.—Are they obliged to go to school under the Act—I presume the parents send the child that is mentally not bright?—They send it to school, but there is no school to give it suitable education.

10092. The CHAIRMAN.—Is it your point that the National Board should be responsible for a separate scheme, by which the unhealthy or undernourished children would be treated separately?—I think so. I think that in a great community there ought to be provision of that kind, for humanity's sake if for nothing more. I put that before you as a matter arising out of this general question, and there is only one other observation that I want to make in conclusion, which is that I hope, as a result of your deliberations, there will be some effort made to co-ordinate all our different systems of education, National, Tech-

26th May, 1918.

Mr. FRANCIS C. FORM, examined.

[Continued.]

nical, Secondary, etc. If that can be done, as an outcome of your deliberations, you will have done a splendid thing for the children of Ireland. That is all I have to say.

10098. Mr. HINLY.—Supposing the National system were to be made as efficient as it could be to help to prepare pupils for your work, what are subjects which you think should be taught better than at present—in what subjects would you expect the higher proficiency that would enable them to benefit by the course of instruction in the Technical school?—I would rather answer that question if it were put this way—What subjects would I prefer to have taught thoroughly well, because if I say "taught better," it rather implies that something is not being taught well at present, and it might be taken as a reflection on the National teachers. The subjects I wish to have taught well are the elementary subjects of education. I should like to feel that, first of all, all boys were kept at school till they were 14, if that were possible, and that they were thoroughly well grounded in English, and all the word "English" connotes; and I include in that, of course, lessons on Grammar, some literature, some Geography. I use that as rather a comprehensive term. I should like to feel that Arithmetic was thoroughly well taught, and I should also like to think that Drawing was taught, and in these industrial days it is almost a form of writing. I think, so far as the boys go, that it would be a useful thing to train their hands in manual occupations, and the girls, I think, ought to be given some instruction in Domestic Science, practically, not book work. Of course, I am speaking merely of secular subjects. Outside that there are other things to be done, which I do not touch upon, and I believe if you get a child thoroughly well trained along these lines, to have a good knowledge of English, to read well, to be well versed in Arithmetic, to have some power of drawing, and to have learned to use his hand or her hands, the boys for what we call manual training, the girls for Domestic Science, we shall see in the Technical school a produce that we can make use of, and pass forward to higher work. I have not thought that out, but I just state what comes into my mind.

10094. Would you add any Geometry or Algebra?—I think that if a child were kept in school till 14, and advanced rapidly, there is no reason why you should not teach Algebra as an extension of Arithmetic. Supposing a boy had become thoroughly familiar with Arithmetic at 12 or 14, I would not see any objection to teaching him Algebra, because it is a mere extension of Arithmetic. He might very well be taught Geometry as an extension of his Drawing. Do you mean by Geometry what we formerly called Euclid?—In that case I do not see why a boy of 14 should not have attained some skill in Geometry, as an extension of Arithmetic.

10095. Mr. HARRISON.—I think you told us that very often there is an interval between a boy's leaving school and his joining your classes?—Yes, that is so.

10096. Do you know how that interval is spent?—In regard to the furtherance of study?

10097. Is he simply idling his time, as a rule, or is it because he has some occupation, and thought better of it?—Well, I take that some of the children on leaving the elementary school go to work. They do with us, because there is employment for every boy that wants it. That is for boys.

10098. Then how does it come to pass that so often there is an interval between the time they leave the school and their joining this preparatory school?—A boy goes to work, and having gone to work, I am afraid he is so glad at having been released from school, that he does not want any more, and then a little later on he begins to realise that he is not keeping pace with those about him.

10099. Is it not in Belfast that it is very often a period of idleness after leaving the school?—Do you mean from employment?

10100. From doing anything?—There is no need for it. There might be, but it is not common.

10101. In many parts of England it is a very common experience, and I wanted to see whether you had the best of us?—There are cases where boys do not go to work on leaving the school, but that is not general at all.

## TWENTY-FIRST DAY.—WEDNESDAY, MAY 21st, 1913.

At 23, Kildare-street, Dublin.

Present:—Sir SAMUEL DILL, M.A., LL.D., LL.D. (Chairman); The Most Rev. DENIS KELLY, D.D., Bishop of Ross; Sir HIRAM SHAW WILKINSON, LL.D.; Mr. JOHN CONNERY; Mr. HENRAGE E. B. HARRISON, B.A.; Mr. JEREMIAH HINLY; Mr. WALTER McMURROUGH KAVANAGH, D.L.; Mr. THOMAS MICHAEL KETTLE, B.L.; and

Mr. ARTHUR J. DONNELLY, M.A., B.Sc., Secretary.

Rev. J. W. TRISTRAM, D.D., Canon of St. Patrick's Cathedral, examined.

10102. The CHAIRMAN.—You are Inspector of Schools of the Church of Ireland for the Diocese of Dublin, and also an Inspector of Schools for the Board of Erasmus Smith?—Yes.

10103. You are a colleague of Canon Mahaffy in this matter, and you appear on behalf of the Education Board of the General Synod?—Quite so.

10104. You are Inspector of Schools in religious knowledge, I suppose?—I am inspector of schools for religious knowledge in National schools, and in non-National schools for secular knowledge as well.

10105. I only refer to National schools, and it can only be in religious knowledge that you are Inspector in those schools?—That is all.

10106. And how long have you occupied that office?—Thirty-three years.

10107. Do you combine it with the work of a living?—No. I am Chaplain to the Royal Hospital, and that is only Sunday duty. My entire week-day work is either literary or educational.

10108. In the duties of that office you have become well acquainted with the management and inspection of National schools in Dublin?—Very well, indeed.

10109. And you agree with all the statements put forward in this document from the Educational Board of the General Synod?—I do, inasmuch as I was present at the drawing of them up. It was as a result of consultation with my colleagues that we drew them up.

10110. You begin with the subject of due notice being given to the manager of an inspector's visit.

Have you found that proper notice is not given?—I find on page 17, paragraph 68, in connection with the duties of inspectors of National schools, it is stated that if the manager resides at such a distance that this would present difficulty, he should receive notice of the proposed visit from the inspector by post on the morning of the visit. If in a country place, notice is sent to the manager's house on the morning of the visit, it is very probable that he has his arrangements already made for the day, or he may be away from home, and in the circumstances he could not be expected to meet the inspector. I regard a meeting between the manager and the inspector, in the course of an inspection, as being in a measure vital to the success of the inspection.

10111. This applies to the one general examination in the year?—This applies to the one general examination in the year.

10112. You ask that proper notice should be given?—Yes.

10113. And have you had many complaints of the want of that notice?—Very many from managers; they have made very many such complaints.

10114. That they have not the opportunity of conferring with the inspector?—That they have not the opportunity of conferring with the inspector. In the first place, there are two disadvantages in their not being able to do so. One disadvantage is, that in the recommendations which the inspector may make for the improvement of the school, he must take into account the difficulties of the school, the local difficulties, and if he had the manager present to guide him, he would be able to make suggestions of a much more practical nature than if he had to correspond with the manager afterwards. I therefore regard an interview between himself and the manager as an important element in the success of an inspection.

10115. And under the present system the opportunities of conference are few?—They are few, and I think they ought to be universal, practically.

10116. You lay great stress on that?—I do.

10117. And that would be once in the year?—Once in the year is quite enough.

10118. Now, I proceed to the second head, the qualification and training of inspectors. Have you come across inspectors much?—I have come across three or four of them.

10119. In the discharge of your duties, I suppose?—In the discharge of my duties. We happen to come into the school together, and I have had conversations with them, and I must say that the inspectors with whom I have come in contact in my inspections were in my view, if it would not be an impertinence to remark it, exceedingly capable and able men; but that is as it might be.

10120. That is your personal experience?—It is my personal experience that they were exceedingly capable and able men; but at the same time might be a matter of mere accident. There might be a very large number whom I did not meet who are nothing of the kind, and what I would be anxious to secure, and am interested in, would be that the inspector should have such training and qualification, not merely to intermediate work of in University work, but in the practice of teaching in the primary schools, and in the circumstances that control the teacher, that he would go into the school so as to fit with his work, as to earn the respect of the teacher.

10121. May I ask you to explain how you would secure that training of the inspector, that is, practical experience of the teaching of the National school?—I would attach them to the Model schools for some little time, and I would send them to well-conducted English schools or Scotch schools.

10122. Primary, of course?—Primary schools. I would give them exactly the same training as is now given, and necessarily given, to an Indian Civil Servant before he undertakes to deal with the complicated questions of a country of which he knows nothing. A primary school is just as much a foreign domain to a great

many who receive their instruction in secondary schools as a Hindu dependency would be to a man who had merely passed a very high class examination in this country without previous training and without previous knowledge of the work. These men are attached in India to sub-ordinate officers for a long time before they are empowered to adjudicate.

10123. You appear to think that the present discontent is due partially to the inspectors not having practical knowledge of primary education?—Much discontent is due to that, and to the method of inspection. A primary school master knows instinctively when an inspector goes into the school whether the man knows his work, whether he has in his own mind the elements on which he ought to appraise the work of the teacher, and if he perceives that the inspector does know his work, he is much more easily managed, and he receives the inspector's suggestions with much more willingness than if he did not.

10124. You are acquainted with the present system of training a young candidate inspector?—Not very well.

10125. They are on probation for a year?—They are on probation for a year, and they go round with a senior officer.

10126. You do not think that is sufficient training, apart from teaching in a school?—Who shall guard the guards themselves? There are many of the class of senior inspectors who have had no such training themselves, and even they do not know very much about primary education. They had no knowledge about it, I assure, when they began, and they have acquired it, in a way, but I think that if the young inspectors were attached to some of the big Model schools they would learn something of the educational methods that they themselves are called upon to recommend. The educational methods, which seem to be the core and marrow of the National Board's arrangements for the inspection of schools are, some of them, perhaps, unknown to the inspectors themselves. These methods have their best exemplification naturally in the training colleges.

10127. Do you think that candidates for the position of inspector should be required to attend a course on method?—I do.

10128. There is no provision for that now?—I know that there is not, and I am strongly convinced that there should be.

10129. As far as I can make out, they are not required even to show book knowledge of that?—They are not.

10130. And would you insist on that?—I certainly would insist on it, because one of the directions to inspectors is that they should recognise existing methods where it is possible to do so.

10131. That is that they should encourage individuality in the teacher?—Quite so. What knowledge have they necessarily of one method more than another as a result of their training and experience?

10132. I suppose you are aware that there are about one-third of the inspectors, strictly, I think, 23, who have been primary teachers?—Yes.

10133. But you would practically make every one take his place in a primary school?—I certainly would; though I do not think that the experience that a teacher gets in a primary school ought to be sufficient to qualify him for the office of inspector.

10134. That is another question. Would you develop that?—I understand that the most unpopular inspectors as a rule, with National teachers are those who have been teachers themselves. Even though a man has been a primary school teacher, I would certainly insist on his knowing something about the educational methods of the training colleges.

10135. You think they ought to have had a wider and more liberal training than many National teachers at present obtain?—I do, sir.

10136. So that the qualifications that you ask for are wider liberal training, combined with the practical work of the National School?—That is so.

21st May, 1913.]

Rev. Canon TUCKERMAN, D.D., examined.

[Continued.]

10187. You do not mind whether or not a man has been a National teacher originally?—Not at all. I do not see why a National teacher should be compelled to undergo two years' training before he can take charge of a primary school, and yet that the inspector should be relieved from the obligation of undergoing even a brief period of training.

10188. Now, I go on to another question under the head of the methods of inspection. The first point is the subject of individual examination of all the pupils in the school every year?—Yes.

10189. Do you think that under the new system there is too little of that examination?—I think too much is left to the option of the inspector, and too much depends on the individuality of the inspector. In no system of inspection—University, Intermediate, or Primary—will you ever abolish the individual factor; you cannot do it. But I think the system of inspection ought to be so formed and elaborated as to minimise the effect of individuality; not to remove it, for you cannot do that; but to minimise it.

10190. And would you say that one great means of doing that would be a general examination of every pupil in the school?—I have not quite made up my mind as to the possibility or feasibility or desirability of that; but I say that in certain subjects, such as reading, and above all English composition, and dictation, and arithmetic and writing, there should be an individual examination of every pupil in the school. I think it would be almost impossible, unless you were to multiply your staff of inspectors by three, to carry out an individual examination on every subject every year, nor do I think it would be necessary.

10191. Then only in certain subjects?—Only in certain subjects.

10192. You would have the inspector examine every child in the school on those subjects?—I would.

10193. Of course, it is alleged by some theorists that the present system is an immense advance, and they say that all theory is on their side in limiting the examination?—I think there is entirely too much theory, and I think we do in Ireland in educational matters exactly what they do in legislation. Systems are tried on here that have failed in England, or they are tried on here in order to be applied in England. We get too many English doctrines in this country. We get them at present in our Sunday Schools. There is a new system of teaching which they have brought over here recently, which appears to me to be a mere bundle of fads, and will never give real results. You will get very enthusiastic Englishmen here to set up a system who do not take into account the difficulties of Ireland and Irish schools.

10194. You would not wish to go back to the results system?—No; I would not.

10195. That is, payment for knowledge for each particular child in every particular subject?—No, because it destroys individualism in education, and it destroys any incentive to the teacher to develop clever children.

10196. So your view is, if I interpret you aright, that under the new system examination does not hold a sufficiently important place?—It does not. It is an impressionist system, so to speak.

10197. And that makes it depend too much on the instinct of the individual inspector?—It does, and it leaves the teacher some reason for complaining. A lay teacher can easily get off under it by throwing the responsibility on the inspector, and, of course, a large number of teachers must be naturally not efficient, where you have 9,000 or 10,000 of them, and individual examination would destroy that grievance on the part of the teachers.

10198. Individual examination limited to certain subjects?—Limited to certain subjects.

10199. Now, I go to another head, in which you mention the impossibility of summing up in a single word the character of a school, and that a better plan would be to have a general report, increments to be given as a matter of course when that report was satisfactory. That is the unanimous opinion of your Association?—It is. I think it is impossible for the

wit of man to devise a word that will exactly apply to the state of efficiency of a school, except in the broad sense of that word. I think it is impossible, no matter how clever or experienced a man is, so accurately to appraise the efficiency or inefficiency of a school as to justify him using the words "very good" instead of "excellent," or instead of "good," or "good" instead of "fair," or "fair" instead of "middling," and "middling" instead of "bad."

10200. Or for 76 men all over the country to apply those terms uniformly?—Quite so; it cannot be done. I do not think it is possible for the wit of man to get a set of inspectors who will appraise in the same degree.

10201. And are there no expedients for reducing the want of uniformity at present?—I would suggest the terms "satisfactory" or "unsatisfactory."

10202. You would cut down the merit marks simply to two?—I would. If a school is efficient and satisfactory I would report it as such, and if it is not I would report it as not such.

10203. But you would have a detailed report?—Most decidedly, and I should summarise the facts on which I would base my recommendations.

10204. That is what you would substitute for the present system of six merit marks?—I certainly would, and I would give the teacher his increment.

10205. You would get rid of the present system of triennial increments?—I would, certainly.

10206. Now, would you tell us what you think is the great evil of that system of triennial increments, accompanied by the present merit mark system?—In the first place, the teachers complain very often of the way in which the increment is given. I have not gone into the question of the increment to the same extent as I have into the question of inspection, and therefore I am not speaking as an expert; but I am speaking from what I have heard teachers say. They say that the increments are dealt with in an irresponsible way, arbitrarily and unjustly, and that if a man earns an increment he ought to get it.

10207. The way we have based that it affects the teacher prejudicially is that a man has to get three "good" reports, and if in the third year, perhaps owing to a change of inspectors, he drops to "fair," he loses his increment for three years. Have you ever come across that?—I have, and I think it is very unjust, because the school may be suffering an extraordinary disadvantage for that particular year from causes not preventable, for instance, or from local circumstances, or he may have a bad assistant, and he is penalised for what he cannot prevent, and his work of two years is disregarded.

10208. Now, do I understand you to propose a system of automatic increments up to a certain maximum on condition that the reports are satisfactory? I do; I certainly strongly advocate that.

10209. That would represent the system you would put in place of the present system?—It would; that is, as regards increment.

10210. Of course, Dr. Stacks and others allege that that would involve a great question of finance, and that the Treasury would have something to say to that?—It may be a more expensive system.

10211. I do not suppose you have entered into that, and we have not materials for going into it?—I think the first consideration in any system of education ought to be efficiency, and the clerical element is only a minor one.

10212. And I go on now to another matter. You mention a plan for securing uniformity of inspection. You have looked on that. What would you propose?—I am entirely against a uniform school year.

10213. On what grounds?—Because it is impossible to conduct the examination at the end of the school year in every school, and you cannot estimate the work that is going on in the school; that is, if you introduce the system of individual tests, unless you go as near as possible to the time when the teacher has completed the course for that school year.

10214. So examination early in a uniform school year might be very unjust?—It would not be a test of the

work done in the school, because everyone knows that there is sufficient human nature in boys and girls to induce them to forget the course of the previous year as soon as you introduce a new one, and if you come into a school when they are entering on a new course, and take them in the old course, I know my experience is that I do not get much answering from them in the old one. They do their best; but after a sort of interregnum they have forgotten a good deal of it; that is, the rank and file of the children; so I would not have a uniform school year. The year ought to be for each school the time that intervenes from the visit of the inspector when he pays his annual visit and has a modified individual examination until he comes again. The course should be fixed, and I think ought to be entered in the school register.

10165. You would have a year for each school, beginning with the visit of the inspector?—Yes, and I have worked that myself.

10166. And it should end with the next visit?—Yes; I have worked that for 33 years, and I have had as much experience of it as any man in Ireland, and though in the North there may be some drawbacks (there are to every system), I think that it is the best.

10167. But with regard to the plan for securing uniformity of inspection, what do you suggest?—The plan for securing uniformity of inspection would be that as far as possible the same inspector should be kept in a particular district for some years, at all events.

10168. He should be kept there for a considerable number of years?—Yes, and then he knows his teachers and he knows his schools.

10169. Do I understand you to imply that under the present system they are changed too frequently?—I think so. There is one man now and another man again, and the teachers resent it.

10170. And they have no time to become acquainted with the character of the schools?—Or to become acquainted with the man and his methods, or with the locality, and the local setting, so to speak.

10171. And in the old time they remained longer in the district than now?—They did.

10172. With good results?—With very good results; I think the old system had a great many merits.

10173. As compared with the present circuit system?—Yes.

10174. Are you minutely acquainted with the present circuit system?—I am not.

10175. You do not know the relation between the senior and junior inspectors?—I know nothing about that internal machinery.

10176. You have not gone into the question of conferences on the subject of standard?—I think conferences on the subject of uniformity of standard would be very desirable, and I think the comparing of notes would be very useful. I do not know whether there are such conferences at present; but I have had conferences with my brother inspectors from time to time as regards programmes and methods.

10177. Would that include all the Church inspectors all over Ireland?—We have not any systematic conferences, but we meet incidentally very often and compare notes. Of course, our system of inspection is not as elaborate or as large as that of the National Board one.

10178. But you find it necessary to consider the question of standard?—We do. The question of standard in religious knowledge with us is considered by this Board of the General Synod, which represents the whole Church of which I am a member, and we have representatives from every diocese in Ireland, who meet in Dublin every year, and elaborate our standard for the next year.

10179. That is, in religious knowledge?—In religious knowledge, and I do not see why the same could not be applied to secular knowledge.

10180. And you find that these conferences do secure what you aim at?—We get uniformity to a

certain extent. We cannot get absolute uniformity. Those who know anything about teaching know that.

10181. Mr. HANCOCK.—Do my grants depend upon your report?—In some dioceses they do. In Cork I believe they do, and in one or two others. In Dublin they do not.

10182. The CHAIRMAN.—As to method, an inspector should not interfere with a recognised method?—Yes; but I think it ought to be a recognised method. I think that hobby could be ridden to death.

10183. They say that under the new system teachers are encouraged to develop individuality. Would you allow that to go on unchecked?—Individuality often spells eccentricity.

10184. But still, if the teacher was following a recognised method that the inspector did not like, would you require the inspector to hold his hands?—I would. Still, I think, to allow systematically recognised methods that the inspector did not like would be going a little too far, because he would want to be more than human not to be prejudiced by it; but a recognised method that would have some element of common sense in it and would be regarded as most suitable ought not to be lightly interfered with. However, I think there might be too great a tendency on the part of teachers to destroy the individuality of the inspector, which I am not at all in favour of sweeping away. I think every possible step should be taken to qualify the inspector, and to see that he is the man best fitted for the post, and when he is so qualified, and when the Commissioners judge him to be a suitable man, they should in every possible case, if they can, support him. If that is not done, all discipline will be destroyed.

10185. You were beginning to speak of the state of feeling between teachers and their inspectors?—I am afraid there is much a thing as intimidating an inspector.

10186. You do think that?—I do, and I am not afraid to say it. I think so. I would support a teacher in every reasonable proposition, but I do not think that the principle: "Jack is as good as his master," ought to be carried too far. I think you ought to give a fair system of inspection, and secure good men to administer it, and then be very careful how you interfere with the inspectors' report. You might have a second opinion, of course. I think the teacher ought to have a right to appeal where the instrument is in question.

10187. It is said that at present different inspectors recommend different methods, and so, I suppose, confuse the teacher?—That must confuse the teacher.

10188. And you have come across that?—I have come across that very frequently. I have come across two or three large schools in the City of Dublin in which the teacher bitterly complained to me that the very method the teacher was employing with the approval of one inspector was denounced as absolutely silly by another inspector.

10189. In those very words?—"Absolutely silly" were the two words I heard.

10190. Mr. KERR.—Might we have the details of the two contradictory methods?—I do not know them. I have very great respect for the judgment of the teacher who told me this; though I have sufficient knowledge of teachers as of other people not to accept all I hear.

10191. The CHAIRMAN.—And there were capable teachers?—Yes, one was a man and the other a woman.

10192. Was she bewildered?—Yes, very much, and very much impeded. The woman was an exceedingly sensible woman, one of the best women I have ever met amongst the teachers, one of the experienced, and she said her whole nervous system was shaken by the disapproval of the second inspector. It was done in such a way. She was a very sensitive, nervous woman.

10193. Now the last point that I have to touch on is the question of notice to be given of changes in the rules?—Well, in Trinity College, or in Oxford or Cambridge, two years' notice is usually given of any change that affects students preparing for examination, any change, for instance, in the College Calendar, and

things in any way, that affect the students, and I think the interests which the teacher and the manager of a school have at stake are just as vital.

10194. This is a point which I should like your opinion on. It has come before us again and again that under the present system of the National Board new rules are published without any notice to the public and without the chance of any remonstrance, and it has been suggested that before any new rule comes into force, that rule should be published for a certain time, some say two months, some say six months—that is a matter of detail—but that some opportunity should be given to criticism. Would you agree with that?—Independently of my experience as an educational expert, I think common sense would indicate it. I think nothing is more unfortunate for the cause of education than to see rules spring suddenly on the public, and to have the teachers meeting to denounce the rule and the Commissioners in unbecoming terms. I think that such a thing is unedifying, to say the least of it, and anything that would tend to remove that would be desirable. I quite agree that rules which affect the conduct of the school should be tentatively published.

10195. You know that these are statutory provisions in certain cases for the making of rules. The Intermediate Board, for example, has to lay its rules on the table of the House of Commons for 40 days, and during those 40 days they can be completely upset, and have been?—Yes.

10196. Would you suggest something of the same kind, not exactly the same, but in a corresponding form in the case of the National Board?—Well, perhaps I should. The only fear I have about that is the practical fear that such a tornado of criticism would be directed upon the rules from all quarters that it would require a large staff to sort the criticisms, because the National teachers are adepts at criticism, and have developed it to an abnormal extent.

10197. Well, I am bound to say this, that for years the Intermediate Board published their rules without consulting anybody. We were attacked fiercely year after year, and perhaps rightly, and then at last some of us claimed leave to summon a conference of teachers, and since then everything has been as mild as possible?—Yes; that is very good. The best plan might be to let off steam in that way.

10198. The teachers come and lay their views before you, and, even if they are against a change, if they are consulted you are not assailed in the same way?—I think that of the two evils you should choose the lesser, and it would be very much better even to face hostile criticism rather than to spring rules on the public, some of which have to be subsequently modified.

10199. The *Banner of the Rose*.—With reference to the last point with which the Chairman was dealing, would you see a difference between summoning a deputation of representative teachers of the country to consult with the Board about the making of a new rule and the publication of it to the whole public with that tornado of criticism of which you are afraid?—I think that the summoning of the teachers to confer with the Commissioners would be an exceedingly good movement; that is, the summoning of representatives of the teachers to confer in respect of rules affecting the work of the school. I think it would be very much better.

10200. Then it would not be likely that this public criticism would spring up in the same way; because this would be a private conference between representatives of the teaching body and the Commissioners in consultation?—Quite so.

10201. And it would not be intended for publication at all?—No; that is an excellent suggestion, and you would not have the same irresponsible criticism from men who were not accredited.

10202. Once the body knew that their representatives had been consulted, they would not have the same desire to enter the public newspapers?—They would not.

10203. In your evidence you told us that you thought that it would be better that the schools should be classed into two categories, "satisfactory" and "unsatisfactory"?—Yes.

10204. You also told us that increments should be given to all schools unless they were unsatisfactory?—Yes.

10205. Now, there is this further question about the promotion of teachers. The teachers are promoted from grade to grade, and I suppose you would probably agree that the entire body cannot be promoted, that there must be some limit in the upper grade to the number who can be promoted?—Quite so.

10206. Would you think that the mere report that a school was satisfactory would be a justification for the promotion of the teacher in the order of seniority, or would you like to encourage the more efficient teachers and select, perhaps, a junior teacher on account of his extra efficiency, and promote him?—I would make seniority an element, but not the sole element, and I think the teacher's record for a certain number of years ought to be taken into account, with the junior teachers, certainly. As in most other professions, I think there ought to be promotion for individual merit.

10207. Well, the question is how are you to apply that rule when your report is merely a "satisfactory" report. No doubt, there would be a general report, and then that general report would be summed up as "satisfactory"; but you would have to go and analyse these general reports, if it is a question of promoting a teacher to a very senior class?—I think so; I certainly think you should analyse them, and the word "satisfactory" or "unsatisfactory" would not cover all that you want to take into account in the promotion of the teacher. I think you should read the reports carefully where the teacher's record is concerned in respect of promotion.

10208. And then, I suppose, the reports being examined in this way by, I presume, the Inspector, you would have to be guided largely by the opinion he had formed?—You would; you cannot help it. He is the senior eye, so to speak.

10209. There has been a great desire for several years past amongst the teachers to find out the details of the reasons of increment and promotion and all the rest, and in this method that we are now discussing, I am afraid there would be a little too much mystery about it to give general satisfaction?—It is really doubtful whether you will ever have a perfect system, or a system that will give satisfaction to everybody; but I am not entirely in favour of putting each individual teacher, whose interests are affected in possession of all the minute facts by which the Commissioners or the inspectors arrive at a judgment. I think it is a little too subversive of discipline, and you must have discipline, and you must have discontent of a kind; you cannot destroy it; but, of course, it is your duty to give as little justification for it as possible.

10210. Having taken all the precautions you could in order to have inspectors of sound judgment and experience, you should then trust those inspectors?—Yes, I think so.

10211. And act on their decision, no matter what the teacher thought?—Certainly.

10212. Therefore, of course, in the promotion the judgment of the inspector would play a much larger part than it does at present?—Well, the question is a very important one where the teacher's increment is concerned, and under certain circumstances a right of appeal might be given.

10213. I am talking about promotion; I am not raising any difficulty about your method of increment; but it is a question of promotion from the third grade to the second grade or from the second grade to the first grade. It is a question of promotion, and as promotion goes at present it is regulated by two principles. The first is that teachers who have served a certain number of years and have certain reports are qualified for promotion by that fact. Then the Board also pick out teachers of special eminence and efficiency, and they promote them before their time?—Yes.

10214. You have these two methods at present of ordinary promotion and special promotion. Now you have all those detailed reports at present, the detailed merit marks, to guide you in the ordinary promotion, and when these detailed merit marks disappear, then I think we are thrown back on the fact that the inspector's judgment must play a larger part in the promotion than it does at present?—Well, in a way, yes;



21st May, 1918.]

Rev. Canon TROTTER, D.D., examined.

[Continued.]

but there is another element I did not mention. If a teacher has a uniform record of "satisfactory" for his school for three or four years, and then the school is reported by the same man as unsatisfactory, and thereby the teacher's promotion to a certain extent is affected, I think the teacher should have the power of asking for the visit of a second inspector. Where he has held a good record for so long there must be some remarkable reason for it, and with that qualification what you say about the recommendations of the inspector to my mind holds good, and the recommendations of the inspector in respect of the unsatisfactory marking having been fortified there would be more confidence than there otherwise would be, and I think that the recommendations of the inspector in the report on the school, and on the teacher's general efficiency, should be sufficient to ensure promotion with that check on each recommendation.

10215. It is your opinion that there should be a special school year for each individual school?—Yes.

10216. And you also said that there were drawbacks to that system, but that on the whole you thought it the best system?—I think it is the best system.

10217. And then you supported your position by your own experience as a religious inspector?—Yes.

10218. It struck me that there might possibly be this difference. One of the evils arising out of a special year for each school is that when children move from one school to another they do not drop in exactly at the same point in the school to which they go, and they would have to overlap or to anticipate. Now, I do not think you have the same difficulty as religious inspectors, because there would not be much danger that the pupils belonging to one parish would go to another parish for Sunday School work?—With us they would; they do not regard themselves as attached in their allegiance to any one parish. But I spoke about that to two teachers on Monday. I wanted to get some more experience and more knowledge, and I went to two teachers. One was master of a National school, a Model school, and the other was master of St. Paul's schools. One was a member of my own Church, and the other a Roman Catholic, and they are both men in whom I have the greatest confidence, and for whom I have the greatest respect, and I spoke to them on that question on the uniform school year, and they said they allowed that difficulty, but that that is a difficulty that does not exist to the same extent that it did ten years ago. There is not the same tendency to run about even in the city, and it does not exist in the country at all, hardly, except in the case of children of employers who live in the country, but not amongst farmers. In the city it does exist to a certain extent, but not to the same extent that it did; still it is undoubtedly a drawback. As I said, there are some disadvantages in the system, but I do not think it is a drawback to a sufficient extent to neutralise the benefits that would result from having a school year from inspection to inspection.

10219. Mr. COOPER.—In suggesting "satisfactory" and "unsatisfactory" for the reports on the school, as entitling the teacher to increment, or depriving him of increment, do I understand you to suggest that these words should be specific merit marks, or that the general trend of the report would show that the school was satisfactory without the work of the school being summed up in that one word?—I think your latter remark agrees with my suggestion.

10220. With reference to individual examination on those subjects of Reading, Writing, Arithmetic, and Composition, apart from any question of teachers or inspectors, do you not think that it is an advantage to the child to have to face an annual examination?—I do, but not every year on every subject. I do not think it could be done.

10221. But do you not think that it would be a fine training to a youngster to have to face an examination on a particular day?—I do.

10222. You referred to the tornado of abuse that the present system was subjected to by the teachers?—Yes.

10223. And I think you said the teachers were poor (at least that was the impression it gave me) to use strong words, and, perhaps, sometimes unreasonable criticism?—Yes, and that is the case in every profession. I do not think the teachers have a monopoly of it, but they certainly are not exempt from it.

10224. You remember Sir Patrick Keenan as Resident Commissioner of National Education?—I do, and knew him very well.

10225. There was some outcry, not amongst the general body of teachers, but, perhaps, amongst the best teachers, and the people who were most prominent in connection with the Teachers' Organisation, against the system of payment by results?—It was very strong and just.

10226. Can you carry your mind back to the time of the administration of the Board by Sir Patrick Keenan and by Mr. Redington. Was there anything of what you would call the strong abuse of the programme or of the individual inspector?—No, because the teachers were not organised at that time.

10227. They were?—Not to the same extent as they are now; they were only beginning to be organized, and they had not the same detailed training.

10228. I understood you to say that there was no attack on inspectors at the time, and I understood you to say that the reason of that was that the teachers were not organised at that time?—That is one of the reasons, but I never remember a time when there was not an attack on inspectors. I do not remember a time when there was not an attack on the system under which inspectors worked.

10229. I cannot remember the time when there was not an attack on the system, but I never remember a time when there was an attack on the inspectors?—I remember much longer than you do. I remember 45 years ago, and I remember there was very little criticism, and Professor Horley will bear me out in that. There was not the same criticism on the system of the National Board. I think we have too many systems in the National Board, and they are too frequently changed. You never know where you are with too many theories and methods and systems. The old system of educational slugging had some advantages.

10230. What I said was that there was an attack on the results system by some prominent teachers, but not an attack on individual inspectors?—From the time the results system was introduced there was an attack on the system, and I think a just attack.

10231. But there was a feeling of confidence in the just administration and just exercise of their duty by their inspectors and by the Resident Commissioners?—That feeling was more prevalent then than it has been under the recent arrangements.

10232. Can you conceive that if some of the attacks that I have seen on the present system, or the present Resident Commissioners, had been made on Sir Patrick Keenan, and on the Education Office in his time, there would have been a general revolt against the Teachers' Organisation by the teachers?—Oh, I have no doubt; it may be an involution thing to say, but I think the Office was very much more popular then than it is now.

10233. Sir HYAM WILKINSON.—You referred to the subject of publication of the rules before they came into operation, and the Chairman mentioned a system under which rules are laid before the House of Commons. Now, there is another system under which statutory Boards are required to give 40 days' notice of any rule that they may intend to issue. During those 40 days any public body can obtain a copy of the rules, and can make representations to the rule-making authority, and the rule-making authority is bound to consider those representations before issuing the rules. Would you agree that that would be a useful thing to have?—I think it would, or something like it.

21st May, 1918.]

REV. CANON TRISTRAM, D.D., examined.

[Continued.]

10234. The question, of course, of time is one which depends on the circumstances of many of the persons who are affected by the rule. Forty days might be ample in some cases, and not ample so high in others?—Yes.

10235. Leaving aside the question of conference at present, you refer to the practice of giving two years' notice in Trinity College. You would not ask for that, I should say, in the case of the rules of the National Board?—Oh, no, certainly not, because in Trinity College, or in Oxford, or in Cambridge the preparation for examination would require a couple of years.

10236. But have you considered the question as to what notice ought to be required, considering the circumstances of the National school teachers who would be affected, and other persons whose interests might be affected, by a change of the rule?—I have not considered the question of time, but I think a previous notice would be desirable, and consultation, either written or otherwise, with those whose interests were concerned in the application of the rule, but I did not consider exactly the amount of time that ought to be given.

10237. You would not consider a conference alone sufficient, without giving notice to other people who might not have an opportunity of attending?—That is quite true. I think it would be desirable that they should have an opportunity of conferring with the great mass of their fellow-teachers and with their organisation.

10238. But I am speaking now of a conference—supposing the Board are going to issue rules—a conference between the Board and the teachers' organisation?—Well, with respect to a conference, I would put it in broader words. I think there should be some means of consulting the teachers whose interests are mainly concerned as to the advisability or practicability of rules which affect their interests and the interests of education, before those rules are published; but if you ask me as to the *modus operandi* of the thing, I would rather not define that. That ought to be afterwards considered, but I think there ought to be some notice given. For instance, that Rule 67 (b), which was made about 12 years ago, and which gravely affected the rights and interests of teachers, was sprung upon them without much knowledge or notice, and I think that was very wrong.

10239. The subject of conference has been mentioned, and it would be desirable to have the benefit of your suggestion as to whether this course would not be the better one. If there is a means of communicating with the teachers, either by letter or by personal interview, that, I take it, should precede the final and formal notice of the regulation that is intended to be issued. That conference having taken place, and the teachers having been consulted, do you think that it would then be desirable to have notice issued to the public generally, for, of course, the teachers generally, knowing that their organisation had had an opportunity of expressing their opinion upon it, would not be likely to make objections to it, but there might still be persons in the public who could either make suggestions, or who might feel that their interests might be affected?—Yes, but the proportion of the public that would be affected by that would be an exceedingly small one. The criticism and the hostile opposition have hitherto come mainly from the teachers. Parents who might consider their interests affected by something in the rules might have a voice, but it is very few parents that have sufficient intelligence to judge as to the advisability of educational rules.

10240. I think it is the teachers and the inspectors whose interests might be affected that criticism might be expected from, and managers?—Well, of course, from managers also, but when you spoke of the public you spoke of managers.

10241. No, I did not. It was your remark, that the teachers would be mainly affected, that made me think about the managers, and, of course, there might be other people, parents and so on, and a conference

with managers and teachers would probably introduce complications, might it not?—I do not know. Do you mean joint conference with managers and teachers?

10242. I will put a case. Suppose that the Board came to the conclusion that it would be desirable that the teachers should get their salary warrants direct, the managers might have some views upon that, and the teachers might have opposite views, and it is desirable, of course, that the managers being affected in some way by it should also have a voice in it?—Yes, but see not all the considerations that affect the discussion of that question already known to the Commissioners?

10243. I am only instancing a possibility?—Quite so.

10244. You suggest that the manager should be included in the conference?—Well, you have rather pinned me to the word "conference" in a way in which I do not wish to be pinned. I will say "consultation."

10245. Then I understand that consultation covers communications by letter as well as personal interview?—Yes, I think so.

10246. And you think that the persons affected ought to be consulted?—I do.

10247. In a wider sense?—I do; and I have a strong opinion that they should.

10248. With regard to the changing from school to school, I believe you mentioned that you were under the impression that there is very little change from school to school in the country. Are you aware that in some places in the country that change from school to school, where there happens to be a neighbouring school, is used by a number of parents to get rid of the Attendance Officer?—No, sir, I was not aware of that fact. I suppose that would be mostly in the North, where they are more southe.

10249. But you can conceive cases in which an acute parent might make use of the change from school to school?—I can quite understand the ingenuity of people who want to avoid doing anything.

10250. Also on the question of examination in certain subjects you mention four subjects. Arithmetic would be one, certainly?—Yes.

10251. And what would the others be?—Reading, and I should say writing from Dictation or Composition in junior or senior classes, and writing home exercises. Reading, Writing, and Arithmetic, with English Composition or Dictation.

10252. It occurs to me, with regard to what has been said in reference to examination, that the results system of individual examination of scholars on four subjects would really entail the waste of a large part of the Inspector's time, and I was going to suggest for your consideration and opinion, whether or not a rule of this sort might be made, which would shorten the time required by the Inspector, that the teachers should understand that they ought to be prepared for an individual examination of their pupils in two out of four subjects, those two subjects being chosen at the time by the Inspector. Now that, at any rate, would have the advantage, you see, of shortening the time. You agree that it would have that effect?—Yes.

10253. If you have the whole of the four subjects liable to examination you introduce, I take it, an incentive to the teacher to devote more attention to those subjects than to the other subjects?—I certainly do think so, because I think they are the most important.

10254. You think that the devoting of attention to these subjects, with a view to this examination, is so important that the risk of the other subjects being more or less neglected has got to be run?—It has got to be run, but, of course, I need not enter into details. I would have a modified system of examination at the option of the Inspector, an individual examination in every subject selected, but the moment one goes into details one lays oneself open to so many objections. An Inspector, who is presumably not a useless person, will know from the exami-

nation of a class, or from the examination of specimens boys and girls, taken at the option of the master or the option of himself, as to the work that is really being done in the school, and if he does not do that without the individual examination of every child in those subjects that are not as vitally necessary as the four that I have mentioned, he would not be fit for his position.

10253. Would you have it that a school, in order to be satisfactory, must not only have its pupils examined, in the four compulsory subjects, but that it should also satisfy the inspector that in the non-compulsory subjects satisfactory progress has been made?—I certainly would.

10254. You would require that?—Yes.

10255. Do you see any objection to the suggestion of making four possible subjects, and yet giving to the inspector the choice of taking any two of them?—I do. I do not think it would be desirable, because you would encourage the setting up of an artificial grievance; and anything that tends to do that, I think, is prejudicial to the interests of education. I would make it absolutely necessary that there should be an individual examination in those four subjects every year.

10256. Reading, Writing, Arithmetic and Dictation?—And Dictation or English Composition.

10257. Well, that reduces it to the three R's really?—The three R's and Dictation, just spelling and common-sense punctuation?

10258. You are aware that in some of the curricula Dictation has been replaced?—Yes.

10259. But you consider that it would be desirable to retain it?—I do.

10260. There are advantages in having a fixed school year as well as disadvantages, of course?—There are.

10261. And it would be an advantage if some means were devised for compulsory examination which did not necessitate a variable year?—I do not understand.

10262. You say that a fixed school year is inconsistent with a compulsory examination of the pupils, on the ground that the inspector cannot examine them all on the last day, or near the last day, of the fixed year?—Yes.

10263. And therefore that their progress ought to be marked upon the whole year's training?—Quite so.

10264. Are there any means of meeting the two things, or having a fixed examination as far as possible towards the end of a fixed year?—I do not think so.

10265. It depends on the district and the man, so that one follows the other?—I think so.

10266. At the present time you are aware that there is of necessity a variation in the ideas of inspectors as to the amount of examination which ought to be done?—That is exactly one of the faults I find with the present system.

10267. So that it would remove one of these grievances which the teachers feel with regard to the varying ideas of inspectors about the amount of examination?—Certainly it would. That would be one of the benefits of the modification or change of the present system.

10268. Now, can you suggest whether the compulsory examination in the three R's would occupy now nearly the same time as was occupied under the results system?—I do not think so at all. At the time of the individual examination in Geography and Grammar, and half a dozen subjects you never knew where you were. There were extra subjects introduced frequently, and it was exceedingly disadvantageous to both the inspector and the teacher, and wasteful to both.

10269. Can you give me an idea of how long compulsory examination in these subjects would take?—For 100 children?

10270. For any school?—It depends on the man. Some men are very slow and very tedious, and you will never have them otherwise, because it is natural,

and other men have methods of their own, and are individually brighter and sharper and smarter; but all I am concerned for is, that there is nothing in the adoption of that system which I have suggested of individual examination in three subjects that would not be feasible—I won't say with the present staff, but with a reasonable increase of the present staff.

10271. You think it might involve that?—I think it might, and I think it ought. I think an efficient system of inspection ought to have an efficient staff as regards numbers, and that the money spent would be well spent by increasing the staff if necessary.

10272. I am afraid we cannot recommend an increase of the staff?—The Treasury, I suppose, blocks the way, but you can express an opinion.

10273. It is desirable, if possible, to avoid these things, and what I am trying now to find out is, whether something between a system of examination in the whole of the three subjects and the examination being left really to the inspector's choice, and the question of how much time he has got to spare before he starts off to another school can be arrived at. Now, suppose that you could not examine in the three subjects, would you think it desirable to have examination in one?—I think it is absolutely necessary to have an examination in one, but I think it is desirable to have an examination in all three. How it could be carried out is a question for the Commissioners and the Treasury.

10274. But you think that examination in three would entail an addition to the number of inspectors?

—Not necessarily, but I say it might do so, and if it did so, I think that £3,000 or £4,000 a year spent on that would be well spent, to secure a more effective test of the work done by the teacher, and to give him more fair play in his work than he receives under the present system of inspection. No. I think that it is absolutely necessary. At present he does not know where he is.

10275. You would, of course, in the question of inspectors' reports, make a distinction between increment and promotion?—Oh, certainly; the one is merely subsidiary to the other, but still it is distinct.

10276. There is at the present time promotion from the third grade to the second, and from the second to the second of first, and from the second of first to the first of first. Now, would you have an examination of the inspectors' reports with regard to all these four cases?—I should say so.

10277. Would you be satisfied with what I believe is the rule applying to Civil Servants generally, that each one gets his promotion by seniority, unless it is considered that very special circumstances make it necessary to promote a younger man, or that the senior man is really inefficient?—Yes; I think the man who serves in the ranks should be mainly considered. I think good service in the ranks ought to be the main element; but, of course, as the Chairman reminded, and as the Bishop of Evesham remarked, in matters of that kind there are individual cases standing out from the mass that will have to be considered; but I think seniority and faithful work in his profession ought to count.

10278. I wanted to get exactly your opinion with regard to that. So you would not have the promotion in the whole service as it were put into the melting-pot at each stage?—I do not think so.

10279. Would you have it that every man should get his promotion as well as his increment as a matter of course, if he were fit for promotion, unless he might be passed over on special occasions, such as I have mentioned?—That must be done in certain cases, and I think the other equally holds good.

10280. Mr. HANMER.—Take this question about the annual examination. Supposing you have an individual examination in reading, writing, and arithmetic, would you record the results as affecting each individual child?—I have a system in connection with the schools of the Board of Erasmus Smith in which I examine. I mark on one day the answering of the individual children, but their numbers are so small that I can examine them in every subject; and I also mark the number of children that pass each year in each subject, and also the number who passed in the preceding year in each subject and each class.

21st May, 1935.]

REV. CANON TRISTRAM, D.D., examined.

[Continued.]

10283. Do you tell the children whether they pass or fail?—I do.

10284. The individual children?—The individual children.

10285. Would you wish that to be done in a primary school?—I am not prepared to think I should, because what holds good in a small school, such as I examine, might not hold good in a larger one. There might be difficulty in doing that in a very large school of 300 or 400 or 500.

10286. Would you apply the principle of individual examination to the younger children of the school, say, to children, roughly speaking, under ten?—Only to those who could read the first book.

10287. Presumably they could read at seven?—The first book.

10288. Would you apply it in their case?—I would; I think so; children who can read first or second book.

10289. You do not think it would be putting responsibility on those children too early in life?—No, not if you merely ask a child to read simple words.

10290. But if a child knows it is to be examined, and that a record is to be made of how it has done?—I get the most marked individual results from children of seven, eight, and nine.

10291. But as far as your experience goes, you have never found any evils from that?—I have never found any evils.

10292. I think you have told Sir Hiram, that supposing this system were adopted, it would entail an appreciable increase of the Inspectorial staff?—Well, it might, and I think it would.

10293. Would it not inevitably bring back the old uniform programme in those subjects for all schools?—I do not think there ought to be a dual programme. An inspector's estimate of the amount of teaching will be governed partly by his listening to the teachers teaching, and partly by the results in the class, but as regards these subjects I pointed out, I do not think there is much room for variation of treatment.

10294. Not in Arithmetic?—Perhaps, there might be in Arithmetic.

10295. Not in Composition?—Hardly. You can hardly teach Composition to the same extent. You can give the children the rules that govern punctuation, and give them specimens of Composition, and methods of reproduction of a lesson, and so on.

10296. All I can say is, that in your schools the teachers must be singularly lucky in their pupils if they get markedly good results year after year?—Well, the general intelligence of the child comes into operation there, and the state of the school is reflected, I think, more in Composition than in anything else.

10297. Supposing you bring back the old annual examination, would you not inevitably bring back the special preparation for it?—Yes, you would; more so in subjects of oral examination, such as Geography and Grammar and History, and things of that kind.

10298. More so than you would in Arithmetic?—I do not think you would in Arithmetic, because, after all, if their intelligence is developed, and if they know the rules, and if they are accustomed to do exercises, I think that is all the preparation necessary, and they ought to be so prepared.

10299. You remember the old objection to the annual examination, that it meant pressure upon the weak child?—And neglect of the strong.

10300. I won't say neglect, but, at any rate, it meant marking time by the clever pupils, and dead level of uniformity, without an opportunity for developing the excellence of the pupil. Did you recognise that those evils did exist?—I recognised it very strongly.

10301. And your proposal would bring those back?—I do not think it would bring them back to any appreciable extent.

10302. But to some extent?—To some extent, yes. You could not help that if a large increment of the salaries of the teachers depended on the passing of a certain number of children, and you did not allow

room for a general estimate of the way the results were obtained and arrived at. So long as the child came to pass the individual test the teacher got his money; but the inspector, before estimating satisfactorily results of this kind, should take account of the methods of teaching as well as the results arrived at, and the estimate formed from a general examination of the class.

10303. You do not think we should get back to many of the evils of the old examination?—I think that no matter what system you adopt it will have drawbacks, but I think that in order to work the present system satisfactorily, you would require a set of arrangements for inspectors and of signals for teachers.

10304. In making this recommendation of an annual examination I suppose you had in mind the present system of grading schools and teachers?—Largely.

10305. Supposing that grading were done away with, or at any rate, considerably modified, would you still wish to have the old annual examination back?—Nothing would make me withdraw the recommendation for individual examination in these subjects, because I believe it is important, in order to enable the inspector adequately and equitably to appraise the work done in the school. If it is to be formed by a sort of general estimate of tone, one inspector might judge one way, and another another, as it is at present.

10306. Now, I will put to you this question. In England we have abolished the annual examination altogether, but it is open to any inspector to examine a school as fully as he likes, individually if he likes, and to make a report upon it at any time that he pleases. Would that satisfy you?—That would leave entirely too much in the hands of the inspector. I do not think you would ever find that system to work in Ireland. I know the circumstances of the country, and I know the material you have to deal with, and I do not think it could be satisfactory. It would place the teacher completely at the mercy of the inspector, whom you won't bind by any rules, and the teacher will never know where he is. That is my opinion.

10307. So you are in favour of the annual examination for Irish schools at any rate. You still adhere to that?—I do.

10308. Mr. KAVANAGH—I think you said the teachers should have the right of appeal?—I did.

10309. Do you think that the teacher has it at the present moment in the fullest sense of the word?—Not in the fullest sense of the word.

10310. Where does it fall short?—Well, in the first place, if the teacher's school is reduced from "excellent" to "very good" he has no right of appeal at present.

10311. But when he has seemingly a right of appeal do you think that appeal is fully heard, does the procedure satisfy him that his appeal has really been heard?—In many cases it does not.

10312. How far do you think he should have the right of appeal?—When I speak of the right of appeal I mean that if a teacher has a particular class of report for two or three years, that teacher is presumably efficient, and before that estimate of his work is withdrawn I think reasonable ground should be given for the withdrawal of it, and there are no reasonable grounds given at present. It is left to the individual estimate of an inspector, and the teacher is not judged on any system, nor is it necessarily made on any adequate basis. That is the general feeling of the teachers. The teachers are not infrequently arbitrarily penalised without any right of appeal.

10313. I suppose the appeal, to be a real one, should be from the inspector's report to the Board itself?—Well, to have a re-examination.

10314. I think you said that the teacher should have a right to re-inspection?—I think he should, if he is penalised by reduction, and reasonable grounds should be shown with reference to the circumstances, but I would hardly make the right of appeal universal. I would take the estimate of the character

of the teacher and the work which he has hitherto done. You must really presume that those who are in charge of the primary education of the country are reasonable men, you must give them responsibility, and you must give them some power.

10315. Yes, but what the teachers imagine is that his appeal is only from one inspector practically to another inspector, and that it never goes past the Resident Commissioner?—I am afraid that must always be the case, because you could not have the Resident Commissioner himself going down and examining the school, so you must have inspectors.

10316. Would you like to have a kind of referee?—Well, you have a head inspector, or, if you like, you could appoint officers ad hoc, to take appeals.

10317. Mr. CORRY.—I rather think that what the teachers complain of is, not that the appeal is sent to a higher inspector, but that when the appeal from the inspector who lowered the mark is made to the Board, it is sent back to the inspector who is appealed against?—I do not think that is the case.

10318. We have that in evidence; and if that inspector says then that there is no just ground of appeal, the matter goes no further?—There are cases in which the head inspector has come down, plenty of them.

10319. Mr. HENLY.—There are no head inspectors now?—No, well, a senior inspector.

10320. Mr. CORRY.—Mr. Purser told us here that during twelve years that he served under Dr. Stokkie an appeal case was never sent to him as chief inspector?—I was not aware of that.

10321. Mr. KAVANAGH.—The teachers complain that the appeal is from one inspector to another, and that it never goes any further?—Things like that ought to come before the Board, to my mind.

10322. They also complain that they never see that report of the inspector. Do you think that quite right?—Well, they see the minute of the report as printed, because we have quite a number of schools in connection with our Diocesan Board, and I get the minutes of the inspectors' reports, on nearly all my own Church schools of the diocese, with regard to secular knowledge, and I also see those minutes in the books of the National teachers themselves.

10323. That is the Observation Book?—Yes; those minutes are made in the Observation Book.

10324. You get a report as manager, I suppose?—Well, I get the report as Secretary of the Board of Education, as the schools are vested in us.

10325. That is practically as manager?—We are trustees of the schools, and I am Secretary to the Trustees.

10326. Canon Mahaffy mentioned the subject of small schools?—Yes, that is very important.

10327. And he said that you know more about the matter than he did. Have there been many cases of small schools under your observation?—Nearly all the schools that I inspect in secular knowledge are small schools, and when I say small schools, I mean schools with an average attendance of under 20, and I find that these small schools are, in the main, exceedingly efficient. There is an idea very prevalent, and which is held by theorists in education largely, that it is exceedingly difficult to have a small school efficient. I have small schools on my list, and I would take the children individually and pit them against the children of any individual school in the country for examination in most subjects.

10328. And are they taught as a rule by a school mistress?—They are taught as a rule by a school mistress.

10329. And I suppose there would be boys up to 15 or 14 years of age, and do you think a school mistress is able to teach them?—I was examining Killybeggin School, in the County Kerry, the other day, and there were boys there 12 and 13 years of age, and I never met with boys of that age better taught or more amenable. Of course, I am not advocating a universal system of that kind, but I say it is not impossible that they should be. There is too great a tendency to sweep aside the small schools and say they cannot be efficient.

10330. You would not say that these small schools are inadvisable as a rule?—I would not, certainly. In Ireland they are necessary, considering the local colour.

10331. But entirely from the point of view of the children?—And entirely from the point of view of the children I think they are desirable, because we must have small schools in Ireland if we want to preserve—I won't say the denominational system, but if we want to preserve the belief that it is necessary to secure that the children's religious opinions won't be interfered with.

10332. But I have put the question entirely from the educational point of view of the children themselves?—I would prefer, on the whole, perhaps, to send any child if I could to a large well-conducted school, if it were a large school with a good staff, rather than have the child taught in a one-teacher small school, but that is entirely a distinct question from the one which I was dealing with. People say that small schools cannot be efficient, and that they ought to be swept away. I deny that altogether.

10333. You say that small schools are not necessarily inefficient?—Yes, I do; that is exactly what I want to imply.

10334. You were speaking of the routine system, and you did not approve of it on the whole?—No.

10335. Do you prefer the present system of inspection, the impressionist system, as we may call it?—No, sir, I do not. I think if I had a choice I would rather have the results system.

10336. I want you to point out the defects that you see in the present impressionist system, from the point of view of the children?—Too much is left to the individuality of the inspector. There is no common basis of comparison. If you had one individual inspector to appraise all the schools in Ireland there might be something to say in favour of it, but what one man would consider lenient another man would consider rudeness or roughness, and there are different ideals set up by different individuals. The circumstances that determine the teaching in a school, and determine the estimate of the teaching under the present system of inspection, are too arbitrary, and very often too insignificant, and it tends to the formation of hasty and unjust judgments, without any thorough test of the real work done in the school.

10337. I quite agree with you, and I am very glad to have got that expression of opinion from you, that you would really rather have the results system of examination than the present system?—I would, certainly.

10338. That is from the point of view of the children?—Yes.

10339. You were speaking also of uniformity. Do you find a great difference in the merit marks of the various inspectors you have come across?—I have not sufficient personal knowledge of the merit-marking of the inspectors, but I have heard the opinions of teachers in whom I have the greatest confidence, both as to their bias and their efficiency, and there is universal discontent with the merit marks given, and also still more discontent arising from the fact that one man may give one merit mark and another man may give a different merit mark to the same school under similar conditions.

10340. Do you think that is a result of the system, or of the difference of the individual inspector himself?—Both. There always will be, and always must be, as I said at the commencement of my evidence, a sense of injustice arising from the personal factor, but the present method intensifies and exaggerates that, and I think it is desirable that it should be minimised.

10341. Do you believe uniformity is possible?—No, sir.

10342. I do not mean an absolute uniformity, because I agree with you that that is impossible, but a workable uniformity?—I think it is an uniformity such as will destroy the feeling of injustice.

21st May, 1913.]

REV. Canon TRISTRAM, D.D., examined.

[Continued.]

10343. Mr. COVENE.—Do you mean under the present system?—No; under the present system it is not possible.

10344. Mr. KAVANAGH.—You really think so?—I do.

10345. It is a system that destroys uniformity. The present system destroys uniformity. Under no circumstances could you have uniformity with the present system. For instance, one man goes into a school, and he objects to the ticking of a clock when he is examining, and if it is not stopped he will be annoyed. Another man objects to flowers, and never can bear the sounds of certain flowers, while another man would cover the table with them.

10346. I suppose you have read the various circulars from the Board, circulars of instruction to the inspectors as a guide to their inspection. Do you think they are misleading with regard to the tone system?—The tone system? I do not like to say so from respect to the man who originated it. I like a good tone in a school, and it should to a certain extent govern your estimate of the work done, but it should not be the main factor.

10347. Mr. KERRIE.—Has primary education, in your opinion, improved its efficiency since 1909?—I do not think it has.

10348. Would you go so far as to say that it has declined?—The teaching of arithmetic has, and the teaching of geography has, because it is not taught at all, and I do not think the pupils have as intelligent an idea of the world as they had when they learned a little more geography.

10349. That is a very serious view. It is founded on experience, I suppose?—It is founded on experience of a large number of teachers, men that are not grievance-mongers in any sense of the word.

10350. With regard to this limited examination that you suggest, I am not certain that I followed quite clearly the difference between the uniform school year and this variable year that you recommend. How would the system work out in practice? Would the examination in each school take place roughly at the same period in each year?—As nearly as might be.

10351. And then the school year would run from one examination to the next?—Quite so.

10352. So if a school was examined early in February, 1914, its next examination would be early in February, 1915?—In February sometimes, as nearly as you could go. You never could have it on the same date; but I think the teacher should know when to expect the inspection. I am speaking now of the inspection for the purpose of appraising the work of the teacher.

10353. Should full notice be given of that examination in advance?—Oh, certainly, I think; both to the manager and teacher.

10354. Would it not have this very striking defect, that the inspector would always be seeing a given school at one particular phase of its work?—I am speaking of the visit of the inspector for that one particular examination, and I take it that in any system of inspection there are surprise visits, or occasional visits, in which he can see the school in its working day dress and appraise the methods pursued; but that is a different thing from the annual examination on which the appreciation of the teacher's work depends.

10355. I am quite sure; the incidental visits would correct that defect, at least, to a large extent. Now, upon another general question that we are inquiring into, do you think the liberty of the teachers is unduly hampered by the present rules and regulations of the Board?—I think it is.

10356. That is the question of what what they call civil rights?—I do not know; there are various opinions on that. I am in favour of giving full civil rights to teachers on the whole.

10357. What do you understand by that?—Giving them the rights of ordinary citizens, the right of voting, for instance.

10358. But there are a good many classes of Civil Servants who are deprived of the exercise of such civil rights. At any rate, do you regard that as a very grave question?—I think the teachers exercise far more influence, and I take it that where they are de-

prived of certain rights they might become agitators. I think a man deprived of his civil rights has a far greater tendency to become an agitator and that he will be much more listened to if he had them.

10359. Your experience is that they have carried the art of agitation to a very high degree of perfection?—They have certainly; it is a recognised fact, and it will be so in every democracy, I suppose.

10360. With reference to that point you said, and I quite agree with you, that the criticism of the teachers, however well founded, was rather too violent and rhetorical. Now, might that be due to the fact that under the constitution of the Board, they have got no recognised means by which they can bring their views to bear on the Board?—Perhaps it might. I do not know what the reason is; I have often wondered myself what the reason is; but the language of some of the teachers has been stronger and more violent with respect to inspectors (and has been so often with respect to myself, I suppose) than with respect to any other class of men. It might be supposed from what one hears and reads that the man who has the responsibility of dealing with the teachers possesses a double dose of original sin, but we are trying to do our best.

10361. Mr. HENLY.—Do not other agitators besides teachers sometimes use strong language?—I use it myself occasionally.

10362. Mr. KERRIE.—But as the case at present stands, at any rate, the National Board, which now controls primary education, is practically isolated from consultation with the teachers. Is not that so?—I think it is undesirable that it should be. I think there should be some means of letting the teacher into the room rather than by approaching by 10 doors and 15 passages. I think he should have some more ready means of access to headquarters, so as to have what he considers his grievances considered.

10363. And the absence of that mode of access would to some extent, at any rate, explain the violence of the rhetoric?—Perhaps that, and nationality and temperament and everything; I dare say it would. The fewer grievances you have existing the less liable men are to use strong language in the discussion of them.

10364. And if you have an educational authority which is also isolated from public opinion, or, at any rate, not directly under the control of it, that would also explain the writing of violent letters against it?—Now, you are touching a question on which there are very strong opinions. I think the principle on which the Board of National Education officials has been hitherto appointed a most undesirable one. Men were appointed to that Board who knew absolutely nothing about primary education, and I think that is responsible to a large extent for the feeling that exists. Some have been worthy of all praise and have done good work, and there are men who devote themselves to their work, but there are others who, if I may say so, with great respect, ought not to be there. They know nothing about primary education, and they were chosen for other reasons and under other influences.

10365. Mr. HENLY.—Did you ever know one to be chosen who opposed the National system all his life till he was chosen?—I have heard of such.

10366. Mr. KERRIE.—There is only one other question arising out of your interchange of ideas with Mr. Harrison. You are of opinion that the method of education which is very suitable in Great Britain is not necessarily suitable to Ireland?—I do; I hold that strongly.

10367. In fact, I think you said that you objected to the imposition upon this country of British fads?—Strongly. In that respect, I am a thorough Home Rule.

10368. Mr. HENLY.—I have very little to ask. I understand you are in favour of a separate school year for each school?—I am.

10369. A point was raised here that migrants going from one school to another would not get the same place in that other school as they would if there were a uniform school year; but you said that the number of migrants in the rural districts were very few?—Yes.

10870. From what time would you have the school year begin?—From the visit of the inspector.

10871. Then as to the considerations which would guide you in fixing the school year, supposing each school was to have a particular school year. Would you not have it so that you would have the largest number of pupils possible present?—Certainly.

10872. And, therefore, would not the schools in one locality have school years more or less at the same time?—They would have it at the same time, and therefore the effect of migration would be minimized.

10873. And, therefore, if there were migrants at all, they would drop in at the same stage?—That is a consideration that did not suggest itself to me; but since you suggest it, it confirms my view. The migration would not be so much from Dublin to Cork or Derry, say, as to neighboring schools, schools in the same locality, and there being the same school year and the same inspector the inspection would be practically in the same month in the same locality.

10874. And you think it desirable that as many as possible of the pupils should be examined?—Yes.

10875. And that the teacher should be obliged to present all his pupils?—Yes.

10876. So that the work that he has really done may be brought under the view of the inspector?—The inspector, by comparing the number on the roll in average attendance with the number present at the examination, will be able to note the fact in his report. If only a percentage, say, 40 per cent., or 50 per cent., or 60 per cent. of those on the roll in average attendance are presented for examination, the inspector must draw his own conclusion.

10877. Then, of course, if there is to be that examination, you agree that the teacher ought to get notice?—Certainly; both the teacher and manager.

10878. Now, I have had a letter from a teacher the other day from a place called Killybeg, in the County Wicklow. The inspector visited his school. There was a fair at Newbury, and he had less than half the pupils in attendance, and yet his work for that year was estimated by the work of the pupils on that day. Would you think that a satisfactory arrangement?—Unless it was the result of an epidemic or something of that kind that he could not present them.

10879. Yes, but he got no notice?—Then, if he got no notice, I do not think that was fair to the teacher.

10880. The teacher gets no notice at present, and he was not able to present all his pupils, and still the same school was marked on the small number of pupils remaining?—That was absolutely unfair, and if I were that teacher, I would have a strong and manly sense of injustice.

10881. That teacher appealed and got no satisfaction?—That would intensify the sense of injustice.

10882. Is not special preparation desirable?—Yes.

10883. Is not repetition one of the means by which we endeavour to fix in the memory of the pupils what they are taught?—I agree with you. I never object to a special preparation for examination.

10884. Are you aware that in Austria they have examination schools, and that in those schools the only subjects taught are those which they have been previously taught in the elementary school, and that they review the courses there in order to fix the knowledge thus gained in the minds of the pupils?—I was not aware of it, but I think it is a very good system.

10885. Now, in dealing with the question of inspection under the results system, I suppose you are aware that the inspectors were obliged to visit the school three times in the year?—Yes.

10886. And under the present system they are supposed to visit three times in the year?—Yes.

10887. And, therefore, the change from the results system has not increased the number of visits as provided for in the rules?—No.

10888. And to see this school in its ordinary work-a-day dress, would not those two incidental visits be sufficient?—I think they ought; I do not believe in a system of espionage.

10889. Another point was raised about having an individual school programme. Have we not got an individual programme at present; have not all the

schools in the country been able to adopt one programme?—They have, and therefore I do not think it would to any extent create a grievance on the part of the teachers.

10890. In referring to the relations between the Board and the teachers, you suggested, I think, that when changes in programme and matters of that kind were under consideration, there should be consultation between the authorities and the teachers?—Yes, I think so.

10891. And I suppose you are aware that it was in that way that the results system was got to work with comparative smoothness in this country, and that it was the result of that consultation constantly between the organization of teachers and Sir Patrick Keenan?—Yes, that was the case.

10892. And is it not likely that had that consultation been kept up part of the friction at present would have been avoided?—Yes. I think there was much more ready access on the part of the teachers during that regime.

10893. Now, in dealing with the question of the liberty of the teachers, do you think that the teacher should be free to criticize the programme in his school?—Do you mean free to criticize it to the inspector?

10894. To the outside public. For instance, if there is an unsuitable or unworkable programme, should the teacher be at liberty to point that out at an outside meeting?—If he has no other way of securing the revision of it, I certainly think so; but, I think, so long as the teacher can consult with his authorities, and has a real mode of consultation, he should be chary of discussing educational grievances outside, provided that he has a regular constitutional channel.

10895. You have told us that the small schools are, in many instances, inefficient?—They are.

10896. So far as your experience has gone. Now, were they not recognized as efficient up to a few years ago?—I know that in 1892 schools of 10 were recognized as efficient and were taken under the National Board, but the tendency in recent years (I do not know whether it is from motives of economy or whether it is from the ingrained idea that seems to have germinated in the Commissioners' minds that small schools are necessarily inefficient), the tendency has been to crush them out in every possible way.

10897. By amalgamation?—Amalgamation; that second word—"amalgamation."

10898. You do not think that that was always done in the interests of education?—I do not; I think it has been forced to an extent that is very injurious. I know that it has left in some parts of the country a large number of children of 14 or 15 years of age without education, because the distances to other schools are so great, and the weather may be inclement, and the means of conveyance may be very bad. I have instances of it here, which I have not been asked about.

10899. With your experience as an inspector, do you think it is possible to judge of the efficiency of teaching with any uniformity without examination?—No, I do not.

10900. We have here (and it is published in one of the reports of the Commissioners) a statement of Mr. Kelly, a very efficient inspector in Belfast, that he had two schools that were marked "excellent," and on the same day he set a test in arithmetic to them, and those two schools were at exactly the same stage of progress in the course of instruction for the year, and although they were marked "excellent," the result, when he tested them in that way, by examination, differed by about 60 per cent. Ought not such a fact to convince anybody of the folly of keeping up the impressionist system?—Yes. I have had a similar case to that in Dublin, where 40 per cent. was the difference in the estimate, and, in my opinion, the fact that such a result is possible vitiates the whole system.

10901. Mr. Kelly's inference from that is that the teaching in arithmetic cannot be tested by a mere impressionist system, and therefore that if the children's interests are to be secured, we must have examination?—Mr. Kelly is undoubtedly right, I think. I do not know what they do in England; but I do not think you can have an efficient test for arithmetic

21st May, 1913.]

REV. CANON TRISTRAM, D.D., examined.

[Continued.]

without individual examination. There is a question of small schools here that I was asked to bring before you. Is it within your purview?

10402. The CHAIRMAN.—I do not think we have it in our power to report on that. It is a matter that does not appear to come within our terms of reference, and my impression is that we have no right under our terms of reference to make a report about the amalgamation of small schools. On that understanding we may hear you, but I do not think it can come into our report?—Unless it came into your report, I do not see that it would be of any advantage to us.

10403. I do not see at the moment how we can entertain it?—But there is a tendency amongst inspectors at the present time to recommend this amalgamation, and we think the members of our Church and some of the Roman Catholics in the North would be hit by it. There is a tendency on the part of some inspectors to reduce the number of the small schools in every possible way, and to send children by vans to larger schools.

10404. Would you connect it in any way with the present system of inspection?—It is partly the work of inspection, for the inspectors report on it, and it is dealt with in the course of their inspection. They say: "There is a good school within two or three miles of you, and I will recommend a van."

10405. Mr. HENRY.—I asked the question with reference to that, which I did not wish to follow up. Were the small schools recognised as efficient until a comparatively recent time?—They were, and now there is a tendency on the part of the inspectors, acting, as some people think, under instructions, to say that the schools are not efficient, and to say that the children should be sent to a school, perhaps, four or five miles away. We say that is impossible.

10406. The CHAIRMAN.—Now that you bring it under the head of inspection, I think you may continue?—Well, I have some instances here to bear out what I say. One is the case of the school of Fenagh, County Leitrim. The teacher left there in May, 1912, and a new teacher was appointed to begin on the 5th of June. A *laissez faire* kept it going. On the 17th of June the Commissioners wrote to say that as a change of teachers had taken place they directed the inspectors to report as to the need for the school. The inspector reported that the children could be drafted from Fenagh National School to Bellefleur, a distance of three miles. Now, the total number on the rolls in November, 1912, was 23, which was an increase largely due to the work of the clergyman, Mr. Wellwood. The average of 10 is mentioned in the Act of 1881, and the average of that school for 1912 was 12.2. Mr. Wellwood consulted his parish, and found they would refuse to let the children go to the van to Bellefleur School, which is inferior to the one at Fenagh, both as to plant and buildings. The inspector then, guided pre-

sumably by the office, writes to say that Mr. Wellwood has waived his objection to the van, and on the strength of that letter of the inspector the school is struck off the list. Principal Moore took it up here in Dublin at Mr. Wellwood's request, and Mr. Wellwood denies that he ever approved of the van. Some of the children would have to travel four miles to meet the van, three pupils would have to travel three miles, and two pupils one mile. There is another case at Skreen, Co. Sligo. In February, 1913, the teacher resigned, and a new teacher was appointed. The Commissioners wrote that no permanent appointment could be sanctioned until the inspector reported. On the 24th, the manager wrote that the nearest Protestant school was  $\frac{1}{2}$  miles away. Skreen had been under the Board since 1877, and there were 21 pupils on the rolls, with an average attendance of 15.1. A memorial against sending the children to Denewah School was signed by every parent and guardian in the district, deciding never to use the van. Some of the children live  $\frac{1}{2}$  miles beyond Skreen, and would have to go before daylight, wet and tired, and return in the dark. Another case is that of Kilmeehan School, Co. Cork. When this school became vacant, Miss Kingston was appointed teacher, but the National Board had not yet sanctioned the appointment. In this case there are 30 children on the rolls, and the average attendance is 15.5. There are 67 children in the parish under fourteen, and there is no other Protestant school convenient in the parish. This is a school that was built 20 years ago by the parishioners. The inspector reports that the children should be sent to Sarsco, in Castlehaven Parish, nearly three miles away, with a small and dwindling population. The inspector said that the Board might supply a long car for the purpose, but most of the children live in parts which are quite remote from Sarsco. Another case is that of Cappoquin, where Miss Johnson was appointed teacher in January, 1913, and the Commissioners wrote that the matter must be reconsidered. The number on the roll there is 23 and the average attendance for the December quarter is 19.5 and for the April one 20. The nearest school in that district is at Lismore, which is about four miles away, and it would be necessary for the children to start shortly after night and be back about five in the evening, and it would be impossible to carry out that in the winter months. If this policy is persisted in, it will deprive the infants in a great many of the country schools of education at all, and I think that the inspectors' power in these cases should be very considerably restricted.

10407. These powers are exercised irrespective of the manager?—Exercised entirely irrespective of the manager, and in despite of the manager.

10408. Mr. CORRY.—Did the inspector report that any of these schools were inefficient?—No, sir; there was no question of inefficiency; it was a mere question of number.



# TWENTY-SECOND DAY.—THURSDAY, MAY 22ND, 1913.

At 23, Kildare-street, Dublin.

Present:—**SIR SAMUEL DILL, M.A., LITT.D., LL.D.** (Chairman); **The Most Rev. DENIS KELLY, D.D.**, Bishop of Ross; **SIR HIRAM SHAW WILKINSON, LL.D.**; **MR. JOHN COFFEY**; **MR. HENRAGE E. B. HARRISON, R.A.**; **MR. JEREMIAH HENLY**; **MR. WALTER MCMURROUGH KAVANAGH, D.L.**; **MR. THOMAS MICHAEL KETTLE, D.L.**; and

**MR. ARTHUR J. DONNELLY, M.A., B.Sc., Secretary.**

**MR. F. H. DALL, Chief Inspector of Elementary Schools, Board of Education, England, examined.**

10409. **THE CHAIRMAN.**—Now, Mr. Dall, I propose for myself to make an exception to my usual practice and address to you only a few formal questions by way of introduction, leaving to my colleague, Mr. Harrison, who has so much experience in common with you, the larger share of the first part of the examination. I think that will be a better way of getting at the facts; but I must ask you two or three questions about your own history and experience. Will you tell us the various offices that you have held under the English Department?—Certainly. I was appointed a junior examiner first of all, inside the office, in 1877. I became an inspector in 1900. I was transferred to the inspectorate in 1899, and I worked in the districts of Bristol and Lincolnshire, and subsequently Nottinghamshire and Westmorland. During the time I was in Westmorland, I also acted as inspector of training colleges for the North of England. That was from 1906 to 1910, I think. In 1910 I became a divisional inspector in London, and in 1912 I became chief inspector.

10410. Now, we have all read your report of 1908, on the state of Irish education, and for myself, I may say, with great advantage. May I ask you on whose suggestion or direction that report was prepared?—It was prepared at the direction, of course, of the Board of Education, at the request of the Chief Secretary, at that time Mr. Wyndham. I was directed by the Board to undertake the inquiry. The Chief Secretary wrote to the English Board at that time asking that an English inspector might be sent.

10411. The suggestion came from England, and not from Ireland?—No, no suggestion came from Ireland.

10412. No suggestion from the Irish side?—Well, from the Chief Secretary.

10413. And what was the main object of it?—The main object, I understood, was as stated in the terms of reference that the Irish Government desired to obtain a report upon primary education, particularly with a view to comparing it with English education. I never understood anything more than that. I think a question arose, but that I cannot be quite certain of, in connection with the application of the Development Fund. Dr. Stacks might be able to give you more precise information about that.

10414. The Honour of Ross.—When did you come over?—In 1908. And I do remember that in connection with an application from the National Board for an additional grant for the purpose of building schools I was asked particularly to look into the premises of the Irish schools, and to report upon them.

10415. **THE CHAIRMAN.**—But still, the whole condition of primary education at the time was the subject of your enquiry?—Certainly; I think that matter of school building arose, but I understood both from the Chief Secretary and Sir Antony McDonnell, as he then was, that they desired a general survey, without any ulterior object, so to speak. I had no information as to what the report was wanted for, nor was I in the least instructed to write it with reference to any particular topic.

10416. It is tolerably evident to anyone reading the report that you found considerable difficulty in the different circumstances of the two countries?—Certainly.

10417. In making any comparison?—Yes.

10418. And what were the differences that created the most difficulty in trying to institute a comparison?

—Well, the great and fundamental difference, of course, is the absence in Ireland of any local authority of any kind.

10419. And then, of course, there was the social condition of the country, the fact that Ireland was a very poor country, while England was a rich one, with great urban centres?—Yes, with great urban centres, while those in Ireland were mostly poor and rural.

10420. And as regards the education given in the schools in those days, in 1908, a great change had just taken place, but I observe from your report that you perceived very marked traces of the continuance of the effect of the old results system?—Certainly.

10421. In what respects?—The schools were still suffering from the payment by results system. In fact, that system so widely affected the character of the teaching that the teachers had not at that period had time to adapt themselves to any new conditions. They were suffering from want of intelligence with regard to the new instruction and its range.

10422. At the same time, causes of that do not lie with the National Board?—No.

10423. The new subjects had not been fully taken up?—No, they were beginning to be a great many schools.

10424. Physical science was taken up?—Yes, and singing and various other subjects were being extended to a good many schools.

10425. But you found the effects of the old results system still very considerable?—Yes, they were to be seen everywhere.

10426. And the ideas of the new system had not begun to take full effect?—Not full effect, but they were being taken up in the better schools.

10427. And amongst the younger teachers?—And amongst the younger teachers.

10428. Since the publication of that report have you had any acquaintance with the condition of Irish schools?—No, practically not. From time to time documents have been sent to me from Ireland connected with the National Board, in which I observed a good many changes that, I suppose, my report had something to do with.

10429. You pointed out a considerable number of defects in the system as it existed in 1908?—Yes.

10430. But you have no means of knowing how far your suggestions have been followed?—I cannot tell how far they have been carried out in practice. I observe that some of the suggestions I made have been embodied in the rules and regulations, and that the syllabus has been very largely modified in various ways; but how far that has actually gone into the work of the schools, I cannot say.

10431. **MR. HARRISON.**—You know the system in Ireland, of course, under which the teachers are really civil servants, at least so far as their salaries and pensions go, but not as regards their appointment, and you know that there is not a very large difference between the salaries to be obtained, but that those in the larger schools are somewhat larger?—Yes.

10432. Then you are aware that there has been adopted in Ireland a system of grading teachers. We may presume that the system was adopted in order to meet the prevailing state of things, and to reward meritorious service. You are familiar with the main outlines of them?—Certainly.

10433. Now, I want your opinion on that system of grading, first of all as regards the machinery for carrying it out impartially and fairly?—The machinery, I believe, is by means of inspection, is it not?

10434. Yes, practically, now?—I regard it as most inadvisable to place on the inspector the direct responsibility for scheduling or grading or promotion of teachers. It puts the inspector into a wrong relation with the teacher, and I should say (but the Committee will have better evidence about it than I can give) that it would be absolutely impossible to establish any uniformity of standard in a large system between inspector and inspector.

10435. At any rate, such uniformity as would be necessary to carry out a scheme of that sort, such uniformity as is necessary in order to command public confidence, and to satisfy the teachers, where their own state is very large indeed?—Certainly.

10436. We have it in evidence the money at stake may amount to one-eighth of the salary that the teacher is receiving?—Yes.

10437. Now, what do you think would be the effect upon the teachers of the working of such a system as that?—I expect that there would be constant complaints. I should expect them also to attach too much importance in one sense to the views of the inspector, and to play up to the inspector, so to speak.

10438. And would not the teacher also be in a position of constant anxiety?—Certainly.

10439. Which is not conducive to his best work?—I quite agree.

10440. Now, then, supposing that there are good grounds for continuing some such system, what would you think of a suggestion that has been made to us, which I will read to you. It was made by his Lordship the Bishop of Ross. The idea was, without altering the amount of the Treasury Grant, to make the initial salary of each grade larger and the increment smaller, but practically automatic, that is to say, that the inspector should have the right on an unsatisfactory report, to refuse the increment; but if the report were what might be termed normally satisfactory, the increment would be automatic. This is the scheme:—In order to secure annual increments, always subject to the provision of not increasing the Parliamentary Grant, the initial salary should be £88, and there would be 11 annual increments of £1 each, and thus a maximum of £79 would be reached. How would you regard that? Supposing that grading is necessary, how would you regard that as an improvement upon the present system?—I do not feel able to express any opinion upon the detailed figures; but I entirely agree in the general principle of such a scheme. It seems to me absolutely certain that the only function which the inspector of a central department can exercise in a system involving a very large number of teachers is the function of rejection and not of selection, so to speak, which is the same principle, of course, that is exercised throughout the Civil Service. A man receives his annual increment unless his superior officer considers that his conduct is unsatisfactory, or that his work is unsatisfactory.

10441. And that all payments should be made directly by the central authority to the teachers, and so far they ought to be treated as Civil Servants?—Yes. Perhaps, I should put the rule in a formal way—unless his superior refuses to certify his work.

10442. We have a system of what is known as merit marks in Ireland. I do not know whether they were in force when you were here?—I do not know.

10443. I can briefly tell you about them. In the reporting form the inspector has to label every subject of instruction under one of six marks, "excellent," "very good," "good," "fair," "middling," and "bad"; he also has to label the school under one of these marks, and he has to label the teacher. The teacher's mark and the school mark will vary often be the same, but not necessarily, and he must label each teacher, if there is more than one. Do you think that any body of officials can fairly carry out such a system as that, or that any definite standard value can attach to each of these marks?—Certainly not; not when it comes to the details. I should say that if you have a large number of inspectors, the "good" of one as regards a subject will certainly differ very largely, as it must do, from the "good" of another. I think if you take a school as a whole and simply con-

fine yourself to three classes of designations, the inspectors would coincide very largely. If you asked them to say whether a school was a good school, a middling school, or a bad school, you would find a very considerable measure of agreement; but the more you try to work that out in detail the more diversity of opinion appears.

10444. In fact, I suppose you would agree that it would be very much better that the report should simply be couched in ordinary language, describing how the inspector regarded the school?—There are not substitutes for the report?

10445. No, they are not exactly, because there is a report given as well?—Yes.

10446. But they are the important points, I understand, of the report, and upon those the teacher's reputation and his increment depend?—I think that any system of that kind is open to the objection which I mentioned first of all.

10447. Now, in reading your report, I come across this sentence, on which you lay great stress:—"Local interest in education is confined almost entirely to the clergy of the different denominations." Now, do you think that it is possible to extend this interest without in any way interfering with the present system of denominational education?—Yes; I considered that question to a certain extent at the time I wrote the report; it is a question which would naturally force itself upon anybody coming to inquire into primary education in Ireland, and the only way in which I could see that anything was to be done was by the association of various managers of schools of the same denomination.

10448. Would that be something on the same lines as we had on the aid grant?—Yes, certainly; that was what suggested the idea to me. Those associations, if you remember, did a good deal of work in England in connection with the administration of that aid grant, and it occurred to me that a similar plan might be adopted.

10449. They were able to take a wider view than the individual manager?—Quite.

10450. And to some extent they were amenable to public opinion?—Quite so.

10451. The CHAIRMAN.—Are those general in England?—No; they have been abolished. They were temporary.

10452. Mr. HARRISON.—When school fees were abolished there was a certain grant paid, and that was in a sense pooled. I forget the details exactly, but associations were formed of Church of England managers, and Catholic managers, and Presbyterian managers, and so on, and they allotted the grant according to the considered claims of the schools affiliated to their associations?—Yes.

10453. Now, did you also consider this other point, whether, supposing it were possible and convenient to form such associations, any definite contribution ought to be required from them?—To be raised by them?

10454. Yes?—No, I did not actually consider that; but I imagine they would naturally endeavour to raise such contributions.

10455. And no doubt it would strengthen their position if they did?—Certainly. I do think, in fact, one of their main objects should be to raise a central building fund through the contributions of rich and poor parishes.

10456. I assume that it is the only suggestion you have to make for increasing the amount of public interest in the school?—Yes; that was the only one, I may say, at the time. There are all political questions which did not come within my province at all.

10457. Now, I have to ask you a few questions on the subject of inspection. When you came over here in 1908, changes had recently been made, I think, in the administration, both inside the office and outside, and one of the most important was the abolition of the chiefs of inspection. Do you remember their functions at all?—No; I never went into that.

10458. Two of the most senior, and, presumably, most efficient and distinguished of the inspectors, were called into the office, where they spent nearly

22nd May, 1918.]

Mr. F. H. DARR, examined.

[Continued.]

all their time noting reports. In fact, doing what in England would be the work of the examiners, dealing with the inspector's reports?—That seems to me to be a waste of power and expense.

10459. Would you mind developing that?—Well, it is work which can be done, as a general rule, by anybody without practical experience of the schools. It is in that sense purely administrative work, as opposed to inspectorial work. Very occasionally a man's knowledge of the schools will help him in noting a report; but the cases are so infrequent that to employ a chief inspector entirely upon that, seems to me to be a waste of power.

10460. Presumably the two most experienced and best men on the staff?—Yes; noting ordinary reports in that case appears to me to be a waste of power. If I may give an illustration from England, only certain types of reports are sent to me to read.

10461. I understand all the reports passed through their hands?—That work can be done by people with much less knowledge of the schools than the chief inspectors presumably possess.

10462. The CHAIRMAN.—The ordinary examiner in the English office has generally no experience of schools?—He might have had a little, but not very much. And I also think that a system of that kind tends to diminish the sense of responsibility with which an inspector writes his report. I think we should in England object to it very much on that ground. If the examiner professes to look at it from the educational point of view, so to speak, we say: "No, the inspector is responsible for the educational recommendations, and he must be held responsible strictly for them." If there is any man to challenge them, then the educational side will naturally have a temptation to throw the responsibility on to the examiner.

10463. Mr. HANMON.—I may take it that you see no possible advantage in that system?—Practically not; certainly not. I ought to guard myself by saying that I think it is a very good thing in the organisation of education, both for people inside the office to have some experience of schools, and for people outside to know something of the internal administrative side and its working; but to employ a chief inspector in noting reports sent by inspectors seems to be a waste of power.

10464. Are you aware that that change caused a considerable amount of heart-burning when the two chiefs of inspection were sent out again to do work which seemed appropriate to their previous training?—Quite so.

10465. There was a good deal of heart-burning over it?—I remember hearing a little of the difficulties; but I never came across them officially, so to speak, nor did I hear anything definite about them.

10466. With regard to the present arrangement of the staff, I think that has been altered very much since you were here. There are now two chief inspectors, one of whom has jurisdiction in the North of Ireland and the other in the South of Ireland. The country is mapped out in 22 circuits, each presided over by a senior inspector, and each circuit is divided, I think, into two sections—the arrangement being that the senior inspector has to take one-fifth of the schools in his circuit every year, and spend the rest of his time in going with section inspectors. Each section inspector then takes two-fifths of the schools, and the authority of the senior over the section inspectors is, as far as we can make out, extremely vague and shadowy. Recently there has been a rate that no merit grant is to be depressed without his sanction, but that is all?—He seems to have very little definite authority over the sectional inspectors.

10467. How does that arrangement strike you?—I presume it is devised in some way with a view to trying to keep the standard of the sectional inspectors even, for the purpose of this grading and promotion of the teachers.

10468. And can a senior inspector really know his area under those conditions?—No, I think not. I should object to it very much. The principle of the organisation in England (and I think the only prin-

ciple of the organisation of inspection) is to have the district of a reasonable size, and to make one man absolutely responsible for everything that goes on in it. He must not be able to put off responsibility on to one of his subordinates. Every report must go through him and he must counter-sign.

10469. And the district ought to be of a size in which within three or four years he could get a fair personal knowledge of the schools?—Certainly.

10470. Do you see any reason to suppose that under the present system in Ireland there would be a too frequent change of inspectors in the different schools, that one year one inspector would be responsible for the report and another year another?—Under the present system as regards sections?

10471. Yes, and that is how it works in Ireland?—I should say so, unless all the reports go through the senior inspector, who has power to amend them as he thinks proper.

10472. I think he has no such power?—In that case, I think the changes of inspector would be much too frequent.

10473. Then, so far as securing uniformity goes, can two chiefs secure that?—No; I have no hesitation in saying that no two chief inspectors taking the whole of the North and South of Ireland, could secure uniformity in such a matter as the fixing of a standard with regard to the promotion and grading of teachers.

10474. There has been an attempt made, I understand, by the Board to get the Treasury to consent to the appointment of divisional inspectors (I think they require four). How would you regard that?—I have gathered that in Ireland the number of inspectors is somewhere near 100—

Seventy-six?—I should say that with 76 people you would want some officers of that character. The way I may put it is this. In England our divisional inspectors, roughly speaking, supervise the work of about eight to twelve districts (which would answer to the circuits in Ireland), and I think that is as many as they could supervise. I think twelve is a very heavy burden. That is the biggest, and it is too heavy, in my view. I should prefer to keep them about six.

10475. And, incidentally, I might say, that it is advisable that three divisional inspectors should have small districts, is it not?—Quite advisable.

10476. So as to keep thoroughly in touch with the schools and with the work?—Quite.

10477. And copies of all the reports in the division should be typed and sent to them?—Oh, certainly.

10478. As is the practice in England?—Certainly.

10479. Now, under the present arrangement for appointing inspectors, the initial salary commences at only £150 a year. From your experience, do you think it is possible to attract a sufficiently good man at so small an initial salary, and with so very great prospects of rising above £300 or £400?—I should have no difficulty about answering the question in England. I should say that it would be impossible to attract men. Do those men take charge of districts?

10480. Well, they go through a sort of training as juniors first, in which they are attached to a senior, and then they take the duty of sectional inspectors?—I see. I should have said that in England; but I really do not feel able to answer the question as regards Ireland. It would need a very much greater knowledge than I possess of Irish conditions.

10481. Do you think it is advisable to make examination a part of the qualification for an inspector?—No, I think not. I think an inspector should be appointed first of all at an age (I should say, not much younger than 30, from 27 to 35) when examination is inappropriate, and in the second place, personal qualities, which are of vital importance to an inspector, cannot be tested, of course, by examination.

10482. Then, in the appointments in England, that is what you look to more closely?—Yes; we look to experience in teaching, general ability, and the personal qualities of decision and tact.

10483. You do everything you can to test whether the man knows how to deal with his fellow-men, whether he has tact and whether he has judgment?—Certainly.

10484. Now, I want to ask you a question on a matter that has been before us a great many times, and that is about the visits of the Resident Commissioner to schools, generally accompanied by one of the secretaries. I think you had some experience of these visits?—Yes.

10485. And probably you made some with the Resident Commissioner. Would you give us your opinion about them?—I think those visits were decidedly valuable on every ground. I think I guarded myself in a previous question by saying that I thought a knowledge of the schools on the part of the administrator was a very good thing. I think it is an admirable thing that the Resident Commissioner is able to know schools personally. I accompanied him, or we went together, to a great many schools, and I am bound to say that I should attach very considerable weight to his opinion of the school from the inspecting point of view. He had had very wide experience, indeed, of schools in different countries, and I should attach great weight to his opinion.

10486. And you think it would be very helpful to him when educational questions come up to have first-hand knowledge?—Certainly.

10487. And we have it in evidence that in some cases those visits have resulted in a reversal of the verdict of a very senior officer. How would you regard that?—That is, no doubt, a very difficult question; but I should be reluctant to say that the head of a Department has not the right to reverse a subordinate's decision at any time, however senior the subordinate.

10488. But to reverse a verdict of his own expert?—Yes; I think that is, no doubt, extremely awkward; but I am afraid it is very difficult to express any definite opinion about it. I never heard of such a thing occurring in England; but then, of course, as a rule, the permanent head of a great department in England is so busy that he has no time to acquire a first-hand knowledge of the schools. If he had been himself an expert in that sense I can conceive his reversing the decision of a subordinate, but I do not say that it would be an expedient thing to do.

10489. And would it not be likely to make the Inspector feel a want of confidence in himself and a lack of the support which he should receive from the central authority?—Yes, I think so. That is what I mean by saying that even if the head of a Department were right and the subordinate wrong, it would not be an expedient thing to do that on the grounds that you put.

10490. And certainly that is a thing that would be quite unknown in any English experience, would it not?—Yes, I never heard of the case of a secretary of a Department overruling an Inspector on educational grounds.

10491. Mr. HENRY.—That is, where an Inspector gives a school good report, he would not go in and say the school ought not get that report where it is merely a question of education?—No; he would say: "This is not my business." Supposing in some subordinate Inspector who gave a good report, he could say: "We will send down another superior Inspector," but he would not do it himself. He would say: "It is not my business to judge whether a school is good or not."

10492. Where a senior Inspector went and gave a more favourable report than the subordinate Inspector and then that senior Inspector's report was overruled, would you think that a desirable thing?—That must sometimes happen, you know. I think a senior Inspector must sometimes overrule a subordinate Inspector.

10493. But it was the senior Inspector's report that was overruled?—By the head of the Department?

10494. Yes?—As I say, it would not happen in England. The senior Inspector would be treated by the head of the Department as the final court of appeal.

10495. And I suppose you would say it could not happen in England?—Yes; I do not think it could happen, because, as I say, the head of a great Department would never profess to be an expert on that particular subject.

10496. Mr. HENDERSON.—Might I sum it up in this way, that the assumption of such power is rather a dangerous weapon, liable to abuse?—Yes; I should certainly agree with that.

10497. Now, we have heard a great deal also about public speeches by a very high official, and I must say at once that some of those are extremely able and most interesting documents; but I want to ask you this, whether there is any analogy in your experience in England to such a thing as a highly salaried officer of a Department of State making public speeches, and giving addresses on a subject with which he has to deal officially?—No, I do not know any analogy, any direct analogy; certainly not so far as such an address was on a political subject. Of course, highly salaried officials have sometimes given addresses on what I may call purely educational subjects, but the standing role of the Civil Service in England is that no permanent official, however highly salaried, can touch in the least on educational politics.

10498. At any rate, would you think it advisable that should be done?—Certainly not in England; I think it most inadvisable on the part of any Civil Servant.

10499. Do you see any difference between England and Ireland?—I presume the real difficulty arises from the fact that the Resident Commissioner is not exactly in the position of a permanent Civil Servant, or of the political head of a Department. As I understand it, he is a member of the Board, at the same time being a servant of the Board. He combines the two functions.

10500. He is a member of the Board and he is the most highly salaried official?—He combines the two functions, the combination of which in England I consider quite impossible.

10501. And however admirable those addresses, and however useful they might be in a way, would they not put him in this position, that he might have to consider officially certain new arguments and new facts that would be adduced for or against the scheme which he himself has publicly advocated?—Yes; but then, of course, he also is in the position, enviable or unenviable, of being able actually to help the acceptance of that scheme by his vote.

10502. True, but he is rather in an awkward position if he has strongly advocated a scheme, and then possibly has, owing to circumstances, to decide against it, is he not?—Distinctly; but that has, I suppose, a parallel in the case of a minister who publicly advocates a scheme which the Cabinet will not accept.

10503. Now, with regard to administration, you have some experience, I think, in England of what we may call government by circulars, and apparently the system has been copied in Ireland and we have had a good many instructions to Inspectors issued by way of circulars. Do you think that that is a good means of making the wishes of the central office known to its officers?—I think its effectiveness depends partly on the circulars not being too frequent—largely, in fact, I should say. I think circulars on important matters are essential; but if they become very frequent, the natural temptation of Inspectors (as of every other human being) is not to read them, but to put them one side. If they are infrequent, they have much more chance of being attended to.

10504. Do you think it is advisable to issue a circular to Inspectors telling them that it is necessary to be courteous to teachers and generally to behave decently in school?—No, I should assume that anybody appointed an Inspector already knew that.

10505. And do you think it is advisable in a circular to attempt to define what is tone, the tone of a school—I do not know whether you have read "The Tone Circular"?—No.

10506. Perhaps, as you have not read it, it would take too long to go into that. With regard to the issue of rules and regulations, we have heard told that these have often been issued at very short notice, and important changes have been made which the public ought to have some opportunity of considering. Would you tell us what the practice in England is?

22nd May, 1935.]

Mr. F. H. DALL, examined.

[Continued.]

The practice in England is to give long notice of any important change. In fact, the practice in England in recent years has been, that supposing the Board were contemplating a very important change in the regulations with regard to the staffing of the schools, they would announce the change some months before it was actually imposed, by means of a circular to the local authority to say that the Board are proposing to adopt such and such a change.

10507. There being no such authority in Ireland, can you suggest any means of getting some public and reliable criticism upon any new changes that are under contemplation?—I do not know whether there are any bodies that might be consulted.

10508. Would there be any objection in a matter of that sort to asking some of the teachers into conference?—None that I can see.

10509. We have it in evidence that it is the practice of the National Board for examination of reports occasionally to issue reprimands to teachers upon the inspector's report; but without any recommendation to that effect from the inspector and without any reference to him. Would you give us your opinion upon that practice?—I should regard that as very inadvisable. I think reference should always be made to the inspector in a case of that kind.

10510. Is puts him in an extremely awkward position?—Yes; he may not even know that the reprimand has been given.

10511. And he may never have intended that it should be?—Certainly.

10512. It may be done on a misinterpretation of the words in his report?—Yes; there is no doubt in my mind that it is very inadvisable.

10513. Would you tell us how appeals from teachers are dealt with in England?—A formal appeal from a teacher against an inspector's report in England must be sent, as you will probably remember, to us by the local authority, that is to say, they must so far endorse it that they must forward it for our consideration. It is their duty first to inquire into the matter, and if they are satisfied that there is a *prima facie* ground for appeal, they then send it up to the Board, and in that case the inspector is asked for his observations and the matter is investigated, and should it appear necessary a divisional inspector is sent to re-inspect the school. I ought to add that occasionally, besides formal appeals from teachers (which are very uncommon, I am glad to say), a small number of what may be called informal appeals reach me personally through the representatives of the National Union of Teachers. They are often appeals on small matters, which it would, perhaps, be hardly worth the while of the authority to investigate. In these cases, I make a private investigation; I write privately to the inspector and find out the facts and then discuss them.

10514. Or occasionally have a personal interview?—Or occasionally have a personal interview with the inspector and discuss the matter with the representatives of the teachers.

10515. Would you say how far English experience would help you to make any recommendation as to how appeals should be dealt with in Ireland, where there is no buffer State, as to speak, between the Board and the teacher?—I ought to say, perhaps, with regard to my former answer on the subject of the inadvisability of inspectors recommending directly the promotion and grading of teachers that my difficulty has always been this; it is very easy to criticise the present system, but it is extremely difficult to suggest anything which can be put in its place. It is easy, of course, to point to the inadvisability of an inspector exercising these powers (and on that point I entertain no doubt whatever), but, on the other hand, if you ask me who should exercise them, I really hardly know what to reply, though I gave the question a great deal of thought. The difficulty obviously is that managers in this country have not got the same of financial responsibility which weighs upon the English authorities in appointments. That is the greatest difficulty that I have always felt in the whole matter. The English local Board is stopped from promoting an unsuitable teacher by the idea that if he is quite unsuitable the grant is

reduced. In the same way I feel a difficulty about appeals. Of course, the appeal has to be transmitted by the manager, but in one sense there is very little to make him hesitate to endorse the teacher's appeal, nothing that I can see in Ireland. I think that appeals in Ireland should, when made by teachers, be dealt with in the ordinary way; the inspector must be asked what is his explanation, and should the teacher be shown to have a *prima facie* case, the school should be inspected by a senior inspector.

10516. The teachers say that appeals in certain cases ought to be heard by the National Board itself. Do you think that should be done?—I think it might be done in certain cases. That would be analogous, I presume, to the procedure which takes place in the case of a grant local authority like the London County Council, whose appeals by teachers on certain subjects are heard by a small sub-committee of the Council, at which the teacher can be represented by legal advice; these subjects may not be connected with the conduct of the school, but may be cases of alleged misconduct, drunkenness, and so on. My difficulty is that if an inspector says that a school is inefficient, it is useless for a Committee of the National Board to investigate it. In a case of misconduct, I think it might be able to do so.

10517. In fact, they are not experts?—No, they are not experts, and they could not tell without visiting the school, even if they were experts.

10518. Now, about the premises: what is your experience with regard to the premises of Irish schools?—I thought the town premises were very badly planned—very badly planned.

10519. In what respect?—The absence of classrooms mainly.

10520. Anything about the shape of the rooms?—Yes, the rooms were much too big, and more like bars than schools.

10521. It is extremely difficult to arrange classes?—Yes.

10522. Did you find cases of schools built in comparatively recent times, where the planning was also on very indifferent lines?—Oh, yes; I did see one or two schools which which were still planned in that way, a very large main room and two or three very inadequate class rooms, very tiny class rooms.

10523. Did you notice anything in the fitting up of these class rooms?—They were occasionally fitted with a very bad gallery.

10524. With narrow seats and no backs?—Very narrow seats with no backs.

10525. Absolutely unsuitable?—Yes; they represented, as far as I can recollect, the kind of building that goes back to 1850 or 1860 in the annals of the English Department, and at that time they were deliberately recommended in the then state of opinion with regard to education.

10526. Is it your idea that the plans of all schools should be submitted to an expert appointed by the Board? I mean not merely an expert in architecture, but in school architecture, who thoroughly understood what a good school should be?—I think the plans should always be submitted to such a person. I do not know how far it is done at present, because I presume most plans are submitted to the Board of Works.

10527. And you think the plan ought to be submitted to the National Board in every case?—Yes, certainly.

10528. Did you come across cases of overcrowding?—Yes. I came across some very bad cases. With regard to your suggestion about the Board of Works, I do not know whether the Board of Works has already such an expert, and, if so, I can conceive that considerable difficulties might arise with two experts. As to overcrowding, I came across some very bad overcrowding in Ballymasareit, and in some of the Belfast schools, and in some Dublin schools—some very bad overcrowding.

10529. And there is no way practically of stopping it?—No way of stopping it. The only alternative is to turn the children out into the street.



22nd May, 1913.]

Mr. F. H. DAZE, examined.

[Continued.]

10553. Would you tell us to what extent you think it generally advisable to apply examination tests?—Of course, there are a great many things which the inspector can satisfy himself about by inspection as the strict sense of this term, such, for example, as the premises and the general condition of the school, which are obvious; also the method that the teacher is employing, and so forth. Besides that, I think the inspector can also see that the instruction has been effective by the manner of the children, if they are alert and intelligent. They should know what they profess to have been taught and that is best ascertained by asking them a few questions.

10554. And it is important that the children should have sufficient confidence in themselves to be able to answer readily?—Yes, and one thing that an inspector, I think, specially desires to test is the children's power of applying their knowledge to questions put in some unfamiliar form, though the questions should be well within their range. By the manner of putting the questions, one power, which is very valuable, can be developed in the children, that is, the power of turning their knowledge to a new use. I generally set some exercises to the children on a level with what they have just been doing, or possibly have been doing in a lower class, some simple sums, for instance, and ask them to write a composition.

10555. You think that such tests as those are necessary in most cases?—Yes. I think that they are specially necessary in bad schools, where one wishes to satisfy the teacher by definite evidence that the children know very little.

10556. They also give satisfaction to the teachers in good schools?—They do; the teachers in good schools like to see their work tested.

10557. Would you be in favour of an individual examination?—No, I would never make up, so to speak, the percentages. I would never make the examination a means of testing whether this or that child has reached a definite standard. That was a pernicious feature of the old annual examination; I am not very clear as to that. The moment you do that the minimum becomes a maximum.

10558. Now, we had a certain amount of evidence that under the present system, where inspection can only be confined to managers by post, the notice will reach the manager on the morning of the visit, so that the managers and inspectors very often fail to meet. Is not that very undesirable on both sides?—Yes.

10559. Of course, you have had a certain amount of experience of that in England lately?—Yes, occasionally; managers in England say occasionally that under the present system they do not meet the inspector as frequently as they used to—they do not know what he is about to appear, and they happen to be away.

10560. Do you see any objection to giving a longer notice?—None that I can think of, if you can trust your manager not to divulge it, and I think they ought to be trusted.

10561. You think that on the whole it would be inadvisable that the teacher should know?—Yes; I think it rather disturbs the teacher; very often it is a disturbing element, and, of course, no inspector wishes special preparation made by the teacher for the visit. You want to see the school in its normal working.

10562. And otherwise you might have a carefully prepared lesson?—Quite so.

10563. There is one point brought before us, that when the teacher in the old days got a long notice, he was able to get all his children together and show the best that he could do, whereas now he is rather at the mercy of the weather and chance, and possibly at the mercy of the inspector's visit there is a very small attendance and some of the best scholars are away?—I should say that an experienced inspector ought to be able to discount those matters.

10564. He should hear of them?—Yes.

10565. And he ought to make allowance?—Yes.

10566. But the question of the manager is a difficult one?—The question of the manager is difficult. I may say my own practice has been to write to the manager a letter marked "Confidential" some weeks

before, to say: "I am coming to your school on such and such a day, and I shall be obliged if you will treat this as confidential," and I found that that worked very satisfactorily.

10567. Mr. HAZARD.—There was no rule during the day of your visit as the time for sending the notice?—No, nothing of that sort.

10568. Mr. HAZARD.—Supposing this present system of grading of schools went by the board, there would be no necessity for annual reports?—No.

10569. It is only the system of grading that really compels the annual report?—Quite.

10570. What has been your general view of the result on education of the abolition of examination in England—has efficiency increased?—I should say unhesitatingly "Yes" to that. The best schools, in my view, are better than they ever were in England, far better than they were under the old results system. I think it is possible that in a number of mediocre schools the abolition of examination at first was attended by a falling off in accuracy. The teacher had been accustomed for many years to one system, and had not had any time to adjust himself to another. I think that is gradually coming round in English schools; but I have not the least doubt of the great advance.

10571. Do you see any falling off in any subject?—I think in arithmetic. There has been a falling off in some of the best schools; but in some of the mediocre schools there has been a falling off in accuracy of arithmetic, and, perhaps, in accuracy of spelling, though I should require to qualify these remarks a good deal. Formerly, as a fact, the children learned to spell accurately words that were completely useless to them, and it is quite true that they can no longer spell those words accurately; but I do not know that I regret that. On the other hand, I should be prepared to admit that possibly in spelling of common words and in arithmetic in mediocre schools there has been a falling off in accuracy; but in the best schools, I am quite clear that the pupils are more accurate and more intelligent than they ever have been.

10572. The Manager or House.—With regard to the mediocre schools, what is your opinion of the intelligence of the children?—I think it is much greater even in the mediocre schools than it was. They are more alert, though they may be sometimes more inaccurate.

10573. Mr. HAZARD.—We have had a certain amount of evidence as to employees of labour (and I think it is the same in England) complaining that applicants for clerical work in offices and that sort of thing, cannot satisfy the tests that they used to satisfy. Can you tell us anything about that in England?—Well, we occasionally have had complaints of the same kind. I am bound to say that whenever one has a chance of investigating them, you frequently find that the basis of the complaint is small, and that it is a generalisation upon a very few instances; and, of course, in any system which is turning out such an enormous number of children as the schools in England turn out, you are bound to have a certain number of failures.

10574. And then, those people assume that they know how to test the intelligence of the child, do they not?—Well, often, you find that tests that are really unsuitable are applied, such as technical tests.

10575. And formerly the child came and said: "That is my course," and he was tested on that special course, and he had been specially trained to pass this particular test?—Certainly.

10576. Now, with the curriculum a good deal wider, you might almost put it in this way, that he is like a machine running untrained?—Quite.

10577. When he comes to pass the examination?—Yes.

10578. But, at any rate, so far as your experience, and that of your colleagues go, there is very little in that complaint that has been very often made?—I do not think there is very much. I am not prepared to say absolutely that in particular kinds of arithmetic, for example, in long tots, the children can do now as well as they used, possibly ten years ago.

22nd May, 1913.]

Mr. F. H. DALL, examined.

[Continued.]

10589. And is it not very undesirable that they should?—We know that that particular proficiency was produced at the expense of everything else.

10590. Now, in your report, you said a good deal about the multiplication of schools in Ireland. I think that since your visit a good many of the small schools have been closed. Would you kindly tell us why the small schools seemed to you to be wasteful?—Well, of course, it is financially wasteful, because you have to employ two head teachers where one would suffice. It is educationally wasteful, because the multiplication of small schools means that you cannot get a proper distribution of teaching power.

10591. And has it not also another disadvantage; do not these small schools mean the non-employment of assistants and inefficient training of assistants?—Yes.

10592. And it is undesirable to put young men straight out of the Training College into the higher posts?—It is undesirable.

10593. And did you find that in the small country schools there was a large proportion of man teachers?—Certainly.

10594. What is the great disadvantage of man teachers in country schools?—Well, in the first place, the great majority of the children will be girls and infants. Now, a man can know something about the instruction of girls, but, in my opinion, very few men know much about the instruction of infants.

10595. And in any case they do not practise it?—No man inspector would be willing to take on the instruction of infants, though he knows, no doubt, how it ought to be done; but it is one of those cases where the difficulty cannot possibly become the justification.

10596. You are aware that the case of small schools is an extremely thorny question in Ireland?—Yes, I gathered that.

10597. But certainly you saw cases in which you thought that there was a great deal of needless multiplication?—Yes; you call a school small in England when it has 50 to 100 children. I should call that a small school.

10598. Sir HIRSH WILKINSON.—You were referring to this multiplication of small schools. Now, did you take into consideration the distance between the schools?—Yes, I did; but what struck me as most undesirable was the multiplication of small separate schools, sometimes in the same village, a separate infant boys' school and a separate girls' school, and so on.

10599. In those cases, was there a distinction in the religious denomination?—Not in the cases I had in mind.

10600. You had cases where they were actually in the same village and of the same denomination?—Yes, there were cases in the same village, of the same denomination, where they were divided into separate schools. I see that in paragraph 128 of my report I mention some instances.

10601. Apart from those cases, you recognised, of course, the difficulty of having anything but small schools in many of the places?—Yes; certainly.

10602. And the small schools are more necessary in Ireland than they are in England on account of the distances?—Both on account of the distances and on account also of the denominational difficulty.

10603. Those two things combine to make the necessity for small schools in Ireland greater than it is in England?—Yes, the second point, the denominational one, is one that lies outside my purview. Assuming that certain schools, on account of the denominational question, are necessary, the necessity is greater in Ireland.

10604. And, of course, in the matter of distances, that also applies?—Yes.

10605. That applies now?—Yes.

10606. You were recommending a certain application of the provisions of the English Act with regard to compulsory attendance. I have got here the Act which applies to Ireland on that subject, the Irish Education Act, 1899, and it is a coincidence that it

contains some of your recommendations with regard to exemptions:—"In every place to which this section applies (and it applies to all towns and to all counties which adopt the provisions of the Act) the parents of every child not less than six, nor more than fourteen years of age, shall cause the child to attend school during such number of days in the year, and for such time on each day of attendance, as are prescribed in the First Schedule to this Act, unless there is a reasonable cause for non-attendance." "Any of the following reasons shall be a reasonable cause for non-attendance of the child, namely, that the child has been prevented from attending school by sickness, domestic necessity, or by reason of being engaged in necessary operations of husbandry and the in-gathering of crops, or giving assistance in fishing or other work requiring to be done at a particular time or season or other unavoidable or reasonable cause." That makes, as I think you will say, very ample provision?—Yes, very ample provision.

10607. And in the second section it says: "A person shall not, except as in this Act mentioned, take into his employment in any place to which this section applies, any child except for the setting or planting of potatoes, hay-making, or harvest?"—Yes.

10608. A child may thus be employed by his parent in necessary operations of husbandry and those other things, and, of course, in those cases no penalty applies to the parent employer, but a stranger employer can employ the children for the setting or planting of potatoes, hay-making, or harvesting; and then, a person shall not be deemed to have taken the child into his employment in contravention of this Act if it is proved to the satisfaction of the Court having cognisance of the case, that during the employment there was not within two miles, measured according to the nearest road from the residence of the child, any National School, or other efficient school, which the child could attend, subject to the provisions of section 1 of this Act. You consider that there is ample exemption there?—I think those exemptions are ample. It is not for me to say whether they are desirable exemptions; but I was advised in Ireland that the exemption of children employed in husbandry was practically imperative.

10609. This provision with regard to the number of attendances, I believe, is smaller than it is in England. The number of attendances for the purpose of the first section of this Act shall be 76 complete attendances in each half-year, ending respectively the 30th day of June, and the 31st day of December?—That is 180 in the year?

10610. Yes—I think complete attendance in an Irish school means attendance the whole day, and that means 300 attendances in England, but 180 is smaller than in England. We require now in England 380 attendances per year.

10611. But you have not 380 working days in the year?—380 attendances. An attendance in England is half-a-day. Our schools meet in two absolutely separate sessions, morning and afternoon.

10612. The CHAIRMAN.—That is 175 days?—175.

10613. Sir HIRSH WILKINSON.—In England, it is 175 full days, instead of 180 in Ireland?—Yes.

10614. The case where overcrowding exists, of course, is to be deprecated; it is not a sufficient alternative for the building of new schools; but you can recognise, I think, that overcrowding, as an alternative to the turning of the pupils out on the street, because there is no other school for them to go to, is, if not altogether allowable, certainly not subject to the same condemnation as if there was a school for them to go to?—No; it depends on the degree. I found one or two cases of overcrowding in my visits to Ireland where really it would have been healthier for the children to be on the streets. If a school is only slightly overcrowded, it might be better for the children to be there than on the streets.

10615. Mr. HENRY.—But would not the reduction that you suggested, by the removal of children under five, largely relieve those schools from overcrowding?—I am afraid I no longer know, if I ever knew it, the number of children under five in the Irish schools now, especially in the rural districts.



10826. **Sir HIRSH WILKINSON.**—With regard to the want of interest which you referred to in the case of people in Ireland in the matter of education, you have suggested the creating of interests by associations of managers; and, of course, the payment of fees did create interest before; but, I take it, we may assume that whatever interest was created by that payment of fees is no longer to be considered at all, and no one suggests now the feasibility of resuming the payment of fees when there is a compulsory attendance Act and when no fees have been paid. I suppose you assent to that?—Oh, yes.

10827. Another means, perhaps, of creating interest in education on the part of parents in the matter of home lessons. How is that dealt with in England?—We leave it to the teacher of the school. The Board has laid down no rule about those lessons at all; but in a fair number of schools, particularly in the more prosperous districts, the children do as a fact do home lessons, and I think it is a desirable thing that they should, where they have the books to do them with, and where they are old enough.

10828. I understand from a report which has just been issued that there are 49,265 children between the ages of three and five, who would be excluded from the school if your proposal were carried out?—Yes.

10829. And that would relieve the competition to a considerable extent?—Yes.

10830. **Mr. HENRY.**—It is 7.8 per cent.—I should certainly have no hesitation in saying at once that if schools are overcrowded, I think the exclusion of children under five is preferable to allowing the overcrowding to continue—disagreeably preferable. The harm that is done to the children by being excluded is much outweighed by the gain there is in working under healthier conditions.

10831. I suppose if you had a choice of making an exclusion, you would exclude children between three and five rather than those over five?—Certainly.

10832. **Sir HIRSH WILKINSON.**—Mr. Harrison asked some questions with regard to the making of reports, and I think he did draw your attention to the fact that under the present system the examiner, who is appointed from amongst the clerks, has not only the making of the reports, but has the issuing of reprimands and censures, without any reference, I believe, to any higher authority, although such may not have been recommended by the inspectors. Do you consider that a suitable matter of administrative action for a clerk, even of experience?—No; not without a definite recommendation from the inspector. If the inspector has definitely recommended the reprimand, then it is merely a clerical duty of the officer to give effect to it.

10833. I refer to Mr. Parnell's evidence, particularly questions 3315 to 3325 (Reads extract from evidence).—I do not consider it desirable that censures or reprimands should be issued to a teacher except on the direct recommendation of the inspector, and I think the inspector should be made responsible for the making of the recommendation on the subject. I do not see how anybody else is really able to do it. He is the only person who has seen the school and who knows the whole circumstances, and if he is wrong, he must take the consequences.

10834. The system which prevailed before that, to which Mr. Harrison referred, was this: that the very same person who now issues the reprimands did the noting, and suggested what should be done to the chief inspector, who examined it, and either approved or disapproved of it, after considering the case; but I take it that you consider that there ought to be an expression of opinion, in the first instance, at any rate, obtained from the inspector concerned?—Certainly. I am not in the least limiting, and I do not wish to be understood as limiting, the power of the examiner to refer the report back to the inspector, and say: "This report is written in very strong language. Do you wish us to issue a reprimand?"

10835. **Mr. HENRY.**—There is a query in the report in which the inspector is asked to state whether any action is necessary, and he leaves that question un-

answered?—Well, he should be asked in that case. The examiner should refer the report back to him and say: "Will you kindly tell us what your views are about this?"

10836. **Sir HIRSH WILKINSON.**—There was one consideration with regard to the appointment of an unsuitable teacher, which I suggest has weight in the mind of the manager. As you are aware, the Priest or the Rector is to meet among the managers, and in a small community to appoint an undesirable person would, as I suggest, weigh heavily on the mind of either of those persons under the present circumstances?—I am quite sure it would as regards unsuitability of character; but I was referring more to unsuitable educational capacity. I am quite sure that a manager would not appoint a person of unsuitable character.

10837. You were asked with regard to a committing of appeals. Now, in cases where a teacher appeals against a report of an inspector, would it not be desirable to have a committee who would be able to say that re-inspection should be made?—Unless a re-inspection is ordered as a matter of course, I do not know; that is so much a matter of internal administration. I should have thought that the obvious person to advise as to whether re-inspection was necessary would be a senior inspector. I presume in Ireland the Chief Inspector, so long as there are no divisional inspectors, would be the obvious person to revise the report.

10838. You consider there ought to be some person with semi-judicial authority to determine whether a re-inspection would be desirable?—Yes; I think the demand for re-inspection is practically an appeal against the inspector, and the obvious persons to hear that appeal are the inspector's immediate chiefs, that is, the senior inspectors.

10839. **Mr. CONNOR.**—You think it would be desirable that when an appeal is received, it should be referred to the chief inspector?—I do.

10840. **Sir HIRSH WILKINSON.**—The Chairman has received a statement of the practice now observed by the English Board of Education with regard to the local authorities. This shows the relations between the central authority and the local authority. And here is a memorandum furnished by Mr. Blair, the Education Officer of the London County Council, on the subject of the teachers' increments. Would you kindly glance at these. (Document handed to witness).—The general practice in England, so far as I know, among the large local authorities, is that which I think I have described, namely, that where there is a regular scale of increment, the teacher will, as a rule, obtain his increment, unless the inspector of the local authority, if there is one, or, say, our inspector, reports that his work is unsatisfactory.

10841. **The CHAIRMAN.**—And that involves in the end loss of a grant?—Yes; especially in the case of a head teacher who had an unsatisfactory report, it might involve in the end a loss of a grant.

10842. I do not quite understand the system of promotion by the local authority?—A great authority like London divides its schools into various grades according to their size, first of all; then, if the headship of a school in the lowest grade falls vacant, applications are invited. The applicant must have had some years' service as assistant before he is eligible to apply, and then these applications are considered, and reports obtained on the men from the inspectors of the authority; but I believe that the appointments are made by a sub-committee of the authority, who interview a selected number of candidates. Then the same procedure holds with regard to the headship of a school of larger size falling vacant.

10843. A school with a higher salary?—Yes, with a higher salary; again head teachers of a lower salary apply, and their claims are considered by the authority. The general practice is that four or five people are interviewed.

10844. But for all teachers in the lowest grade of schools, there is a maximum fixed beyond which increments cannot go?—Yes; that is so.

\* Vide Appendix XXIV.

| Vide Appendix XXV.

10663. And then that teacher, when a chance arises of a higher grade school, goes in and gets a bigger salary with a bigger school?—Yes; roughly speaking, in England, in order to be promoted, you must obtain a bigger school than the one you have.

10664. Suppose a person is going from a school of the lowest grade to a school of the next higher grade, how far has he to rely on the report of the inspector?—Not necessarily at all; but, no doubt, if he has received a very favourable report during his tenure of office in the lower grade, he now puts that in to the authority as part of his evidence, so to speak, that he is qualified.

10665. The Bismar or Ross.—The reports of the inspectors are also further testimonials?—Yes; occasionally, no doubt, the authorities do consult the inspectors privately. The authorities write a letter saying: "We should be glad to have your private opinion about the candidate; but it is essential that the entire responsibility for the appointment rests with the committee. The inspector may express his opinion, but the Committee are not bound to follow it."

10666. The CHAIRMAN.—But their local inspectors have considerable influence?—I have no doubt that authorities frequently do pay attention to what the inspector tells them, when they have inspectors of their own. A great authority like the London authority employs about 80 inspectors of its own, and, therefore, they can obtain very close knowledge of the performance of individual teachers.

10667. They pay more frequent visits?—Oh, yes; one large part of their duty consists in getting to know the performance of particular individual teachers in London.

10668. The Bismar or Ross.—I suppose the promotion of an English teacher would involve his change of residence?—Yes, except so far as he is promoted within a large city, which is a very common case.

10669. In London, it might involve a change of residence, too?—It might and it might not. It might very well involve a change of residence.

10670. Sir HENRY WINTERTON.—You have looked over this statement of the practice in London, which you say is accurate, and I therefore propose to put it in. Have you any observations to make upon it?—The system which the Council has adopted is a system which I have mentioned, that is, that the teacher's increments are awarded, unless his work is reported to be distinctly unsatisfactory. It throws on the inspector the burden, which he ought to bear, of selecting an unsuitable person, and it does not put upon him the burden, which he ought not to bear, of promoting people. Head teachers are promoted, I believe, without being subject to any special report. They are not required to have annual reports as assistants are. If any head teacher in London were quite unsatisfactory, it certainly would become known to the authority.

10671. I had great pleasure in reading over your report, and there was one point that I thought you might give us a little light upon. The terms of reference are to inquire and report how typical Irish elementary day schools compare with similarly circumstanced public elementary schools in England. It is the expression "similarly circumstanced" that creates a doubt in my mind as to the circumstances?—I think by that expression were meant the rural schools. There would be no good in comparing an Irish rural school with a big English town school, and the instruction was to compare it with English rural schools.

10672. You were, as a matter of fact, better acquainted at that time with the Lincolnshire schools—you had an acquaintance with them?—I had.

10673. I do not know whether your attention was called to the report of the conference of the National Union of Teachers, where Mr. DARR, in his presidential address, referred to the Lindsey and Salway areas as starving their schools?—Yes. No doubt my report upon the salaries of the Irish teachers would now have to be modified, in view of the great changes which have happened in England since 1902. I specially pointed out on page 27 that the conclusions would necessarily be subject ultimately to the modifi-

cation produced by the Act of 1902. The teachers' salaries in England have considerably increased as a result of that Act in most districts.

10674. In your observations with regard to the salaries, you did not compare the salaries in the large towns in Ireland with Kesteven?—No; I never compared the town salaries; but I really have not the means at my disposal for saying exactly what modifications might have to be made.

10675. You are confirmed now in your anticipation that what you wrote would now require modification with regard to any comparison?—Certainly some modification would be required, because salaries in England have altered very considerably since the Act of 1902.

10676. You were asked with regard to the question of notice of an inspector's visit. In your and Mr. Stephen's report, page 60, 229th and 230th paragraphs, you have this statement, that the inspector should visit each school, sometimes without giving notice, in order to see its normal working, and at other times, when a more detailed inspection was required, he would give notice to the head master or head mistress. That refers, of course, to secondary schools?—Yes.

10677. But would that not apply to primary schools?—It might, in certain cases. It might be quite advisable, in certain cases, for the inspector to give notice to the head master of the primary school. It depends on circumstances.

10678. There are three inspections usual in the primary schools in Ireland. One of these is the annual inspection, and it is suggested that of that annual inspection, on which everything depends, the teacher might receive notice, not notice so far beforehand as to enable him to work up his classes specially for that visit, but that at least some days' notice should be given, in which he might say to his scholars or to the scholars' parents: "Now, I know that this is your pocket gathering time; but the inspector is coming, and I should like the inspector to see all my boys and to form a fair opinion of my school." I take it that you would not condemn that in any way, and that would be a right and proper thing to do; for you see that under that Act it is perfectly open to the parents to keep their children away for agricultural purposes, and it would hamper, I take it, an inspector, if he had to find out on each occasion that he was going to have his annual inspection, whether that was a particularly busy time or not?—I do not think so, very much. I may tell you that an experienced inspector discounts the small attendance, or the fact that the upper classes are denuded of some of their best boys. He will discount that kind of thing quite easily.

10679. We have complaints of the teachers that that discount is not allowed?—There you take me out of my province. All I say is that an experienced inspector, as ordinary district inspector, in England, constantly discounts circumstances of that kind. If he happens to go to a school which is closed for some reason for part of the day, he won't expect as many children there as he would if it had been open all the time.

10680. The CHAIRMAN.—If there was a complaint that the inspector did not take these things into account would it come up to you?—I don't know that it would come up to me. It would in the first instance probably be referred to the man himself, and then, if the case seemed to warrant it, it would be referred to a divisional inspector.

10681. The Bismar or Ross.—Who would decide as to which party would deal with it?—The examiner would decide it; but it is the recognised procedure in the first instance to refer to the man himself, and then he might refer to me, but it would probably go to the divisional inspector.

10682. When the examiner based the views of the inspector concerned, he would decide whether the case should be sent any further?—Yes, he would; but I think he would probably, in fact, I think he would be almost certain, in the case of a complaint backed by the authority, to send it to the divisional inspector, unless it were proved to be a very trifling one.

22nd May, 1915.]

Mr. F. H. DALE examined.

[Continued.]

10653. Sir HIRSH WINSTON.—An appeal in Ireland is more important than an appeal in England, seeing that upon the report of the inspector the teacher's increment of salary depends?—Yes.

10654. So that what might be sufficient in England in the matter of appeal would scarcely be sufficient in Ireland, as so much depends on it?—Yes, I quite see that. There are very few appeals in England, but when they are made and backed up by the authority, they are sometimes important cases. That generally arises in cases where the dismissal of the teacher is demanded by the Board, and that, of course, is very serious.

10655. That would receive particular attention?—Yes.

10656. Would you draw any distinction between secondary and primary schools with regard to recommendation 229?—As to sending notice to the head master of the visit?

10657. Yes?—No, I could not draw any distinction between different classes of schools. What we had in mind there was that there were a great many topics that might arise with regard to a secondary school, especially with regard to a boarding school, which one would want to discuss particularly with the head master. You would want to inspect the premises where the boarders live, and so forth, and you do not have the same number of topics of that kind in a primary school.

10658. But you would not see any objection to the application of that to the case of a primary school?—I think it should be left to the discretion of the inspector whether he sends notice or not.

10659. And then on the two other occasions in the year he might make surprise visits?—Yes; but all the same, I should leave it to his discretion. It is a matter on which it is very difficult to lay down a general rule, because so much depends on the particular school and the particular master and manager.

10660. I believe you said you were not brought into intimate contact with the operation of the system detailed in Mr. Baird's statement, but you, no doubt, know about the general operation of it, and so far as you have heard is it working smoothly?—I think that really in order to get precise information the question should be addressed to the local country people; but I have never heard any complaint from the teachers. That is all I can say.

10661. Mr. COOPER.—As I understood you said you disapproved of any system of marking of schools under the designation of "excellent," or "very good," or "good," and so on. You think it objectionable to run up the work of a school in one word?—Yes, I do not think you can really do it with such a complex organisation as that of a school. It is not to say that you cannot roughly discriminate schools, as I said to Mr. Harrison, into "good," "average," and "bad." You can; but your class of "good" would in that case include such a variety that really it is not the best way of expressing what one means.

10662. Then may I take it that your view is that a general report should be prepared by the inspector after visiting a school as to whether the school is satisfactory or unsatisfactory?—Certainly, that is my view, and the report will make it quite clear to any person reading it whether the school is officially, in the judgment of the inspector, a satisfactory or an unsatisfactory school.

10663. I am quite at one with you in your view of the desirability of the Resident Commissioner having personal knowledge of the work done in schools, and I think outside that that you will agree with me that it is undesirable that he should visit a school in the position of what may be called Inspector-General, and influence the judgment of inspectors who are competent men themselves and experienced men?—I should not like to go so far as that if I may say so. It is difficult to offer an expression of opinion on that matter. I think the Resident Commissioner, like the head of any other department, has a right to obtain information about his sub-ordinates in any way that he likes to take, and if he expects that an inspector's

judgment is not to be trusted, I should myself see no objection to his going and looking at a school.

10664. But if the Resident Commissioner goes further and over the head of the chief inspector, who is an expert of 30 years' standing, expresses disagreement, and puts himself in the position as to say of a superior judge of the school to the chief inspector, do you think that desirable; in fact, not alone do you think it desirable, but do you think it defensible for the Resident Commissioner to do that?—I think in extreme cases it might be defensible; if, for example, it were the only way of saving the teacher from a great injustice being done him in the opinion of the Resident Commissioner.

10665. Quite so, but if it was the purpose of what the teacher would call preventing justice being done, would that alter your view?—No, I think not. I think I can conceive cases in which it might be defensible. I think it is another question altogether whether it is expedient. That is my general feeling on it. I think it might be quite defensible, that is to say, there might be very good reasons for it, but whether it is expedient is another question, on which I do not feel competent to give an opinion. I should want to know the whole circumstances to give an opinion on that question.

10666. I would have no objection in giving the whole circumstances, except that it might weary you?—I would really rather not. I should want to see the school, and everything of that kind, but I agree, as a matter of general principle, with Mr. Harrison, that, as a rule, it is not expedient; indeed it is distinctly inexpedient, I should say, for the head of a department to overrule his chief expert for any years, but I am not going to commit myself to the assertion that he never should do so.

10667. You told us that you never test individual children as to whether they have reached a certain standard of instruction?—Yes, that is so.

10668. Do you think that with any system of inspection, as distinct from individual examination, the pupils are likely to show an effort equal to what they would show if they knew they were to be examined?—Certainly, if examination is defined as including a certain number of questions and tests. In fact, I should say that one of the disadvantages of the former system of examination was that the strain on nervous children was too great. I entertain no doubt of that.

10669. But do you think that the existing arrangement that we have in our schools, with which I presume you are acquainted, of the inspector dropping into a school for an hour's visit, and asking a child or two a question, and not asking the other children any questions at all, but observing the discipline and order of the school, is likely to bring forth as much effort from the pupils as if they knew they were to have an examination of each pupil. I am not asking now which is the most desirable method, but is it likely to draw forth as much effort from the children as if they knew they had to face on a certain day an examination of each pupil?—The examination imposes so much strain upon them.

10670. So that you think that they would not put forth as much effort?—They would not put forth as much undesirable effort. The strain is not so great.

10671. I am quite with you that the results system was vicious, that its principle was vicious, and its practice was injurious, and that too much was put on the teacher and too much put on the children. Do you think, or have you at all considered, whether we have not possibly gone too far in the other direction and expect the children now to do too little?—I am afraid I cannot give an answer to that question. Before I could do so I should have to see a good deal of the way in which the Irish inspectors actually conduct their inspection. I object myself to the antithesis drawn between inspection and examination. Inspection, as I understand it, includes a certain amount of what I call informal examination, and examination is useless without some inspection.

10672. But we have had it in evidence from the chief inspectors that on the instructions it was

2nd May, 1918.]

Mr. F. H. DALE, examined.

[Continued.]

quite open (they did not say that it was desirable, but that it was quite open) to a senior inspector to go into a good National School and lower the mark without asking a single question?—I should say, as a general rule, that would be wrong from the point of view of inspection. I think before you lower the mark of a school it is very desirable to convince the teacher that there is good ground for it, and the simplest way of doing that is to show him what the children actually do.

10675. What incentive to exertion has an average boy in a primary school at the present time?—I think a good teacher will always contrive a sufficient incentive to exertion, you know. The children of every primary school are very largely influenced by the teacher, and in the hands of a good teacher they can be made interested in anything. Everything depends on the teacher.

10676. But all teachers are not ideal teachers?—That is certainly true.

10677. But, then, in the hand of a teacher who is not a man of a particularly good class from the educational point of view, what incentive have the pupils to work well?—You mention him as being a teacher who cannot give an incentive, but a good teacher is primarily a person who can get good work out of his pupils, and if he cannot do that, nothing external that you can devise will completely remedy it.

10678. But if a boy has to prepare for an examination it is not always an incentive to him to work, or generally so?—As a matter of fact, what happens is that the examination has to be made to suit the ordinary boy, the average boy, and, therefore, all the clever boys are wasting their time. That was the first result of the old system, which everyone engaged in it recognised. They could get through quite well and yet do much more than they did. You simply transferred your labour from one set of boys to the other. When a teacher was instructing the backward boys the clever boys idled.

10679. Then it would be a question from the point of view of country, where is the gain and where is the loss, if you turn up the gain and the loss and note whether you have more clever boys or more idle boys?—But it is not a question of that particular point; there are many other reasons against formal examination in elementary schools—many other.

10680. Now, in withdrawing from the pupils the necessity of passing an examination, do you not withdraw from them a very important element in education, a settled purpose of desiring to succeed?—No, I think not. For one thing, the teacher in any decent school examines them frequently, I presume. I do not know whether in Ireland it is so, but in England frequently prizes are given by managers and others.

10681. Prizes are very rare in Ireland. I could, perhaps, say a good deal for the examination by a head master of a large school with a large staff of assistants, but I cannot see the utility of it, or what special stimulus it would give to the boys of a one-teacher school, to be examined by a man who is examining them every day, and most of our schools are one-teacher schools?—He should not be examining them every day, he should be teaching them.

10682. But he knows their capacity?—It is quite true that children like to be examined; they like occasionally to show what they can do. That is quite true, and a good teacher gives them opportunities to show what they can do against time tests in other similar ways.

10683. You have told us, I think, that in your experience in England, and we have had the same from the present officials and from ex-officials of the National Board, there is less accuracy in spelling and arithmetic than there was. Do you not think that is a loss?—Yes, that taken by itself is a loss, but I guarded myself by saying that that only happened in mediocre schools; as against that, you have to put the gain that the children are undoubtedly more intelligent, if they are less accurate, and more alert. The great evil of the results system was that it aimed simply at cramming the child with facts as against making him alert and intelligent.

10684. But do you not think that there was some advantage, from the point of view of memory training, in cramming the child with facts?—No, because the facts were generally not facts which it was worth anybody's while to remember.

10685. But at what stage of a boy's life will you train his memory if you cannot train it between five and fourteen years of age—at what stage is he likely to undergo the same drudgery?—Do not misunderstand me as meaning that there should not be what is called the training of children's memory. I have a great belief in children being trained to remember things, but what they were trained to remember formerly was not of value. They were trained to remember such things as all the Capes and Bays round the Coast of Great Britain.

10686. That was the system?—That was the system. I do not say anything against the practice of making children learn by heart. I think it is most valuable to make them learn by heart a great many things.

10687. But individual examination had, at all events, the merit of making a boy or girl depend on themselves on a certain day. Is not that so?—Yes, that is true.

10688. Is it not important to teach children self-reliance?—Yes, but I think a good teacher will teach it better during the year. In the whole course of his instruction a good teacher will be teaching that, and in the case of a bad teacher you will not really produce it by just examining on one day in the year.

10689. But he has been trained all the year?—No, excuse me, that is exactly what he was not. He was only trained for a very small part of the year, because the great point under the results system was to have an average standard, and work for that. The clever boys got up to that standard with about two months' grinding. The invariable practice under the old system was to wait till the last three months of the school year, and then really to go at it for the rest of the year, the other nine months the children idled.

10690. I do not think so?—That was very common.

10691. I do not think it was possible to let the children idle for nine months out of the twelve?—That was the great evil. A clever child could get through the examination quite easily after three months' pressure.

10692. Yes, with regular attendance, but in this country we had not regular attendance?—What happened then was that there was considerable pressure just before the time of examination. Instead of having a steady training spread over the whole year, you had this rush in the last three weeks.

10693. Well, they have repetition in the last four or five weeks, perhaps. Is not repetition desirable?—Yes, but I would much rather have it spread through the year than taken altogether in the last period.

10694. You have very much larger experience than I have, but I cannot imagine how children could be prepared unless they were taught systematically and regularly through the year, with, perhaps, additional energy towards the end of the year in the way of repetition?—Like any other case of examination, it becomes easier the longer the time you take to prepare, but a really clever examiner will manage to catch the children in an incredibly short time in the matters that the inspector is likely to ask.

10695. That may be so in secondary schools or universities, but I will be glad if you will explain to me how that could be done in a short time, how a child could be got, for instance, to calculate the cost of 69 halfpence at £12 12s. 10d. each?—I will tell you exactly how it is done if you like. It is quite simple.

10696. You referred in your very interesting report to the fact that there was a lack of local interest in education in Ireland?—Yes.

10697. That would be on the part of parents?—Yes; I was informed that there was not much interest on the part of parents, but primarily, I think, it referred to people of position, other than the clergy, in the neighbourhood of the National Schools.

22nd May, 1913.]

Mr. F. H. DALL, examined.

[Continued.]

10700. Then it would not be within your knowledge, or you were not informed, that the parents of the children took the keenest interest in these examinations as to whether their children passed or failed?—No; I dare say they would, but I do not know. It was not within my knowledge.

10701. But if you withdraw the examination from them you lessen their interest in the working of the school?—There again a good teacher has numerous ways of keeping interest alive during the whole year, and not confining it to one day. A good teacher will get into touch with the parents of the children, and even an ordinary teacher ought to be able to do that, especially if he lives in the same village, as in the case of a country school.

10702. Have you in England a uniform educational year, or are there any cases in which the schools have years of their own?—The Board has laid down no rule on the subject at all. In most localities the educational authorities now have the same educational year, as it is called, in their area.

10703. But that may differ from the educational year in other areas?—Yes, quite; some will be the 1st of April and others the 1st of August.

10704. And the educational authority does not interfere with that right?—You mean our Department?

10705. Yes?—The central Department does not interfere; it is a matter that is left to the local authority.

10706. Sir Joshua Fitch was a very experienced educationalist, and had a very great knowledge of primary education?—Yes, primary education of many years ago; it must be twenty years ago.

10707. He was a very strong advocate from his experience for individual examination?—That I really do not know. I think he was against the entire abolition of examination; on the other hand, he was equally against payment by results.

10708. Here is the evidence that he gave before the Manual Instruction Commission:—"Individual examination is for its own sake, and for the children's sake, not a grievance, but a privilege. It is the only real safeguard for accurate teaching, and it is the only real way, in my opinion, to avoid slovenly teaching and slovenly inspection"—I should agree with that. That exactly coincides with what I have said. I agree with you if you are not going to put examination into absolute antithesis against inspection. I say you must have both.

10709. The *Brecon or Boss*.—You visited Ireland in 1902 or 1903?—Yes.

10710. And you saw a great many schools in the country at that time, and you had had considerable experience in England prior to that in various parts of the country?—Yes.

10711. And from your experience in England you think Lincolnshire more closely approaches the conditions in Ireland than any other parts of England you were acquainted with?—Yes; I took Lincolnshire because I knew it well, and it was very parallel in condition with parts of Ireland; it was purely agricultural.

10712. Then you told us that the salaries have increased in England since that time, and that, therefore, the comparison made at that time does not hold up to the present?—No, it does not hold; I should have to re-write that part of the report if I were writing now.

10713. When we consider the poverty and general condition of the people in Ireland would you think that, in arranging a scale of salary, you should take not only the salaries of English teachers on the one hand and Irish teachers on the other, but that you should also take the salaries, with the conditions of the population, on both sides?—I should say that would be reasonable, certainly.

10714. And if the earnings of the various classes of society in England were higher than in Ireland it would be reasonable that the salaries of the teachers should be higher?—Yes, I think so.

10715. Would you also take into consideration the cost of living in the two countries?—Certainly.

10716. So that a sovereign in one country might not be the same as a sovereign in the other country?—Yes, I think it is quite reasonable to take that into account as an element.

10717. The money really means its purchasing power. If the purchasing power is greater in one country than another, therefore a sovereign in that country means more than a sovereign in the other?—Yes.

10718. So that all those matters have to be considered?—Certainly.

10719. Well the new system that was started in 1903 was only beginning when you were here?—Yes.

10720. And you found that the teaching was rather mechanical, and I understand you tell us that you found a good deal of accuracy in certain directions?—Yes.

10721. But I gathered from you that it was purely mechanical accuracy?—Yes; but there was a great deal of good teaching. No system of inspection or examination could destroy good teaching, and there was a great deal of good teaching going on.

10722. Did you find much receptivity on the part of teachers and managers with whom you dealt in accepting the new ideas?—Yes, I think on the whole I did. I think on the whole most of the teachers I talked to about it, especially the best teachers, welcomed the new system.

10723. Did you come across many of the inspectors while you were over here?—Yes, a fair number.

10724. Well, what attitude did they take?—I think they all expressed to me their appreciation of the new system.

10725. And that they were prepared to work loyally under it?—Oh, yes.

10726. So that the idea had been prevailing through the country?—Oh, yes.

10727. Were you satisfied, as far as you saw, with the rapidity with which those ideas were prevailing?—I think I was.

10728. Of course, you could offer no opinion as to whether it would be a success in advance?—No, I could not.

10729. I suppose that may be decided at the end of 30 years?—I should undoubtedly expect, if I went to some Irish schools now, to see an advance, a distinct advance; but I have no personal knowledge.

10730. You made a very proper distinction, in my opinion, as to the inspectors, that it would be a difficult thing to put on them the selection of teachers for preferment, and that you thought that the inspectors' duty ought to be confined to refusing the recommendation of such preferment?—Yes.

10731. There seemed to me no difficulty in carrying out your idea so far as increment of salary in the particular grade is concerned, but considering the Irish conditions, can you make any recommendation as to how a teacher should be promoted from grade to grade. In England it is promotion from one school to another school, but how a teacher, remaining in the same school, doing the very same work, is promoted from one grade to another grade, and thus secures a considerable increase in salary, as well as an increase in official position?—Yes; I have always thought that it might be possible to get a system more analogous to the English one, by which you grade schools according to size, and then a teacher would take a transfer from one school to another, and the managers would be the persons responsible for the promotion; but I am bound to admit that, looking to the Irish conditions, I would tie managers much more narrowly than in England.

10732. You know there is this difficulty in Ireland, that in Ireland our political economy has been for years and years to fix everybody in the soil; in fact we try to make them *serfs* of the soil. Now, in England your political economy is to encourage the mobility of labour, the fluidity of labour; you want to have your workers like an army, to be shifted from one part of the country to another at a moment's notice. We have been fixing our farmers in the soil and our agricultural labourers, and now we are

22d May, 1918.]

Mr. F. H. DALE, examined.

[Continued.]

engaged in the occupation of firing our town labourers in houses. Now, your system in England, applied to the rural conditions in Ireland, would mean the transfer of the residences of the teachers from one end of a county to another, or to another county, but the teacher here, like everybody else, has a tendency to become a sedentary person, so that would be a great difficulty?—I quite see that the conditions applicable to England might not be well applicable to Ireland in this matter. The only suggestion that I can offer would be that promotion might conceivably be managed by an association of managers, such as I spoke of.

10731. Do you mean that they should transfer the teachers from one school to another?—No, the plan might apply to teachers remaining in the school. If you had a County Association of Managers of Protestant Schools, let us say, then notice would be given that there were so many promotions to be made, and teachers would be eligible, the conditions of eligibility being fixed by the National Board, and teachers would apply, and those teachers would be interviewed. They would apply to the Committee, and the recommendations of the Committee would weigh largely.

10732. And this would depend largely on the report of the inspector?—Yes.

10733. And the responsibility would fall, not on the inspector, but on the Committee? Your whole point is to try to shift the responsibility from the shoulders of the inspectors to somebody else?—Yes.

10734. You told us about the initial salaries of junior inspectors, that you could offer no opinion, as you did not know the number of university candidates in Ireland that are willing to take up not very fat positions. You can offer no opinion on that point?—No.

10735. With regard to appeals, you made, I think, a very substantial distinction between appeals merely of a technical character with respect to the condition of the school, the efficiency of the instruction, or the educational value of it, and appeals with reference to charges of gross misconduct on the part of the teacher, and I think your opinion was that you should rely either on the junior inspector, or appeal from him to his senior, or from the senior to the chief inspector, to settle a technical appeal?—Yes.

10736. And you thought that the National Board, not being experts, would not be a suitable court for that?—No; I really do not see how they could form an opinion. I think the only person who could reverse an inspector's judgment, so to speak, is another inspector, or another person of the same kind, but a body of laymen sitting outside would not have the material before them for arriving at any conclusion.

10737. Then you only have the material supplied by the inspector, and have to be guided by his judgment?—Yes.

10738. But then, in the case of misconduct, as you say, a body of men like the National Board would form a suitable jury?—Oh, certainly.

10739. To judge of the gravity of their misconduct?—Certainly.

10740. Just as an ordinary jury, say, of men not lawyers will judge of a man's conduct?—Certainly.

10741. Mr. KAVANAGH.—You were speaking of the appointments of inspectors, and you said that you would entirely rely on examination for the purpose of appointments?—I would not rely on a written examination at all, as I think inspectors should be appointed, at an age when written examination is inappropriate, and written examination is not appropriate to anybody after the age of 25 or 26.

10742. Then what would you rely on?—I would rely on reports as to record of a candidate's work and experience as a teacher, his academic qualifications, if he had obtained any, and upon finding out from the persons with whom he had worked for the previous six or seven years what they thought of his personal fitness.

10743. But would you be inclined to give any preference to ex-teachers?—Yes; I think, in fact, a man ought to have had some teaching experience

before he becomes an inspector. I should not myself restrict it to teaching experience in one class of school, but I should require some teaching experience.

10744. Would you approve of an absolute preference being given to the teachers in such appointments?—No, I do not believe in any class of teachers having an absolute preference.

10745. Do you think an ex-teacher makes a better inspector than an ordinary man?—I think an inspector is the better for having had some experience as a teacher, undoubtedly, *ceteris paribus*.

10746. But you would not give it as a right to the teachers to be appointed inspectors?—Do you mean teachers of National schools?

10747. Would you have the National Board always give the preference to ex-teachers?—Do you mean ex-teachers of National schools or of intermediate schools?

10748. Of National schools?—No, I should say that it would be wrong, in my judgment, to take inspectors solely from ex-teachers of National schools, to give them an absolute preference.

10749. Now, about the Compulsory Attendance Act, you said that that was impracticable in Ireland. Why did you say that?—I was advised that public opinion in Ireland would not allow us to make the attendance absolutely compulsory, as we understand it in England, in the rural districts; that it would be making a law that could not possibly be enforced.

10750. But it is enforced in a good many counties in Ireland?—Yes, I understand it is enforced in a good many towns, and I attach no weight to my opinion offered on that subject.

10751. You said it was impracticable?—That was ten years ago. I am not prepared to say now. I have no evidence before me at present as to whether public opinion in Ireland has advanced on that subject or not.

10752. It was only public opinion that you thought was against it?—Certainly; I think it is very desirable that there should be compulsory attendance.

10753. Is public opinion against it in England?—No, it is decidedly for compulsory attendance.

10754. When I talk of public opinion I mean the parents?—Yes. I should say that the parents in England as a whole wish their children to go to school.

10755. You said that it should be made compulsory in a part of the year only?—That was what I suggested. That is the original report.

10756. What did you think about the attendance at the other times?—Well, that I did not know, but I was told it was quite hopeless to expect parents to send their children to school at any time when there were husbandry operations, if the children were wanted for those operations; but you are a better judge than I am as to whether that is true or not.

10757. Well, in my experience of it, I find that the Act works well, and I have seen it work well. Now, some witnesses advocated the raising of the age of boys or girls leaving school from 14 to 15. Would you approve of that, that the children should not leave till 15?—I do approve of that. I think 15 is a better age for the children to leave. The longer children can stay at school the better, provided they are getting a better education. Whether, as a matter of practical position, it is right, is a different question.

10758. Then about the hours of attendance, from 9 to 2.30, with an interval of half-an-hour?—Yes, I must frankly say that in the towns I was rather surprised at those hours of attendance. I think it is desirable that the children should have a longer interval in the middle of the day than half-an-hour.

10759. But in the country there would not be an objection to it?—In the country they might often have a considerable distance to go at the end of the day.

10760. What is your attendance time in England?—The usual hours in towns are from 9 to 12, and then either from 1.30 to 4, or in some towns 2 to 4.30; in the country 9 to 12, and very often in the winter 1 to 4.30, and in the summer generally 1.30 to 4. You must not have less than an hour's interval without special sanction.

10761. You think that a better arrangement than ours?—I do. I do not know the circumstances of Ireland well enough to be able to say that the other arrangement is not necessary.

10762. Then, in answer to Mr. Coffey, you said you preferred intelligence to accuracy?—No, I object to that way of putting it. I like them both. All I mean was that I think it is true that there may be a loss in accuracy, but that you have, on the other hand, to put as against that a certain gain in intelligence and alertness. I do not approve of children having less accuracy; I want both accuracy and intelligence.

10763. The present system has brought about that result?—Yes, it may be said to have done so in certain schools. I think it is fair to say that.

10764. Do you think that that would pay them better in after life from a business point of view?—I think in the schools in which that has happened on the whole the education is so mediocre that it would not affect them in after life.

10765. Mr. KERRIN.—Do you regard yourselves as having reached finality as regards primary education in England?—No, far from it.

10766. Of course, you had the results system, and then it was passed on to us?—Yes.

10767. And I am suggesting to you that if we go on with this present system (which is your present system) you will probably change your minds again?—No, I think we have reached finality in that respect. If you mean whether the system of payment by results has gone for ever, I think it has. In fact, the ultimate objection to payment by results was to having a formal examination of children individually on which the reputation and the salary of the teacher were to depend. You discouraged absolutely all progress in education, because you stopped the teachers from thinking, and it is from the teachers that the improvement of the children should come.

10768. But what I am suggesting is that the pendulum has swung back a little too far?—The best way I can put it is this. Under the present system more depends on the inspectors than used to. It is a more difficult task to inspect a school under the present system than it was to inspect one under the old; but if the inspection is properly conducted, it is a more thorough test of what the school is worth than the old examination was. But, of course, it can be improperly conducted, in which case it is no thorough test at all.

10769. You want the two elements in the test, of course, inspection and examination?—Yes.

10770. And it depends on the relative weight one gives to each?—Yes, if a man never asks any questions of the children at all, but simply confines himself to listening to the teacher, he is, no doubt, liable to be misled.

10771. You know it is open to an inspector to fix the merit mark of a school in Ireland at present under our system without asking a single question?—I think it would be very improper to do so. I should not like to do it myself.

10772. But with regard to the antithesis between intelligence and acquired knowledge, you have not heard of this famous tone structure, which sets up the ideal that is now supposed to govern primary education. I will read two sentences which are typical of it:—"The acquisition of knowledge can be regarded as of value only so far as it leads to the development of character and habits of intelligence." "Do you approve of the word 'only'?" Is it valuable only in so far as it develops character?—That is a very big question, a philosophical question.

10773. The sentence is this. They have been speaking of the tone of a school which is described as "almost indefinable," and they say, "where the tone is good, deficiency in the acquisition of knowledge, even defects in methods, may be to some extent disregarded?"—There is a truth in that, you know. The way I should put it is that with comparatively young children, such as the children in primary schools up to the age of 12 and 13; the acquisition of good habits is a much more important part of their education in one sense than the acquisition of facts, because

the facts they may be able to learn after, but unless they form habits in various matters when young they never will form them, so that to that extent character is worth more than what is ordinarily called knowledge.

10774. But I am suggesting to you that that truth has been so over-stated that it is settling up nearly as bad an ideal as the old results system set up?—I do not think it could do that.

10775. The attitude expressed in that sentence seems to me to be this:—"Of course, you cannot acquire habits without learning something, but please learn as little as you can." Is not that roughly what it comes to?—No, I might reduce it to cruder practice. Take the case of two girls' schools. In one school the Geography is not very good, while it is very good in the other, but in the school where the Geography is not very good the mistress has influence over the girls, and they are neat and tidy, polite, courteous and moral, so far as school can make children so. In the other school they know a great deal of Geography, but the girls are very untidy, they do not speak nicely to their teacher, and their attitude in school is not such as to suggest that their behaviour is satisfactory. Now, which school would you prefer?—I know which I should make the best report on, and in that sense I would reduce the deficiency of Geography in the former school on account of the admirable training that has been given to the girls.

10776. Mr. HANLY.—Might that not be the result of home influence?—But that is the inspector's business—it is for him to decide whether it is or is not in the school.

10777. Mr. KERRIN.—Now, if you continue the line of thought that public opinion in this country is in favour of a scheme of scholarships that would enable a student to proceed from the primary school to the secondary school, on what basis will you award those scholarships to the children of the age, say, of 11 or 12 or 13?—I would award them partly on reports, such reports as I could find from the teachers and others, as to how the boy had done in school, from the inspectors if we could get their assistance, and partly upon some sort of examination, both written and oral, of the boy in such subjects as English and Arithmetic. I should probably ask him to write an Essay.

10778. But there would be a formal examination?—Yes; I should ask him to write a composition for me.

10779. It would have to be of a formal, serious character?—The London County Council examine some hundreds of scholars annually on these lines.

10780. And the moment he gets to the secondary school you give him also the right to go on to the higher training of a University, and you must recommend for the scholarship, and I see no substitute for it?—I agree with you that you must recommend for the scholarship, but I do not see why you want to revert to the old system of a formal individual examination of the children in the school for that purpose.

10781. But it has been suggested to us that you might have a formal examination, limited to the three essential subjects, reading, arithmetic, I think, and composition. Would you have any objection to that?—I should have an objection to it if it is an examination on a uniform syllabus. If you had a uniform syllabus of books it would simply mean that the school would read nothing else but the ones you put down. I do not object to examination, in itself, you know, if it is conducted by a competent examiner, and if it is the kind of examination that the boy can take in his stride.

10782. And the formal examination is, I understand, to be discouraged in favour of an examination that he would take in his stride, that his existing knowledge would induce him to strive a little more stoutly than he otherwise would?—There are so many dangers connected with that proposal. If you get an examination conducted upon the syllabus of the school (because every school ought to have to some extent its own syllabus), that means an enormous difficulty in arranging for the details of the examination, and there is also a very grave danger if you once begin to publish results, and compare schools with schools, and the number and percentage of boys who passed,

22nd May, 1918.]

Mr. F. H. DALL examined.

[Continued.]

and so on. Then you are once more back in the old rut of not thinking of what is good for the children, but of what the examiner wants.

10783. But if the individual results were not published?—Then I do not suppose there would be so much harm in it.

10784. The idea, as I understand it, is that the inspector should conduct the individual examination of the child?—Yes.

10785. And that he should assign a mark to his notes to each child, and that he should use that in forming his judgment as a whole, that he should conjoin that with his impression of the school in preparing his report?—I do not see why he should keep a private mark. Of course, you confirm your impression of the school by the way in which the children do the composition for you, but you do not want to remember that Tommy Jones got 10 marks for it and Ethel Smith got 5.

10786. But that plan would ensure that the inspector would not proceed on a hasty impression?—It is more a matter of the instructions given by the National Board to its inspectors as to which, of course, I cannot speak. The inspector should be told that his inspection should be thorough, and that he has power to set any exercise to the children which he may wish to do if he desires to satisfy himself that the instruction is effective. If he does not do that I should say that he is inspecting badly.

10787. It is said that an inspector might take a student at random here and there and make a brief and hasty survey of the school, and might, within the letter of his instructions, produce a merit mark which is really not well founded, and I suggest that the element of examination should bulk a little larger in the test?—Really it is a question of fact, and I cannot answer that, because I do not know how largely the element of examination does bulk in Irish inspection, but I think a school cannot be tested only by examination or only by inspection.

10788. Mr. HARRISON.—At what age are scholarships from primary schools held in England?—Usually the examination is for children from 11½ to 12.

10789. And what is the reason for that?—The reason is that it is thought that a child ought to pass to a secondary at the age of 12.

10790. On account of the change of the curriculum?—On account of the change of the curriculum.

10791. The CHAIRMAN.—In the Manchester Grammar School they all come in before 12, and the reason was that only when you could get a boy at 12 had you any chance of carrying him to the University, at least in time to get a scholarship?—It is largely a question of the foreign languages.

10792. Mr. KERRIN.—There was only one other matter on which I should like to have the advantage of your experience concerning the political difficulty of teachers. What degree of political liberty, using the term in the widest sense, do the teachers possess in England—are they allowed to engage in business?—I had better refer to the code on that. A teacher will not be required to abstain outside school hours from any occupation which does not interfere with the due performance of his duty as a teacher of a public elementary school. He is not required to abstain from anything which does not interfere with his duty as teacher.

10793. He may attend a political meeting?—Certainly.

10794. Has he liberty to speak at that?—Yes. Article 15 of our Code gives the conditions of employment of teachers.

10795. He may attend political meetings and speak at them?—Yes.

10796. Mr. Harrison was asking you about the Resident Commissioner's series of public addresses. If it were a case of a man at the head of a department endeavouring to popularise new ideas or methods, would you not think it rather a creditable thing to deliver public addresses?—Certainly; I tried to draw a distinction, in answering Mr. Harrison, between what I should call educational topics pure and simple and educational politics. In fact, in England, inspectors, for example, sometimes give addresses to prin-

cipal teachers and others on Methods of Teaching; but, of course, no inspector would dream, for example, of giving an address upon such a subject as the repeal of the Act of 1802. No inspector would dream of giving an address on that subject.

10797. But would he give an address in favour of methods that might involve an increase of the educational estimates—would that be educational politics?—I do not know where we should draw the line; but the general principle is that a Civil Servant should refrain from giving an address on subjects which involve a general question of policy.

10798. Mr. HARRISON.—And especially on subjects on which he may be called upon to give official advice?—Certainly, and he should refrain from giving any address upon a subject which either is, or is likely to, become a subject of political controversy.

10799. Mr. KERRIN.—I see the line of distinction. Now, comparing the educational methods in England and Ireland, how long would it take England to allow its primary education to be controlled by a body like the National Board?—I really do not think I can be expected to express an opinion on that.

10800. Mr. HARRISON.—To whom are the grants that are made by the Educational Department in England paid?—To the local education authorities.

10801. Not to the teachers directly?—No.

10802. And then the question of the inspector's report is, after all, not of such vital importance to the teacher in England as it is in Ireland?—That is true, generally speaking.

10803. That is, his promotion and his increment of salary do not depend upon the reports?—Not directly, as they do in Ireland.

10804. And, therefore, it is a matter of greater importance to teachers (I am not speaking with reference to education, but to the pay of the teachers), that we should have a just and uniform system of inspection in this country than it would be in England?—Certainly.

10805. And then if we have one inspector adopting one standard and another inspector coming into the district and suddenly adopting another standard, with the result of a wholesale lowering of the marks, I suppose you would agree that that would be a substantial ground of complaint in that district?—Certainly.

10806. We have had one case where the teachers in one district got 187 "excellents" and "very goods" and 141 "goods," and instead of that, when a new inspector came, they fell to 70 "excellents" and "very goods" and 154 "goods." Now, had not the teachers in that district a just ground for complaint?—Certainly, they would have, as I understand their salaries are affected.

10807. Of course their salaries are affected under the present conditions?—Yes, quite so.

10808. Then, you think that with a proper system of inspection some means should be devised by which a sudden alteration of standard would be prevented?

—Yes; I think sudden alterations of standard should certainly be stopped, if possible.

10809. Now, you told us this morning that you would be in favour of one inspector being placed in charge of a district, which he could control, and in which he should have adequate knowledge of the schools and the teachers, and be responsible for everything in it, and I think I understood you to say that copies of all the reports should go to the divisional inspector. Was I right in that?—Yes; I am in favour of a system under which a district is in charge of a senior inspector, and his subordinates' reports go to him, and he is entirely responsible for them.

10810. For everything that they do?—For everything that they do.

10811. And I think you stated also that as two chief inspectors could have secured uniformity in this country?—The area that each of them had to cover was much too great.

10812. Do you think it was a proper arrangement by which these chief inspectors were ignored of what was taking place in the district that I referred to; that is, the chief inspectors were then getting no report and knowing nothing of the alteration of standard and the lowering of marks?—It would



22nd May, 1918.]

Mr. F. H. Darr, examined.

[Continued.]

be very difficult, indeed, for a single man dealing with all the schools in the North of Ireland alone to keep in touch with every district.

10813. But the point I am raising is this, that the reports were not submitted to them?—But I do not know that every report of a district inspector or district inspector could possibly be submitted to a chief inspector. There are far too many.

10814. But when they got some of them?—Well, I do not know why he should get any of them, so to speak. I do not think there is any harm in that. I agree with Mr. Harrison that there should be intermediate officers who should have the making of those reports. In England, I do not necessarily see any reports by individual inspectors.

10815. But then, if the chief inspector is there, and if you assign to him as part of his duty, that he is to endeavour to secure uniformity, how can he carry out that?—Certainly, he cannot, if that was one of his duties. But one obvious way in which, no doubt, he could make an attempt to carry it out (though I should say the size of the area would render it impracticable) would be for him to be furnished with copies of the reports sent in from that part of the country. I am sorry for the chief inspectors, I frankly admit.

10816. Then, I think you stated that you were in favour, or at least that you thought it would be a waste of energy, to have two chief inspectors in the Education Office?—To have them in the Education Office doing the work which I understood was entrusted to him, namely, that of noting reports.

10817. And deciding what action was to be taken on a report—would that modify your view?—No; I do not think it would. In fact, the chief inspector is not, in my view, an examining officer; he is an inspecting officer, and he ought to be going about the country and ought to keep in touch with the inspectors, he is not to be in the office to decide what action is to be taken. That is administration.

10818. But, as a matter of fact, they were in the office more as consulting officers than as inspectors?—In that case, it does not seem to me to be a good organisation. That is employing them at something which their previous experience gives them no special claim to do.

10819. Then you disapprove of the examiners sending out reprimands to teachers when even no action of any kind was suggested by the inspector?—Yes; I think the examiner, before sending the reprimands to the teacher, should certainly refer to the inspector, and ask him whether he means the reprimand to be sent.

10820. And then, do you think that the examiner ought to be at liberty to reprimand a teacher without any inquiry, that is, that if the inspector merely recommends the reprimand, that should be issued as a matter of course?—Oh, no doubt, the examiner then comes in; I think it is then for the administration to consider whether the inspector's recommendation is to be acted upon.

10821. But if the administration is to consider, how can clerks who have no experience of inspection of school work decide whether the question demands a reprimand or not?—It is only in this way. I can quite conceive an examiner, on reading an inspector's report, saying: "The inspector in this case recommends me to make a reprimand. I observe, however, that Mr. So-and-so, in the next district, writes a much more severe report for reprimands"; and then he would bring that to the notice of his superior, and they could decide as to how severe a report ought to be before a reprimand was issued. The examiner in that way takes the function of standardising the inspector's report.

10822. But we have it in evidence from the examiner, that whenever a reprimand or censure of any kind is recommended, he issues it as a matter of course, and that he issues it even without any recommendation, and, therefore, as far as reprimands are concerned, that mode of action that you recommend or suggest is not adopted. Now, you referred to the visits of the Resident Commissioner. Would it modify your view in any way if you knew that after those visits the Res-

ident Commissioner communicated with the inspector with reference to the character of the report?—No; I should think that was a very proper thing for him to do, possibly. I should think that is exactly the kind of thing that the head of a department has a right to do. He has a right to inform himself, so far as he has time, by personal visits to the schools, and by looking at the character of the report, and to say: "Well, really, all I can say is that your report does not appear to have been at all clearly expressed upon this matter."

10823. Then supposing that, in writing to the inspector, the tendency of his letters was to get the inspector to revise his judgment on the school, would that modify your view in any way?—No, I do not think so. I think the head of a department has a perfect right to do that. That is a different point from the one Mr. Harrison put to me. The head of any great department has a right to say to the chief inspector or to any inspector: "Are you really quite certain about this?" "Does your report mean this or that, where you express it in this particular way?" I think it is the duty of the head of a department to ask that.

10824. I do not object to that; but we will take the case that an inspector inspects a school, and then that Dr. Starke goes down and spends ten minutes, for instance, in that school, and that he writes to the inspector, and says: "You have marked that school too high."—I think he might be quite right, because that is part and parcel of the difficulty that you have to contend with in the Irish system. The great difficulty you have to contend with is to get any sort of standard. Now, the only person who can form any judgment as to the uniformity of standard is a person who has seen the working of a large number of schools and the work of the inspectors. That, I imagine the Resident Commissioner can do, and he can write to a man and say: "I notice that such an inspector takes a much higher standard than you do." That would be perfectly proper, I think.

10825. Mr. COOPER.—Would it not be rather a matter for the chief inspector?—Yes, I think it possibly would be primarily a matter for the chief inspector, but I only wish the heads of a great department in England had time enough to go and do it.

10826. Mr. HANLY.—In the evidence here a question was put to a witness, do you think that such visits and such letters coming from Dr. Starke would be likely to influence the head inspector, and the reply from Mr. Purser, the Chief of Inspection, was: "Certainly, and they were meant to do so."

"To raise or lower the mark?" he was asked, "which was the tendency, as far as you know?" and his answer was: "Well, I think the tendency generally was rather to lower the mark than to raise it; but there were cases where the effect of the letter would be to raise the mark." Now, considering that the head of the department has the promotion of the inspectors to a large extent in his hands, would not that be likely very largely to influence their judgment?—I do not see why he should not influence their judgment in a sense, because I presume that he has to defend their action. Suppose that there is a challenge, he would have to defend the case.

10827. But then, the inspectors claim to be experts, and to have peculiar knowledge of the schools, and Dr. Starke cannot claim to be an expert?—I hesitate to give an opinion on that. Personally, all I can say is, although that does not come within my province, that I should attach a great deal of weight to Dr. Starke's opinion about a school, in view of his long experience and the number of schools that he has seen.

10828. But if you put yourself in the position of a chief inspector, exercising your judgment to the best of your ability, would you think it right to have Dr. Starke coming down and spending, perhaps, ten or fifteen minutes in a school, and then going off to another, and subsequently writing letters reversing your judgment after you had spent hours in the school?—You put the case with some details which prejudice it. I should not like to give an answer on a particular case. I have already given my general view.

10829. Now, with regard to examination and testing of schools, do you think that the teacher should get notice, particularly in a country like this, where the attendance usually is variable, many more pupils being present on some days than on others?—I should leave that to the discretion of the inspector. I think Irish teachers, perhaps, are often unduly nervous about that. I think an experienced inspector would easily discount a small attendance.

10830. Take a case that I have been written to about in the last few days. An inspector visits a certain school, and there was a fair in a neighbouring town, and there was a small attendance of pupils in the school on that day, and yet the year's work was appraised to a large extent on the result of that visit. Now, would it not be better for that teacher to get notice and to have an opportunity of having all the pupils present?—It might not make any difference in the result necessarily.

10831. If there is any benefit to be derived from inspection should not all the children get the benefit of it?—I should be sorry to say that the inspector's visits were as important as that; but, as a matter of fact, I gather that in Ireland the inspector visits three times, and he must have very bad luck if on one of those three occasions in the year there is not a fair attendance. The same difficulty occurs occasionally in England. The inspector may go to a school, and the teacher may say: "There are very few children here; there is a meeting and the children are away." Well, the inspector may stop there, or he may say: "I will come again another time." I should have thought that there was in Ireland ample opportunity for the inspectors to find a school in normal condition.

10832. A great many complain that the inspection on which so much depends in the matter of increment and promotion, and all that, is very largely interfered with in that way. Now, with regard to appeals, of course, the appeals relating to visits of inspectors do not stand on the same footing in this country as in England. It is the local authority there that would be interested in the appeal, as far as the grants are concerned?—Yes; it might be.

10833. And, therefore, would not the fact that the local authority would be concerned, and not the individual teacher naturally make the inspector more careful about the award that he would make in that case than he would be if he were only dealing with a single individual?—No; I do not see why that should necessarily be the case.

10834. And if they have an appeal to make against the award of an inspector, would it not come with more force than in the case of a single teacher's case in this country?—That is very difficult to say. I do not see why it should. There has been a preliminary investigation, perhaps, by the local authority in the case of an appeal in England.

10835. But, in any case, you think if there be appeals against the reports of the inspectors, if necessary an inspector should be sent down to re-inspect the schools?—Certainly, if necessary.

10836. And in one case in this country, I think over 70 teachers appealed, and in another case over 111 teachers appealed?—Against definite inspectors?

10837. Against the inspector's marking, and there was no reinspection. There was a reinspection of six or eight schools in each case, but there was no reinspection of the whole of them?—I do not know about that case.

10838. And when the new programme was introduced, I think you disapproved of some of the subjects that were recommended?—Yes.

10839. You did not think the science course suitable that you found in Irish schools?—Yes, and I did not think the hand-and-eye training was suitable. I understood that changes had been made since my visit.

10840. The hand-and-eye training has been dropped, with the exception of some kindergarten work for infants, and that is the only form of hand-and-eye training that there is in the schools at the present time. Would you think it right, in introducing a system like that, to have it enforced on all the teachers from

end to end of the country without notice, without preparation, and without training?—No; I do not like enforcing any system without notice.

10841. But you know that there was an attempt made to introduce it into all the schools of the country from end to end?—I did not know that it was intended to be compulsory. I thought that the teachers had an option as to whether they would adopt it. Was not that so?

Mr. HENRY.—I think not.

Mr. CORRY.—They had not the option in this way, that they could not get the increment otherwise.

10842. Mr. HENRY.—And besides all that the subjects were made compulsory in the school?—I did not know about that.

10843. Do you think the science course, as it is at present in some schools, is a suitable subject for very young children attending the schools in the third and fourth standards?—I am afraid I have not looked at it as it now stands.

10844. Now, have you considered the question of the time that it would take a teacher, under the most favourable circumstances, to get from the bottom to the top under the present regulations?—No, I do not know that.

10845. Well, it is 36 years?—Is that under the most favourable conditions?

10846. Yes; unless they get what is called special promotion over the heads of others?—Yes.

10847. Now, would you consider that a suitable arrangement to offer teachers a scheme of promotion under which it would take him 36 years to get to the top?—Does everybody get to the top after 36 years?

10848. No?—What is the proportion of them?

10849. I cannot answer that. You are aware of this, that a large number of the schools in Ireland are small?—Yes.

10850. I see by this return that there are 1,742 schools for less than 50 of an average attendance. They can never get into the second grade. And there are 2,999 more with an average attendance of less than 50, and they can never attain the second division of the first grade. Now, is it a wise arrangement to deny all hope of promotion to such a large proportion of the body?—Well, I suppose they could get into the first grade if they got a bigger school.

10851. But bigger schools are not available?—I do not think I should like to give an opinion on the details of the present system of salaries and grades.

10852. Now, I understand that in England each local authority has its own school year?—Yes, it can have. Some authorities do not have a uniform school year and in that case each school has a separate school year.

10853. Mr. CORRY.—Even under the same local authority?—Even under the same local authority.

10854. Mr. HENRY.—We had a separate school year up to 1900 in Ireland?—Yes.

10855. And we have now a uniform school year?—Yes.

10856. And the result is that sometimes a school is inspected when there would be three months' work done, or less?—Yes.

10857. And does it not become difficult to appraise the work in such circumstances?—It is quite easy for an experienced inspector.

10858. But are all inspectors experienced?—They ought to be.

10859. With regard to the programme in England, are all the schools compelled to take the same programme from one end of the country to the other?—No.

10860. What is the amount of the liberty they are granted?—They are granted a very large amount of liberty. The school draws up its own syllabus.

10861. The CHAIRMAN.—For approval?—For approval.

10862. Mr. HENRY.—By the inspector?—Yes.

10863. What I would like to know is this. Are there any subjects that are compulsory on all schools?—No, strictly speaking, there are not; that is, a school can leave out any subject, but nobody ever proposes to leave out reading, writing and arithmetic.

10864. And they are at liberty to take any other subjects?—Yes; but they do not add on a great many.

22nd May, 1913.]

Mr. F. H. DALL examined.

[Continued.]

10864. And they are not at all compelled to add on the same?—No.

10865. And I presume that uniformly they take the three assumed subjects?—Yes.

10866. Plus how many more?—Most of them take a good many more. Most of the English schools take the subjects named in Article 2 of the English Code, but they have power to omit. Any English school has power to omit one or more of these subjects under suitable conditions, if the conditions of the schools demand.

10867. They have the power of adapting the programme to their local conditions?—Yes.

10868. Mr. HARRISON.—Are those subjects obligatory?—No subject in the English Code is obligatory.

10869. Mr. HARRY.—How far are the teachers allowed freedom of organisation in these schools in England?—I think the teachers are allowed a considerable latitude of organisation.

10870. I have here a letter I got the other day from a teacher whose school has been marked, I understand, "good," and he said: "I had a visit from an inspector, that I need not name, and he said I should change my school organisation. I remonstrated without avail. I showed the inspector how one half-hour's disposal of classes would disorganise the whole school. No use. The change ordered by him must be made." Now do you think the freedom of the teacher should be interfered with in a case like that?—I am afraid I would want to know a great deal more about the case before I could express an opinion on that.

10871. That was a school to which the inspector had awarded the mark "good," and yet the organisation was to be interfered with?—It all depends on what the standard is in the first place for awarding the mark "good." I can conceive that a good school might have some defects in organisation; but I am afraid I should want to know a great deal more about that particular case.

10872. You mentioned this morning, as one of the objections to the system of marking, that the tendency would be to make the teacher play up to the inspector?—Yes.

10873. Do you think it is right for an inspector to interfere with the teacher's freedom of teaching, provided he is teaching by recognised methods?—What do you mean by recognised methods?

10874. Any standard method that you will get in any training college and approved by the inspectors coming there is recognised?—I can imagine a teacher using a recognised method so badly that the inspector might be justified in not regarding it as the very best for him to use. A method that one teacher might use well another teacher might not use so well.

10875. And that is why I think a man ought to be allowed freedom to adopt the method which he can handle best?—Certainly.

10876. So long as that is a recognised method. Take, for instance, one that had the approval of the training colleges, should the inspector be at liberty to come in and interfere with the teacher's freedom in using that?—I think the inspector should not interfere. I think all I can say is that as a general principle the inspector should be chary of interfering with the teacher's methods, distinctly chary.

10877. With regard to testing schools, I think you are in favour of what everybody in this country would be in favour of, that is, inspection plus examination?

—I am in favour of an inspection which includes some examination by the inspector. That is the way I should put it.

10878. And I think you said quite properly that it would be desirable that the inspector should put questions in an unfamiliar way to test the intelligence of the children?—Yes.

10879. And would it not be desirable, too, to have some general questions on the subject lest the teacher should have a tendency to get into a groove?—Yes.

10880. To show that there was another aspect of the subject, another possible way of looking at it?—Yes, it is sometimes quite advisable to put questions in that way.

10881. And then, if the inspector is unreasonable, would not examination be necessary as a protection to the teacher—you know you have had unreasonable inspectors in England?—Yes.

10882. And you have had complaints of some of them?—Yes; inspectors are no more infallible than anybody else.

10883. And would not examination in that case be a protection for the teacher?—I do not know what you mean by examination—do you mean some testing of the children?

10884. I do?—Yes, it may be; but I rather object to the use of the word "examination," which has come to have all sorts of associations bound up in it. I much prefer to call it "test." I think all inspection must include some testing by the inspector, and I am quite conscious that such tests might qualify his general impression in favour of the teacher, as well as against him.

10885. Would it not be well to have testing for the satisfaction of the parents?—I do not really know that the parents know much about it. I should not tell the parents myself how an individual child had done. I do not want to test how an individual child has done; I want to see how the school does on the whole.

10886. What proportion of junior inspectors are taken from the ranks of the elementary teachers in England?—Well, it is a difficult question to answer, because we have just made a change of system. We have discontinued the grade of junior inspectors, and have instituted a new grade called assistant inspector. The rules and conditions of the present year with regard to the appointment of assistant inspectors are that they are to be men of 35 to 40 years of age who have had at least eight years' experience of teaching in elementary schools. Whether these conditions will remain in force in the future I cannot tell you.

10887. The CHAIRMAN.—It has been suggested (I do not know by whom) in past years that the purpose of your report was to carry out certain views of the Treasury?—Yes.

10888. And I do not know whether you would care to give any answer to that?—All I can say on that head is that nobody made the least suggestion to me as to what line I should take in my report. I never received the slightest hint to report in this way or that. I was left absolutely unfettered to report exactly what I believed, which I did.

10889. You had no communication from any person in authority to lead you to believe that they wanted the report for a certain purpose?—None whatever.

10890. Except the purpose stated in your terms of reference?—Only that they wanted a report on Irish Primary Education.

10891. Were you not to inquire into whether small schools were desirable?—No; that was never mentioned by anybody but myself. The facts in that part of my report I discovered for myself.

# TWENTY-THIRD DAY.—FRIDAY, MAY 23RD, 1913.

At 23, Kildare-street, Dublin, at 11.15 a.m.

Present:—Sir SAMUEL DILL, M.A., LL.D., LL.B. (Chairman); The Most Rev. DENIS KELLY, D.D., Bishop of Ross; Sir HERMAN SHAW WILKINSON, LL.D.; Mr. JOHN COFFEY; Mr. HERBAGE E. B. HARRISON, B.A.; Mr. JEREMIAH HENLY; Mr. WALTER MCMURROUGH KAVANAGH, D.L.; Mr. THOMAS MICHAEL KETTLE, D.L.; and

Mr. ARTHUR J. DONNELLY, M.A., B.Sc., Secretary.

Mr. P. E. LEWIS, I.R.O., L.R.C.S.I., examined.

10802. The CHAIRMAN.—You are one of the secretaries of the National Board, we know?—Yes, I am the senior Secretary.

10803. I believe you were appointed to that office in December, 1900?—Yes.

10804. What was your office before that?—For ten years I had been Private Secretary to successive Resident Commissioners.

10805. To Sir Patrick Keenan and Mr. Redington?—To Sir Patrick Keenan, Mr. Redington, and to Dr. Starke for about two years.

10806. Mr. COFFEY.—Were you Private Secretary and Secretary to the Board?—No, I was Private Secretary till I was appointed Secretary to the Board.

10807. But Dr. Starke was not there two years before 1900?—Not quite two years; he was appointed in February, 1898, and I was appointed Secretary in December, 1900.

10808. The CHAIRMAN.—You were Private Secretary when for about 18 months?—Yes, or somewhat longer.

10809. Had you any service under the Board before you held that office of Private Secretary?—Yes, I was one of the staff in the office from the year 1870. I entered the office by limited competition in 1870. At that time there was a special examination for the office, embracing a great number of subjects. It was regarded as one of the most difficult examinations in the whole Civil Service at the time.

10810. And when you passed that examination you became—?—A member of the established clerical staff.

10811. And you held that position till you were appointed Private Secretary by Sir Patrick Keenan?—Yes; I had been before that a head pupil teacher in the Central Model School; I cannot remember the number of years, but I think for three years; and a senior monitor before that.

10812. I do not propose to go minutely into this list of your duties, which you have kindly supplied, but I will ask you to give the Committee, in a general way, an idea of your Department as distinct from Mr. Dilworth's, and the general character of your duties?—Well, it is very hard to draw a line of demarcation, because, though I gave you that list that represents our duties in a general way only, they very often interleave, and when he is absent I do his work, and when I am absent he does my work.

10813. Would this be any approach to it (I speak with very great diffidence, because I do not know much about office work), that your duties are more financial and relate to the organisation of your office more than those of Mr. Dilworth?—Yes.

10814. And you have less to do with inspectors and inspection of schools than he has?—No, I would not say that would be correct; I have practically as much to do with inspectors as he has, but in a different way. I often deal with inspectors in matters of inquiry. He deals too with inquiries; but matters of leave and disciplinary matters and things of that kind are generally referred to me. He deals with the reports of the inspectors and the action on reports, the action noted by the examiners. I occasionally deal with those, too.

10803. When the examiner recommends action it goes up to him for his initials?—The letter goes to him for signature. Sometimes the notings are sent up specially by the examiners, when there is any doubt about the action to be taken.

10804. Promotion and increments of teachers you have to deal with?—Yes, to some extent.

10807. Now, in this paper, with which you have supplied the Committee, you begin with a brief sketch of National Education prior to 1872. As we have a great deal to get through to-day, if you will permit me, I will pass that over for the present and come to the results period from 1892 to 1900?—I had an object in referring to National Education prior to 1872. The Board has been, for the last thirteen years, assailed from many quarters, and my object in referring to National Education prior to 1872 was to show the members of this Committee who are not acquainted so well with the past history of the Board, that the National Board was intermittently assailed from the time of its foundation in 1861. In 1845 the Commissioners put on record a minute that they would not entertain applications from certain people in the country, owing to the charges that they brought against them, charges of dishonesty and trickery, very life the charges brought against the Board at the present day; and they said: "The Commissioners have been charged with such unprincipled trickery and disposition to overreach, to deceive and to evade, as must render them, supporting the charges, or half of them, well founded, utterly unfit for their situation, unworthy of confidence, and such as no one can wish to have any dealings with."

10806. Mr. COFFEY.—Those were not charges made by teachers?—I could not say whether they were charges made by teachers, but I have a minute of the Board in 1845 to the effect that I have mentioned. Then, during the time of Sir Patrick Keenan, the Board was constantly assailed, and he himself was constantly assailed, and was subject to gross abuse, and almost slanderous abuse, and even his physical defects were referred to; and that condition of things existed as long as he was Resident Commissioner.

10808. Mr. HENLY.—I did not know that Sir Patrick Keenan was assailed?—He was assailed frequently, and even in Parliament by a former member of the Irish Party.

10810. The CHAIRMAN.—I see in this document you refer to dismissal of head inspectors for insubordination. That was under the old system?—Yes.

10811. You intended to say something about that?—I referred to that, because a question has been raised here, I understand, about the duties of the present examiners and the duties of the chiefs of inspection, now called chief inspectors, and I wanted just to refer briefly to the history of that if you will permit me, that is, the appointment of chiefs of inspection; because it was the appointment of chiefs of inspection that led to the dismissal of one of the head inspectors and the suspension of another. What happened was this. Up to the year 1855, there was no inspector of any kind in the office. The secretaries dealt with all the reports. The reports were noted by the clerks as they are at the present time. They noted any previous action, and suggested

22nd May, 1913.]

notice to be taken, and that was brought to the Secretary, who approved or disapproved of it, or brought it to the Resident Commissioner for the time being. As the system expanded the work of the central office became congested and got into considerable arrears as regards reports, and the Commissioners called in the six head inspectors to assist the office staff in clearing off this clerical work. They were there for two months, and one of them, Mr. Macready, did not care to go about the country again, and he contrived to stay on in the office, and the people in power at the time applied to the Treasury for his payment as chief of inspection, and after some time he was recognised in that position, but not as a permanent indoor officer.

10942. That was the first chief of inspection?—That was the first chief of inspection. He was, I think, a Presbyterian. The other five head inspectors had to go back to their districts, they did not like it, and they sent a round robin to the Commissioners, which was considered insubordinate, indiscreet and indecorous, and they were threatened with immediate dismissal. One of these was the late Sir P. Keenan, and another was Dr. Newell, who was subsequently secretary.

10943. Mr. Conner.—Were they dismissed?—They were practically dismissed, but they were all restored on apologetics, with the exception of Mr. Keenan, who did not make his peace with the powers that were at the time, and he was actually dismissed from the service and gave great trouble to the Board afterwards.

10944. The Chairman.—The inspectors were not generally of a high class under that system?—No, some of them of a very poor class; but Sir Patrick Keenan, Dr. Newell, Mr. Sheridan, and others were exceptions. They were persons who were picked up everywhere. Some of them had been school teachers and some of them had not. At that time there was no special examination either for inspectors or for the office staff. The Commissioners might nominate persons for the central office or for the inspectorate, and they would be appointed, as a matter of course, and there was practically no examination at all. When I went to the office in 1870 I found a collection of subversives there that would astonish a modern civil servant. It was much the same with the inspectors. A considerable number of the inspectors had been teachers, but there was no very strict discipline over them, and some of them were very unsatisfactory.

10945. And they were appointed by pure patronage, without examination?—Pure patronage.

10946. Sir Patrick Keenan was himself an example of that?—He had been head master of the Central Model School, and an excellent teacher; he then became an assistant in the training college, and from that he was made an inspector.

10947. But you mentioned some exceptions when you said the inspectors were generally not of a high class?—Some of them were of a decidedly inferior class, but there were eminent exceptions, such as Sir Patrick Keenan and Dr. Newell, and Mr. Sheridan and Mr. Molloy and others.

10948. What rank did Mr. Molloy rise to?—He was secretary. He had been a teacher in Harcourt Street, I think Quinn's School, a good secondary school, before he was appointed an inspector.

10949. Now, will you go on to the results period?—Sir Patrick Keenan was immediately responsible for the introduction of the results system into Ireland; it was only following the English system. So far as my acquaintance with him went (and I was very intimate with him for some time) though he is generally credited with having been entirely in favour of the results system; I do not think he was. It was a question in 1872 what system should be introduced that would improve the condition of the teachers, and Dr. Newell, who was then, I think, a Secretary to the Board, and Mr. Keenan (as he then was) were asked to draw up schemes. Sir Patrick Keenan adopted this plan of the results. Dr. Newell had what would be more pleasing to the teachers nowadays, a scheme which would increase their class salaries, without any very radical change in the system. Sir Patrick Keenan's scheme was adopted, but it was only so far as a quarter of the entire vote was concerned, about £200,000, and

he had to go on with the class salaries. These were slightly increased, and when the results came, they were in addition to the class salaries. It was not the same as in England. In England the whole system was changed, and practically all the payments were made by results.

10950. The effect of the change was a great improvement in the teachers' emoluments?—Certainly, it was an improvement; I do not say whether you would say a great improvement, but an improvement. There was a great improvement in the condition of the rural schools undoubtedly.

10951. Would you say that the results improved the instruction in ordinary National schools?—Yes, in the rural schools especially. In the high class schools, I think the effect was rather the reverse. The Central Model School at that time, I think, was the best primary school in Ireland, possibly in the United Kingdom. It was under Dr. Joyce, and had been previously under Sir Patrick Keenan as head master, and some other masters of great ability. I only knew it in Dr. Joyce's time. I can speak authoritatively of that time, and I can say that it was a much better school, I think, than any model school we have at present.

10952. You say the general tendency of the results system was in the beginning to improve education?—Yes, in the rural schools, where rather indifferent instruction had been carried on by these men that I have referred to, and the teachers were backward. The teachers were slack, and there was nobody to keep them up to their work; but the incentive of the prospect of payment for increased work had an immediate effect on the schools and on the work done by the teachers.

10953. You say that it injured the 1870s the high class schools like that in Harcourt Street?—That was not a model school. I referred to the Central Model School in Marlborough Street.

10954. It injured high class schools?—Certainly it injured the Central Model School, and from the time of the introduction of the results system up to the present, the Central Model School has never been as good as it was. It is beginning to recover now, but for years it went steadily down, and I believe that was largely due to the influence of the results system. The freedom of teaching was curtailed. There was an excellent drawing school in connection with the Central Model School, under one of the best drawing masters, named Smetham, and when the results system was introduced, and every boy in the school had to be taught drawing (and there were some of the boys utterly incapable of learning to draw), he had to convert that select school into a general school and the result was that it became very mediocre.

10955. Might I ask you to develop the reference you make to Sir Patrick Keenan's mention to the chiefs of inspection?—That subject of the chiefs of inspection and the examiners, I regard as a very important one in connection with the whole question of teachers at the present time. I was present with Sir Patrick Keenan, when Mr. Molloy, the late Secretary, was also present, and somebody called Sir Patrick Keenan's attention to the fact that the reports were being dealt with almost entirely by the clerical staff of the office, the notings were made on the backs of them suggesting action, and the chiefs of inspection were merely attaching their initials in a perfunctory manner. Sir Patrick Keenan said in my presence to Mr. Molloy: "The chiefs of inspection are destroying their position," and he said: "I must insist that they deal with the reports themselves, and put notings on the backs of the reports themselves. Let the clerks in the office supply them with material for their action; but the clerks must not deal with the reports in their entirety, because, if they do, there will be no necessity for chiefs of inspection."

10956. After that mention did the chief of inspection do the duty more seriously?—They appeared to take it more seriously. I was asking one of the clerks who is now in another position, but who was at that time assisting the chiefs of inspection, what happened, and he told me: "I remember the occasion very well, and what happened was this. I

2nd May, 1913.]

Mr. P. E. LAMAS, I.R.O., L.R.C.S.I., examined.

[Continued.]

was told not to make any more notings on the backs of the reports for action, but I was to make them on slips of papers, and I was to insert them in the reports. The chiefs of inspection then took my slips of paper and they copied my notings on to the backs of the reports. That man regarded that as a grievance.

10925. Mr. CORRY.—About what date would that be?—Well, that would be sometime in the 'nineties. I was appointed Private Secretary to Sir Patrick Keenan in 1893.

10926. The CHAIRMAN.—He died in 1894?—Yes, this was sometime between 1890 and 1894. There is a point which I wish to mention, that during Sir Patrick Keenan's time there were a great many important matters considered by Sir Patrick Keenan, masters of State. One of them was the Compulsory Education Act of 1893. Well, Sir Patrick Keenan practically carried out all the negotiations with the Government about that Act of 1893 himself. The higher officials generally were not in any way, so far as I am aware, consulted about it. Perhaps Mr. Taylor, who was a Secretary, was, but the other higher officials were not consulted by Sir Patrick Keenan in the matter. There was also a great question of the settlement of the denominational Training College in Mr. A. Balfour's time. That was a matter that was carried on entirely by Sir Patrick Keenan himself and the Government. I drafted letters for him and signed them, and transmitted them to the Castle, but no other official in the place, from the highest to the lowest, had any cognizance of what was going on with the Government.

10927. And did those matters not come before the Board?—The matters at that stage did not come before the Board. What happened was that Sir Patrick Keenan consulted the Commissioners confidentially as to whether he should bring these matters before the Board generally, because they were matters which, if they got ventilated in any way, might have created considerable difficulties.

10928. He consulted individual members of the Board apart?—Yes, and he consulted confidentially others outside; but so far as the officials in the office were concerned, either the indoor staff or the outdoor staff, they knew absolutely nothing about those things, and I may tell you an incident connected with the scheme, which established the free homes for the denominational Training Colleges, under which the Colleges in Kildare Street, in Drumcondra, and Caryfort got very large grants. That scheme was drafted early in the year 1900, but it was held over till November awaiting sanction from the Government. At this time the scheme was in charge of Sir Patrick Keenan. One member of the Education Office staff got some hint of what was going on, and he came to me many times to try to get some idea as to what was passing, or what was being done, and I had considerable difficulty in keeping him in the dark. In the Education Office the document had been put carefully under lock and key, but Sir Patrick wanted to look over it at home, and it was taken to his residence. He returned it to the Education Office concealed in the folds of a newspaper and enclosed in a large envelope addressed to me. The envelope and its contents were placed by me in a locked drawer, and there I found the scheme, which Sir Patrick was afraid he had lost or mislaid. He was delighted to get it, and to feel assured that the secret had not leaked out. I only give you that as an illustration of the fact that the higher officials, in connection with great changes in the National Education system, were not consulted until the Board or prominent members of the Board were prepared to consider the question formally. I mention that in connection with the complaint that Mr. Purser has made about the new system, that he was not consulted about it.

10929. I gather, then, that Sir Patrick Keenan, very eminent administrator as he was, was autocratic?—He was somewhat autocratic, and that was one of the charges against him. He had a very difficult task at that time to perform in the Education Office. He was alone; he had a great many possible opponents, and he was making a radical change in the system for the better.

10930. Now, will you proceed to the next point?—There is a little thing about the July examinations. Mr. Redington became a Commissioner on the 25th of November, 1894, and after that Mr. Morley appointed Archbishop Plunket and Archbishop Walsh as members of the Board. Archbishop Walsh had been criticizing the Board very strongly before he became a Commissioner.

10931. Was that the present Archbishop?—Yes, the present Archbishop of Dublin. He saw that there were a lot of things that he thought wanted mending, and one of the things that came immediately under his notice was the complaint of teachers and of the training colleges that some of the questions at the July examinations 1895 were too severe, some of them were wrong, and that there was a considerable number of teachers who had been deprived of their promotions owing to the irregularity.

10932. Did that complaint come before the Board?—That complaint came before the Board.

10933. In 1895?—In 1895.

10934. And what did the Board do?—There was a Committee appointed. First, the matter was referred to the chief inspectors and the head inspectors, who had charge of the examinations, but those gentlemen did not care to have their work revised; then the matter came before the Board, and it was decided to have an investigation, and this investigation was undertaken by the Archbishop, by the Rev. Henry Evans, and some other members of the Board. The Archbishop and Dr. Evans took some of the questions and answer papers and went through them themselves; they had the chief inspectors before them, and they had some of the head inspectors. Mr. Downing was one of the chief inspectors at that time, and he did not like his work to be reviewed. At his examination before the Committee he did not favourably impress them, and he sent in a memorandum which was considered offensive, but which he subsequently withdrew. I have his letter of withdrawal of the memorandum here. He asked leave to withdraw it, and he was allowed to withdraw it. That was in 1895, long before the time of Dr. Stickle.

10935. Who was on the Committee besides the Archbishop and Dr. Evans?—Some other members of the Board.

10936. Sir HERMAN WILKINSON.—Can we have the memorandum itself?—I have the letter withdrawing the memorandum. I have not the memorandum. It is not easy to get all the documents of 18 years ago. There are hundreds of thousands of papers in the office of all kinds. Mr. Redington was on the Committee.

10937. The CHAIRMAN.—The Committee was composed of Mr. Redington, Resident Commissioner, Archbishop Walsh, and Dr. Evans?—And, I think, Judge Shaw. At first, Mr. Redington was not on the Committee, he came on afterwards, but Archbishop Walsh and the Rev. Henry Evans were both members of the Committee from the beginning; they examined the inspectors individually, and they appeared not to have been satisfied with the answering of one of the chief inspectors, at least.

10938. What was the result of the Committee?—The result of the Committee was the promotion of several teachers, the re-constituting of the arrangement for the examinations in future, and very full and precise directions given as to the conduct of those examinations. Mr. Purser was a head inspector at that time, and some of the questions or some of the papers that were in Mr. Purser's charge or that he was responsible for, were handed, by the direction of the Committee, to another inspector, to be revised, and this annoyed Mr. Purser very much; he wrote some letters to the Board, and said his work should not be reviewed by an inferior officer.

10939. That was a junior officer?—An inspector.

10940. Mr. HENRY.—Was he a head inspector?—I do not know that he was—it was Mr. Eardley.

10941. Mr. Eardley was a head inspector?—At any rate, he was an officer who was inferior to Mr. Purser.

23rd May, 1913.]

Mr. P. E. LEWIS, I.S.O., I.R.C.S.I., examined.

[Continued.]

in rank, and Mr. Pursey objected very much. The Board decided that they could not listen to him, but he still persisted, again asked that his work should not be revised, and he had to be told that no further correspondence could be carried on with him. That was the condition of things, so far as the chief inspectors were concerned, prior to Dr. Starke's appointment.

10942. The CHAIRMAN.—Will you go on to the next section, about complaints from teachers?—There were complaints from teachers during this time. There were resolutions of the teachers' associations and articles in journals, in which the results system was assailed vigorously. We had all these things tabulated and these resolutions were presented to the Board, and I have here a list of them for some years.

10943. These were appeals for re-examination?—There were appeals for re-examination of schools. I was looking up this matter and got hold of some memorials for re-examination of schools under the results system, on the ground of the hasty way the examination had been conducted by the inspector. That is one of them. Another was on the ground of the inexperience of the inspector.

10944. Did this appeal go before the Board?—I do not think that any of those that I saw went actually before the Board. They did not go formally before the Board. They were dealt with by the secretary and by the chiefs of inspection, and in every case refused. If I had time, I could get you a great many more appeals; I asked for some, and these were brought to me hurriedly. There were cases of fines and reduction of fees, which were very serious things in connection with the results system, and all those came before the Board in the form of sub-committee orders; they were rarely discussed at the Board. There was an order, say, to fine a man £10. That was done, say, at the suggestion of one of the staff, following precedent.

10945. And it was laid on the table of the Board?—It was received by the Secretary from the Chief of Inspection and laid on the table of the Board as a sub-committee order. These sub-committee orders were entered in the book of sub-committee orders, which was laid on the table, and any Commissioner could take and turn over, and see the cases, and that is done at the present day; but we do more now—we give an abstract to the Commissioners of all the cases. Every case of fine or dismissal, or anything in that way, is clearly set forth on the agenda, so that any Commissioner now can see for himself and inquire at the Board meeting into any case where there is any penalty, or anything of that kind, inflicted on a teacher; but at the time I speak of there was no such thing, and fines, dismissals even, were mere committee orders, and entered on sub-committee orders. Again, in resolutions, the teachers asked for periodic meetings, and the drudgery of the results system was condemned, the teachers said they had no time for any intellectual labour and that they were kept grinding at these examinations.

10946. We have had a great deal about that; might I call your attention to one point that I would like you to develop, that the promotion of the teachers by examination was not satisfactory?—Yes, that is a very important point. In 1900, and prior to 1900, nearly 80 per cent. of the National teachers were in the second class, and had no prospect of getting beyond the second class.

10947. Why?—They could not get the promotion for two reasons. They could not get beyond the second class at that time without examination, and a great many of those men were advanced in years or middle-aged, and every one knows that people of advanced years or of middle age have a very strong objection to examinations, and the National teachers were no exception to the rule. That was one very great reason. I have spoken to scores of National teachers for some years past, and that was their one great objection to the old system of examination. Another reason was that some of them that were called "the heroes of the contest" had not been trained, and they could not get promotion to the first class without being trained.

10948. Mr. CONYER.—Who described them as heroes of the contest?—The journals very frequently. These men had refused to go to the Marlborough Training College, and that was the only training college at the time open to them, and, as a consequence, they were deferred from promotion to first class, because they were untrained.

10949. The CHAIRMAN.—So that there were two causes, their unwillingness to undergo examination and their dislike to going to the Marlborough Training College?—Yes, one old teacher told me: "It would be a nice thing for me to sit down beside a young fellow who might be one of my boys that I had prepared," he objected to that, and that was a very considerable cause.

10950. There was another point, about the difference in standard in the marking in these days?—Yes; that is very important, because there was a complaint at the time about the difference in standard. If my opinion is worth anything on the matter, I think there was a much wider difference in standard under the old system than there is under the present system.

10951. And were the appeals numerous?—The appeals were numerous. As I mentioned just now, I got six appeals from the records in a few moments at the office when I asked for them.

10952. And the subject of those was a great variation in the standard?—Variation in standard was the cause and the mannerisms of the inspectors. There were some inspectors too easy. There was one very amiable inspector, Mr. —, who was beloved by the teachers all over the country. In every district that he was in, the teachers would, if they were allowed, present him with an address and testimonial, and the reason of that was that Mr. — gave No. 1 marks freely in every school. He was exceedingly lenient. He was so lenient to the teachers that he was removed to another district, and the unfortunate inspector who followed was denounced as a tyrant, because he simply marked as he had been marking in all the other districts where he had been before. He had been marking normally. But the contrast between his marking and the marking of Mr. — was so extraordinary that the teachers said: "This man is entirely too severe."

10953. Did the head inspectors take no steps to remedy that?—They were supposed to take steps.

10954. I understood that that was one of the principal duties of the head inspectors?—So it was.

10955. Did they not tackle that?—It is not very easy, even nowadays, with all the attempts the Commissioners have made, to keep a uniform standard, and I think in the days gone by it was less easy. But there was another inspector, and he was at the opposite pole. He was a scourge. He went through every district like a scourge. There was one district, I remember, having had charge of it in the office, and nearly every teacher in that district was fined, reprimanded, or admonished, or had his result fees reduced, so much so, that I, though a very young man at the time, wrote a memorandum about these matters, the contrast between his policy and that of the other inspectors was so extravagant.

10956. Was he not shot at?—We have never had an inspector shot. His case was brought before Sir Patrick Keenan, and I do not know what actually happened at the interview, but he was removed from that district, and he was warned at the time.

10957. With what effect?—For a time with very good effect; but he resumed his old practices after some time. Then there was another, who was accused of having possibilities of manner, but he was a very good inspector, a very earnest inspector. I was told that one of his weaknesses was, having got the school records down on the floor, to go over them and look very minutely for very small preconditions. Another, who was a very good inspector, but rather of a rough type, was objected to on account of his personal manner. He would go into a school after a long journey, and take off his stockings and put them before the fire in the school room. The object of my evidence is to show that there was a very great divergence in the assessing in the merits of the schools in the results period.

23d May, 1913.]

Mr. P. E. LEWIS, I.S.O., L.R.C.S.I., examined.

[Continued.]

10958. Now, about the promotion of teachers to the inspectorship, up to that time had National teachers not been appointed inspectors?—They had been appointed in many cases. Sir Patrick Keenan was a National teacher. The teachers demanded in later years that all the positions as inspectors should be given to them.

10959. That all inspectors should have been National teachers?—Yes.

10960. What about the tenure of teachers being insecure?—Well, that is an old complaint, and is a complaint at the present day; but the Roman Catholic Hierarchy passed a series of resolutions, and the Lordship the Bishop of Ross can tell you about that.

10961. In what year was that?—I think that was about 1886, and the teachers expressed satisfaction with them.

10962. What was the purport of them?—Practically they provided for an appeal to the Bishop of the diocese in every case of threatened dismissal of a teacher by the manager of the school, who is generally the parish priest. But there was a case tried by the Chief Baron, a case of dismissal of a teacher of Lecklip school, and the teachers seemed to think that the trial proved that the Mayothen resolutions were not satisfactory as securing that fixity of tenure, and they were about approaching the Board of National Education to ask the Board to become a Court of Appeal when the Bishops agreed to modify those Mayothen resolutions and made them more satisfactory to the teachers, but at the same time the teachers were warned not to proceed with the memorial to the Commissioners, and Mr. Coffey, I dare say, will know all about that.

Mr. Conner.—I know a good deal about it, but I had no connection with the Lecklip case.

10963. The CHAIRMAN.—What about the action of the Bishops and the Most Rev. Dr. Walsh, which you mention in your paper?—That was the action I have just referred to, so that the Catholic teachers are now satisfied.

10964. Now, would you go on to the point about fines, severe punishment, etc.?—Yes; the fines and severe punishments for falsification of the school record at this time were very numerous, exceedingly numerous, so much so, that I remember on one occasion Sir Patrick Keenan, when a deputation of teachers waited on him about some improvement in their salaries, took up a bundle of reports that he had there before him, and he said:—“How could I go before the Treasury? The first thing the Treasury would say is: ‘All your teachers are falsifying their accounts; they are making what they please out of the results system.’ How could I deny that in the face of those reports that I have before me?” I may tell you that he had some dozens of reports there, and I have a long list of teachers fined, deposed, and dismissed for falsification. But undoubtedly the temptation was very great under the results system, almost too great for impetuous human beings to resist, and a good many of the teachers were at that time, and I suppose are still, impetuous.

10965. That was followed by a circular on the subject?—Yes, that was a warning circular saying that if their accounts were irregular they would be reprimanded first and then that they would be fined, and finally dismissed. That was in 1896.

10966. Will you kindly let us have that?—Certainly.

10967. Then as to insufficiency?—Before we have that I want to give an example of the kind of temptation before the teachers, which I think it is well the Committee should know. It was this kind of thing. A boy should have 100 attendances to be eligible for earning a fee, as they called it, for the teacher. If a pupil was in the school for 99 days in the year, and if he was a very brilliant fellow, he would, if he had an additional odd day of attendance, be able to earn £1 or £2, or less or more, for the teacher, but we would have to strike him out when the report would come to the office, because he had only 99 days of attendance. The teacher lost that money because the boy was absent one day. There was the temptation. That is an example; but there were others of a similar kind, where the temptation was very great, and one of the things that influenced the Commissioners in 1900 in making the change was the fact that under the new system of payment a great deal of this temptation

would be removed from teachers. A man's income now does not depend to anything like the same extent as it did under the results system on mere figures. Well, the inspectors also complained that they were occupied all their time examining pupils. The inspectors were hampered by this results system, and a good inspector, even the best of the inspectors, took a whole day to examine a small school. They had to examine every child, and one very efficient and conscientious inspector said he could not examine a school in less than three days. We told him to hold the examination, and he simply said he could not do it in a day, so he had to resign. The inspectors had a great deal of clerical work to do. They had to prepare and mark the sheets from their notes; they used to complain very bitterly about that, that they were at work all day and then at work all night, and they complained also that the office orders were very severe. I want to mention here that the office, so far as the inspectors were concerned, meant the chiefs of inspection. They made whatever orders were made. I refer to that, because Dr. Sturges, in his Belfast speech, said that the inspectors would be no longer slaves of the office. The “office” at that time was not the clerical portion of the office, or the secretaries; it was the chiefs of inspection, and the chiefs of inspection devoted a great deal of their time to checking the journals and the travelling expenses of the inspectors. They knew more about that than other matters, and one of the chiefs of inspection, as I understood, practically did nothing else. He succeeded in landing a real fish case, when he got an inspector dismissed for something of that sort; he found that he had overcharged to 8d. It became a question in Parliament, as the inspector was dismissed. The chief of inspection who discovered that irregularity practically did nothing else when he was in the office but review the inspectors' journals and check the travelling expenses, and he had one of those little things that run on a wheel for the purpose of measuring road distances on maps.

10968. Now about the proposal to reform the system, that was the result of the Commission on Manual and Practical Instruction?—There was a great deal of manual instruction in connection with the National system before 1895. We had what was called the alternative scheme. That was a scheme that provided for payment for such things as cutting out, dress-making, weaving, lace work and crochet, and we had also kindergarten. That scheme was Sir Patrick Keenan's, and it was too weighty.

10969. Was it adopted generally?—It was not adopted generally. It was taken up by the convent schools; as we had at the time a system of industrial teachers connected with convent schools, but it was not taken up generally.

10970. Was elementary science taught in any considerable number of schools?—Well, it was taught; but it was not systematically taught.

10971. They had not a proper equipment?—They had no equipment except what they provided themselves. A boy was taught a little galvanism or electricity or magnetism or chemistry.

10972. By the book?—Some of the teachers at that time were very good, and some of them had provided apparatus of their own, and their schools were very good, and in the Central Model School and all the Model schools, things were supplied. In the Central Model School there were classes in connection with the Science and Art Department, and in a great many schools throughout the country also there were similar classes.

10973. Then came the appointment of a Committee of the whole Board to consider how the education system might be modified by the introduction of manual instruction. That was in 1896—that was the turning point?—That was the turning-point; at the instance of His Grace Dr. Walsh, Archbishop of Dublin, there was a Committee of the whole Board appointed to consider how National education might be modified.

10974. That was in March, 1896?—March, 1896. Then at a meeting of the Board on the 9th of June, the Most Rev. Dr. Walsh moved that the Lord Lieutenant should be asked to receive a deputation. A deputation was appointed, consisting of Professor Fitzgerald, the Lord Chief Baron, the Rev. Dr. Evans, the



23rd May, 1915.]

Mr. P. E. LAMONT, I.S.O., I.R.C.S.I., *continued*.

[Continued.]

Rev. Dr. Wilson, the Most Rev. Dr. Walsh, Mr. Harrington (now Sir Stanley Harrington), Mr. Molloy, and Mr. Redington. The deputation waited on the Lord Lieutenant on the 23rd June, but, of course, there were various of interim meetings.

10975. Mr. HENRY.—They waited on the Lord Lieutenant on the 23rd of June, 1896?—Yes.

10976. The CHAIRMAN.—And there was another deputation on the 18th of August?—Yes. It is a great pity that the address delivered by the Archbishop of Dublin at that time was not made generally public, because it would have cleared away a great deal of the confusion and misunderstanding that was in the minds of a lot of people about the new system.

10977. Where could we obtain it?—I have it here. It is an address to the Lord Lieutenant. I have a copy of it here in type from the *Freeman's Journal*, and I think it has a very important bearing on the new system.

10978. Do you wish to read any selections from it?—Yes, if you please. His Grace the Archbishop said:—"I have been asked to state to your Excellency some of the reasons that have led us to ask for this audience in connection with the proposal for the introduction of an organised, comprehensive scheme of manual instruction into our system of National Education in Ireland. For myself, I am bound to say that, although I have long taken a very deep interest in this subject, I cannot lay claim to any very special knowledge of it in its details. The only reason, indeed, that I know of, for my being asked to make the statement here to-day is that it was I who happened to bring the subject forward at a meeting of our Board, and to move a resolution in reference to it, which, I am happy to say, was unanimously adopted by the Commissioners. It is satisfactory for me to be able to feel that there is not very much that need be said upon the subject of our deputation, outside what is contained in the Memorandum which we already have had the honour of submitting to your Excellency. A few points in that Memorandum may, perhaps, bear some development. Beyond that, I do not think there is anything to be done. The Memorandum refers to the widespread feeling that exists in Ireland, that, in the system of education which we administer, too much prominence is given to the merely literary instruction of the children, their instruction in mere book knowledge, and in matters that are in no way directly related to the work that lies before them in the world. The case in support of the proposal to give to our system of National Education a more practical character than it as yet has had, is very easily stated. The school—the elementary school as well as every other—has a two-fold work to do. It is a place for the instruction of the children, for the putting into their minds of a certain amount of what is supposed to be useful knowledge. It is a place also for their education, in the proper sense of the word—I mean, for the drawing out, the development, the cultivation of their natural powers and capacities. Under both of these heads, a claim is put forward for the fuller recognition of the practical element in the work of the school. As regards instruction, it is claimed that provision should be made for such a course of teaching as will make the children familiarly acquainted, not merely with words and with the names of things, but also with the things themselves which these names and words represent. And again, as regards training and development, it is claimed that provision should be made for the training of the hand and of the eye, as well as for the training of the intellect. It is hardly fair to occupy your Excellency's time by pointing out that some writers who are regarded, especially in England, as eminent authorities on such matters, insist upon all this as essential to the completeness of every system of education, quite irrespective of any special wants of the particular class to be educated. Professor Huxley, for instance, has said that even "if there were no such things as industrial pursuits, a system of education that does nothing for the faculties of observation, that trains neither the eye nor the hand, and is competitive with other ignorance of the commonest natural truths, might still be regarded as strangely imperfect." Now, I am not called upon to adopt that strong way of putting the case.

For we have not to do with any such hypothetical case. We have to face the fact that not only are there such things as industrial pursuits, but that we, the Commissioners of National Education in Ireland, are charged mainly with the education of the children of the industrial classes of our country. It is by means of industrial pursuits that these children are to make their way in the world; and their success or failure in life most largely depend upon how they have been fitted for those pursuits when they come to enter upon them. So, then, the instruction and the training which, to a large an extent, undoubtedly, are still lacking in our system, are precisely those which, in the sphere of secular knowledge are of the very first importance to the vast majority of the children whom we have undertaken to educate. I happened, a few weeks ago, to look through the pages of a publication that circulates widely, I understand, amongst the teachers of our Irish National Schools. I found in it a sharply antagonistic comment on the proposal, which was then known to be under the consideration of the Commissioners, for the introduction of a system of manual training into our schools. The writer spoke of this as a "fad." Why, he asked, should the children of the National schools be selected as the victims of this experiment? When such things, he said, were introduced into the schools for the children of "the classes," then it will be time enough to think of introducing them into the schools for the children of the masses. Now, it surely should not be necessary to point out that it is precisely because our National schools are schools for the children of the masses of our people that the demand has been made for a change, and a comprehensive change, in this direction. It is, as I have said, the view of not a few who are regarded as high authorities upon educational subjects, that it is desirable, in the interests even of the children of the professional and other higher social classes, that, even in their schools, provision should be made for a scientific course of manual training. Professor Huxley's words, which I have quoted, go that length, and personally I am not at all inclined to dissent from what he has said upon that point. But that is not the point of our present case. We have to do with the education, not of the children of the higher social classes, but of children who, in some cases out of ten, will have to earn their bread by industrial pursuits. Why should it be suggested that such children should be deprived of that special instruction and that special training that would most directly tend to fit them for their work in life? Why, above all, should this be suggested on the ground that not such training and instruction, or but little of it, is given to these other children, whose fortune it is that when they leave school, they will be under no necessity of earning their bread by manual industry? There was a time when education was the privilege of the few; when, in fact, it was all but exclusively confined to those who were destined for the learned professions, who were to be lawyers, or doctors, or priests. This restriction of the sphere of education, naturally, according to the views of the time, determined the course of studies as it was then conceived. The course was then determined by its ultimate aim and object, from the very rudiments on to the end. Then came a later time, when broader views began to prevail upon the subject of the diffusion of education amongst the masses of the people. Gradually that great change came about, but, by a strange anomaly, the old course of school studies held its ground almost unchanged. The demand that has come to be so widely made in our own day, for a comprehensive change in the curriculum of the primary school, is simply a demand for the removal of that long-standing anomaly, and for a solid, practical recognition of the established fact that education is no longer the exclusive possession of any privileged classes, but is the birthright of every child that is born into the State—the birthright of the future artisan, the future agriculturist, the future agricultural labourer, as well as of the future lawyer or the future member of any other learned profession. I venture to say, your Excellency, that there are few subjects connected with public affairs in Ireland upon which you will find a nearer approach to unanimity than you will find upon this, that, as regards the system of education in our National schools, the time has come for looking into this whole question in

an earnest and practical spirit, with the view of introducing into this system, in so far as it may be found practicable to do so, a well-considered scheme of more practical teaching and more practical training than we as yet have had. Therefore, it is that we have come to your Excellency to-day, asking you to take whatever steps may be necessary for the holding of a public inquiry upon this subject. It may, perhaps, be asked, why we, the Commissioners, as we are, of National Education, do not introduce this practical element into the system ourselves? What need can there be for the holding of any inquiry about it? Or if, for any reason, an inquiry be necessary, why cannot we hold the inquiry ourselves, without seeking for the intervention of the Lord Lieutenant? Your Excellency is aware that the responsibility of framing the course of education in the National schools of Ireland is borne by the Commissioners only to a somewhat limited extent. There are, I believe, cases on our records—some of them touching very closely upon this matter on which we have come to your Excellency to-day—in which an official correspondence had to be continued for a number of years before the Commissioners were set free to make certain changes which they desired to make in the system of education which they administer. Changes involving the possibility of any increase in expenditure, even through the facilitating of the earning of some additional results, fees, can be made by us only with the approval of the Irish Government and of the Treasury. It is but natural, then, that when there is question of a far-reaching change, such as that which is now under consideration, we should, in the very first instance, take steps to ascertain whether what has been proposed is to be regarded even as feasible. We seek, in the first place, to do this by bringing this important matter under your Excellency's notice in this prominent way. Then, as to our request for a formal public inquiry upon the subject, I beg to assure your Excellency that we have not put forward that request without being fully convinced, not only of the advantage, but of the practical necessity, of such an inquiry for the attainment of the object we have in view. I trust there is no want of respect in my saying to your Excellency—expressing in this merely my own personal view—that I have, as a rule, very little faith in such a procedure. But there are exceptions to every general rule, and I cannot but regard the present case as eminently exceptional. There is no great point of public policy at issue. There is really question of but little more than of a matter of degree, and of the selection of the most efficient means for the attainment of an admittedly desirable end. If ever there was a case in which a practical outcome might be expected from a public inquiry, I cannot but consider that we may expect a practical outcome from the inquiry we ask your Excellency to set on foot. As to the reason for holding this inquiry, we regard it as necessary on two distinct grounds. In the first place, widespread as the feeling is in favour of the introduction of a system of practical instruction and of practical training into our schools, it is, I am sorry to say, a feeling characterised by looseness and vagueness, to a most unsatisfactory degree. Many of the suggestions that have been made from time to time by earnest advocates of reform in this direction, are regarded by no less earnest advocates of it as crude and impracticable. Some of these suggestions, it is objected, would involve the turning of our National schools for boys into so many carpenter's workshops. Against some others, it is said, that they would involve the turning of our National schools for girls into so many tailors or laundries. The teaching of trades, of one kind or another, is as strongly insisted upon by some earnest critics of our present system, as it is objected to by others amongst them. In all this, plainly, there is a mass of confusion to be cleared away before any real progress can be made. We, for our part, do not see how that confusion can be cleared away except by means of a public inquiry, an inquiry in the course of which all who have any definite suggestions to offer upon the particular aspect of the case with which we have to do, should have the opportunity of putting forward these suggestions, of explaining them in detail, and, in so far as it might become necessary, of justifying them when brought to the test of principle, or con-

treated by any conflicting scheme. Until this has been done, we do not feel that we could undertake with any prospect of success the formulating of a working scheme that would receive, either from the public at large, or from the managers of schools, that general support, without which it would be vain to expect that any scheme of popular education could succeed. I feel, your Excellency, that it would be altogether out of place for me to indicate my personal view upon any of the points of detail in the case. On some of them, I am free to confess my inability to form any very definite view, in the absence of that information which an inquiry, such as we ask for, would, I am confident, elicit. There is, however, one point upon which I am absolutely clear; and I do not think that it can tend in any way to prejudice any fair subject of inquiry, if I express my view upon it. It is, that the teaching of trades is the one thing that we should absolutely make up our minds not to admit into our schools. As to this, the attention of the public, at least in Ireland, has not, I fear, been as yet sufficiently directed to the broad line of distinction that separates what is properly designated "Technical" education on the one hand, from manual training on the other. By "technical" education, as I now use the word, I understand instruction in particular arts, or trades, or complete processes of manufacture, and the like. It will hardly, I think, be questioned that instruction of that kind has to be regarded as altogether out of place in a primary school. The work of such a school, as I conceive it, in the sphere of industrial training, should be confined to that general training of the faculties, especially of the hand and of the eye, which underlies all industrial training, of whatever kind, and which is not specially connected with any trade or occupation, but stands in an equally useful relation towards all. Not merely as an illustration of my meaning, but also because it helps to bring out a point of considerable practical importance in connection with our view of the need for a formal inquiry into all this matter, I take that system of manual instruction which has proved so successful in so many ways in the primary schools in Sweden—the Sloyd system—to which we have referred at length in our Memorandum. In that system, as your Excellency is aware, the material used for the work of the children is wood. But one of the very first points laid down in every treatise on the system is that Sloyd is a wholly different thing from carpentry. It is, in its essence, an educational system. There is a carefully graduated series of objects to be made, 70 or 80, I think, in all. These lead on, one to another, almost like the propositions in Euclid. They are so carefully graduated that the second introduces some different, but only slightly different use of the simple tool that was used in the making of the first; and so on, from first to last, until, at the end of a well-arranged course, the use has been learned of each of the various tools that it is considered advisable to comprise within the system. There is no division of labour, as there is in carpentry as a trade. Every object made must, from its beginning to its completion, be the work of the one pair of hands of the one individual child. These objects are of no commercial value, at least, they are not valued for their own sake. So far as the intrinsic value goes they might be destroyed as soon as they are made. As has been well said in one of the best expositions of the system, they are, in this respect, like the pages of the copy-book that the child fills in when learning to write. It is not the objects themselves, but the making of them, that is looked to. It is the work of making them that constitutes the means to the end that is aimed at—that end being the cultivation, not only of manual dexterity, but of accuracy, of carefulness in little things, of modesty, of self-reliance, of patience, of perseverance, of concentration of thought upon the work to be done, of love for honest, well-finished work, in a word, the training and cultivation of all those faculties and habits which it is of the highest importance to cultivate as a preparation for the business of life. Now, one of the main advantages which I, at least, look forward to as a result of the holding of an inquiry such as we suggest, is the harnessing of public attention upon this vitally important distinction. Perhaps I have read enough of it. The point the Archbishop tells me is that he wanted to have ready material with which he could go

to the Treasury, that the Commissioners should have the recommendation of a Commission of Inquiry at their back in asking the Treasury to give money.

18970. Now, I think you may tell us what the next stage was. You say: Then came the Warrant appointing a Committee of Inquiry, in January, 1897, and you give the names of the Committee?—Yes; the Earl of Balmora was Chairman of the Committee, which included Archbishops Walsh and Plunket, the Chief Baron, Mr. Redington, Judge Shaw, Messrs. Molloy, Rev. H. Wilson, Professor Fitzgerald, Mr. Stanley Harrington, Mr. W. B. Molloy, Captain Shaw, and James Strathairn, Esq. The Committee held 93 meetings and examined 186 witnesses, and Mr. Downing gave evidence before that Committee. There was one point in Mr. Downing's evidence that I would like to call the attention of this Committee to. He stated at that time before that Committee, the Manual Instruction Committee, that the results system examination, as a test of intelligence, was not worth the paper it was written on. That was Mr. Downing's opinion of the results system. He stated the other day before this Committee that there was a great deal in the results system. He made use of an expression that conveyed the very opposite of his former idea. Mr. Downing is well acquainted with this Manual Instruction report, and he knew all that was in it; Mr. Purser was actually one of the assistants to the Committee, and he was sent to Germany to inquire, so he knows all about the recommendations.

18980. The Committee made its report on the 5th of June, 1897?—Yes, the final report.

18981. Then was that dealt with by a Committee of the Board?—A Committee of the Board was appointed in October, 1898, to consider the whole matter. The Committee met on the 17th of November, 1898, and recommended inter alia that the chiefs of inspection, in consultation with other administrative officials, should be requested to draw up a scheme to give effect to the recommendations of the Manual Instruction Committee. The chiefs of inspection were Mr. Purser and Mr. Downing. Mr. Naish, who is now our accountant, was at that time our assistant bookkeeper, and he had prepared a financial scheme. I have here the confidential document. It is a very elaborate scheme, very well thought out; but it is rather an elaboration of the results system. That was prepared before the report of the Committee of Inquiry. Then, Mr. Redington asked Mr. Young, the financial assistant secretary, to prepare a memorandum dealing with the financial aspects of the recommendations. He had asked me to be the Secretary of the Commission, but for reasons of my own, I asked Mr. Redington to excuse me, and Mr. Daly was appointed, but I did a great deal of work for the Commission. Mr. Redington said to me: "As you have had so much to do with this thing would you give me your views on the financial aspect of the recommendations?" I said I had very little time, and I had not thought over it, that I would do what I could for him, and I started to prepare a memorandum, but before that memorandum was completed Mr. Redington died. He had never seen my memorandum, and had never seen Mr. Young's.

18992. What was that deposition that you referred to immediately after, of Dr. Walsh and Mr. Fitzgerald?—That was a deposition to the Lord Lieutenant. They wanted to go to the Lord Lieutenant to put some points in connection with the requirements before him.

18988. The financial requirements?—Yes; to put some points before him. There were two estimates prepared for the coming financial year.

18984. That was for 1899?—1899-1900. In one estimate there was no reference to manual instruction, and in the other estimate there was, and they wanted to have some views from the Lord Lieutenant about it. As there was a new Resident Commissioner about to be appointed, the Lord Lieutenant requested the Commissioners, on the 26th of February, to consider again the report of the Manual Instruction Commission. I think he did that merely to gain time until Dr. Starke was appointed.

18986. At what time of the year was Dr. Starke appointed?—Dr. Starke was appointed in February, 1899.

18986. And when was the letter from the Lord Lieutenant asking to have the matter considered again on the 26th of February?—At that time, Dr. Starke's appointment had been made, but not formally notified to us. On the appointment of Dr. Starke, he asked me what steps had been taken to give effect to the report of the Manual Instruction Commission, and I told him practically no steps had been taken, that they had been under consideration, that there had been a memorandum prepared by Mr. Naish, about the financial portion, that Mr. Young had a memorandum, and that I had a memorandum in hand, and he asked me to finish up my memorandum and give it to him. I have that memorandum here. I have also Mr. Young's memorandum.

18987. Then, in the following month, Archbishop Walsh moved for a Committee?—A Committee to prepare and submit a working scheme to give effect to the recommendations of the Manual Instruction Commission.

18988. That was submitted to the Board?—The working scheme that was submitted by the Committee had nothing to say to the financial portion. It only dealt with the subjects to be introduced. I have here the report that was made to the Lord Lieutenant, with an estimate of the cost of the new subjects. The report was published by the Commissioners of National Education themselves. If you have not got this, I think if you ask for it we can give it to you; but the memorandum I prepared was a private thing, prepared for the Resident Commissioner.

18989. That memorandum of yours was on finance entirely?—It is headed: "Suggestions for a Change in the Method of Payment of State Grants to the Teaching Staff of National Schools, with some observations on points arising in connection with the subject." This memorandum is dated the 9th of January, 1899; but it really was not in their hands for a month after.

Srs. HENRY WILKINSON.—You might give the reference to the Board that was actually published.

18990. The CHAIRMAN.—You said we might have it?—The suggestions that I make in my memorandum are only indirectly referred to in this report. This report is marked July, 1899. "Report of the Commissioners of National Education made for the information of His Excellency in reference to the recommendations of the Commission of Manual Instruction." That was sent to him on the 26th of July, 1899.

18991. One that he had?—Yes. That deals with subjects to be introduced in the schools, the different subjects in accordance with the recommendations of the Commission, and it also deals with a proposal to appoint organisers of Manual Instruction.

18992. That was prepared by Dr. Starke and Professor Fitzgerald?—Yes. That was submitted to the Board, approved of, and sent to the Lord Lieutenant.

18993. Now will you go to that point where you say the chiefs of inspection in all this business gave little or no assistance?—Yes; the Resident Commissioner came there as a new man with the best intentions towards Mr. Purser and Mr. Downing; but it became evident at once to him and evident to Professor Fitzgerald, that the chiefs of inspection did not look favourably on this new scheme at all, that they thought some slight modification of the old system would suffice. At that time, they were not aware that there was anything in the way of a sweeping change like the abolition of the results system on the 1st. The incident that is referred to is this. The Committee invited Mr. Purser and Mr. Downing to confer with them, and I was present at one of those conferences between Mr. Purser, Dr. Starke, and Professor Fitzgerald, and Professor Fitzgerald was giving his views. He had got charge of the mathematical side of the question and the elementary science side. He was giving his views with regard to what the Commissioners would like to have done, and Mr. Purser was countering them. At last matters reached a climax, and Professor Fitzgerald said: "Remember, Mr. Purser, that we are the Commissioners and wish this to be done. You are not a Commissioner, you are one of our officers, and it is our views that must obtain with regard to this new programme."

10094. You were present?—I was present, and Dr. Starke was present. I think the interview ended then and Mr. Purser went away. I give you that as an illustration, to show that Mr. Purser had very strong views, and Mr. Downing also had very strong views on these matters, and they apparently would like their views to be adopted, but their views then were not the views of the Board.

10095. Mr. CORRY.—What was the date of that conference?—That was after the 26th of July, 1899. Then Dr. Starke informed me (and he repeated it the other day to me) that the Committee concluded that they would get little assistance from the chiefs of inspection and that practically they decided to ask them for no further assistance. Dr. Starke will give you very full evidence all about that. He knows all about it himself.

10096. The Committee, not the Commissioners, formed the opinion that they would get very little help?—The Committee appointed to draw up a working scheme approached the chief inspectors, and from the attitude of the chief inspectors, the Committee concluded that they would get very little assistance from the chief inspectors.

10097. The CHAIRMAN.—Then Mr. Downing submitted a memorandum,\* dated the 27th April, 1899, dealing with another question altogether, apparently?—Yes, this is Mr. Downing's memorandum. It is on four sheets of letter paper, and is headed: "Some measures urgently needed with a view to more efficient inspection to schools." He begins: "Recent reforms have made a very considerable addition to the work of the inspectors. Numerous special reports on efficiency of service are now required, and these involve careful and lengthened inspection of many schools. Practical tests in teaching also make a new and very considerable demand on the inspector's time. The inspectors in their general reports complain almost unanimously of the want of sufficient time for efficient inspection. Already the strain of duty is very severe in some districts, and the difficulty of providing the necessary assistants for completing the work of inspection is beginning to be acutely felt. This pressure is increasing, and likely to increase very considerably still. The increase of inspection, as distinguished from examination, is a most valuable improvement, and it is to be regretted that it cannot at once be much further extended; but that is impossible until the system of examination is simplified."

10098. Had a considerable change taken place already in that month of July, 1899?—Nothing in the way of the new system.

10099. But he seems to refer to an increase of inspection and the diminution of examination?—Yes; he evidently had read the Manual Instruction report, and that was advocated in the report.

10100. But nothing of the kind had been introduced?—No. I think this was a bona fide effort on the part of Mr. Downing to give assistance. At all events, he sent that document in.

10101. It makes some alterations in the old system?—Yes. It suggests some alterations in the old system, and makes some recommendations.

10102. Recommendations that were finally adopted?—Yes. He says: "There are two matters calling urgently for consideration, namely, a re-arranging of districts—"

10103. That was done?—That was done subsequently. "And a modification of the system of examination of pupils."

10104. And that was done?—And that was done. Then he says: "In re-arranging the boundaries of the districts, the question as to the most profitable way of employing the inspectors' assistants is involved, as well as that of the distribution of the present head inspectors' districts amongst the district inspectors. The present division into districts does not by any means distribute the work equally amongst the inspectors. There are two ways of proceeding to remedy this defect." "The second and more feasible way is to make a certain number of the districts sufficiently large to

afford continuous employment for an assistant in each." And we did that; we made circuits.

10105. Does he suggest alterations in the programme?—He advocates that in first, second, and third classes, the assignment of individual marks should cease at once, and the inspector should note their estimate of the value of the instruction given in each subject as "excellent," "good," "middling," or "bad," as the case may be.

10106. He suggested merit marks?—He was one of those who suggested merit marks; he quite approved of them. He also suggests, in connection with arithmetic, that each new process should be introduced and explained by means of easy mental calculations (we introduced that); and that when learning the compound rules, the pupils should be made acquainted with the coins in circulation, and the weights and measures in common use. We introduced that, and put weights and measures in the schools. He says: "Specimens of these weights and measures to be kept in every school, as well as a simple balance. The pupils should be required at this stage to weigh and make actual measurements. In connection with these rules an elementary knowledge of measurement should be introduced at the proper stage. The examination in arithmetic should be mainly oral, and the cards should be wholly discarded. The programme in geography is so out of accord with the principles of rational instruction that it should be at once altered. It should in future run somewhat on these lines:—A plan of the school and of the school premises, and a map of the neighbourhood to a radius of three miles." We have introduced that, and, in fact, everything of any value, and I am afraid some things not of very much value, were put into the programme.

10107. Mr. HANCOCK.—Would it be possible to have a copy of that?—I can get it typed and send it. This is Mr. Downing's own.

10108. The CHAIRMAN.—That seems the very germ of the proposals that Dr. Starke adopted?—Yes, of some of them.

10109. Except so far as he followed the lines of the Commission?—Yes, a great many of the proposals of Mr. Downing, however, had been in previous documents.

10110. Will you go on to Dr. Starke's scheme?—Dr. Starke commenced the preparation of a draft scheme\* for the Board.

10111. He commented that in 1899, did he?—About May, 1899.

10112. And that draft scheme was submitted to the Board?—Yes; this is the scheme here.

10113. The original scheme?—Dr. Starke's scheme, submitted to the Board.

10114. Sir HERMAN WILKINSON.—Could we have that?—Well, there is a good deal of matter in this. The following subjects are considered in the memorandum: Reorganisation of the system of payments of salaries of the teaching staff in National schools, the revision of the school curriculum and school organisation, and other things; but I foresee Dr. Starke will have no objection to putting this in. It is known as his memorandum.

10115. Mr. CORRY.—Did Dr. Starke prepare that in May, 1899?—It was not ready till November. There were several revisions. This was revised again, and again and again, and in November, 1899, it took final shape.

10116. The CHAIRMAN.—Will you try and obtain that for us?—The financial portion of this document has been organised, and it is largely based on my memorandum.

10117. Mr. HANLY.—That document was prepared by Dr. Starke himself?—This document deals with other matters than his original memorandum did not deal with. The first is the revision of the school curriculum and school organisation and the second the re-organisation of the inspection staff. My memorandum only made suggestions as to changes in the method of payment of State grants. They were merely suggestions. One of those suggestions has been largely adopted by Dr. Starke and the Commissioners, and that was the present system of payment.

\* Vide Appendix XXX.

11018. The CHAIRMAN.—Along with that document of Dr. Sturkie's will you let us have your memorandum?—I will ask Dr. Sturkie.

11019. You will try and obtain them for us?—Yes. These documents contain the new system of payments.

11020. The BANNER OF ROSS.—And you say that you are responsible, that it was in your brain the system originated?—No, I did not make that assertion. In this paper that I was asked by Mr. Redington to draw up, I made a series of remarks about the state of payments, and I made the following: "The present complicated methods of remunerating the teaching staff of National schools could then be simplified." I suggested that we should have a short Act of Parliament to amend the Education Act of 1892, which hampered us at the time, and hamper us still, because, by a schedule to that Act, we must pay a certain portion of the vote in a specified way. In order to get rid of that, my idea was to have a short Act of Parliament to give the Commissioners and the Treasury power to pool this money under the Irish Education Act with other monies, and to give the teachers out of those funds consolidated incomes without any annual payments. We could have given them better quarterly salaries, and we would have had no annual payments. I say: "The present complicated methods of remunerating the teaching staff of the National schools could then be simplified in accordance with some uniform principle, of which the following are examples."

(1) The payments might be all made by way of class salaries, in accordance with the educational class of the principal and assistant teachers, by fixed salaries in the case of work-mistresses, industrial teachers, monitories, etc., and by capitation grants to convent and monastery capitation schools. (2) The payments might all be made by results fees or annual grants, on account of the proficiency of the pupils, as in England, at the end of the year, the Commissioners not dealing with the persons composing the school staffs individually. (3) All the classes, or provisionally classed teachers, might be divided for financial purposes into two, three, or more sections, each section having a special scale of salary, rising from a fixed minimum to a fixed maximum, by increments; other members of the staffs to be similarly paid, with the exception of the teachers of convent and monastery capitation schools, who should be paid by capitation grants as before. (4) All schools might be paid entirely, or almost entirely, on the capitation system. Plan 1 would give satisfaction to the teachers generally, but Parliament and the Treasury might not be prepared for such a reactionary measure. Plan 2, involving, as it does, the appointment of School Boards, would scarcely suit the special circumstances of Ireland. These plans are consequently not discussed in the present memorandum, but plans 3 and 4 are considered in detail. Well, Plan 8 is the one that is practically in force, with modifications of several of the Commissioners, including His Grace Dr. Walsh, who went into it very minutely indeed.

11021. The CHAIRMAN.—Now, shall we go on?—Of course, that involved a great deal of labour, but I want to draw the Committee's attention particularly to the fact that in preparing this scheme the Commissioners gave the greatest possible attention to the interests of the teachers, that they made this change, so far as the money portion of it, almost entirely in the interests of the teachers. They gave consideration to the claims of the teachers, who were clamouring for the abolition of the results fees. I have several of their resolutions here. They were clamouring also for the revision of the school curriculum and school organisation, and several teachers of small schools said they could not teach three or four classes with only one teacher; the Commissioners went in for increments of salary for them and promotion without examinations, and for bettering the position of the teachers of small schools, and that was a thing for which they were thanked by the Protestant Episcopate, because there was a great number of small Protestant schools all over the country, where teachers were at that time striving to live by the aid of small endowments of £80 or £90 a year, and one of the things the Commissioners put in was that in every school the teachers should have a living wage, the programme was to

be arranged to suit the localities, and full permission was given to managers to draw up their own programme. Only one manager, I think, in the whole of Ireland acted on that, and the programme that he drew up was such that the Commissioners could not adopt it.

11022. Mr. HENRY.—Was there not a programme adopted for Castleknock and approved?—Yes, I think there was; but that did not come under my cognisance. The only one that did was one drawn up by a Parish Priest of a Northern parish, whose name I do not want to mention, and certainly he gave us some trouble. The Commissioners introduced a number of improvements. They tried to simplify the instruction. They provided for seating accommodation for all the children, and better ventilation and hygienic arrangements, school museums and laboratories, prizes and books for the use of pupils, and managers were invited to co-operate with the Commissioners in the reorganisation of the schools.

11023. The next point is, I think, the confidential report?—The Commissioners, when introducing the new system, thought it would be desirable, as in England, that the managers of the school should supply annually a report.

11024. A confidential report? I have the form.<sup>a</sup> It is called "Manager's Annual Report." This report was drawn up largely, but not entirely, in the interests of the teachers. It had more than one object. It was adopted by the Commissioners and circulated throughout the country. A considerable number of the managers furnished the reports, but the majority did not, and this form of report has been the subject of attack in the Teachers' journals and elsewhere.

11025. This was a report to be sent up by the manager?—By the manager.

11026. On the teacher?—No; an annual report on the school.

11027. Mr. HENRY.—And on the teacher?—On the school and teacher. In England the managers of the schools furnish an annual report. At that time they certainly did, but I do not know whether they do so now.

11028. Mr. HARRISON.—As far as I remember, there was one question asked of the managers, whether they were satisfied with the teacher's general conduct and attention to business. I do not remember that there was anything else?—At the time that this report was drawn up, I sent for all the English forms of report, and the forms that I was supplied with had those questions in them which Mr. Harrison has mentioned, and a good many more.

Mr. HARRISON.—I remember nothing more, but I am speaking of a good many years ago.

11029. The CHAIRMAN.—Was that a rather searching inquiry?—I will hand in this. This is a very important point in the consideration of the whole question connected with the attitude of the teachers to the Board. This annual report, I say distinctly, was designed largely in the interests of the teachers themselves. It was intended to correct, so far as it was possible for the Commissioners, through the intervention of the manager, harsh reports, or too lenient reports, on the part of the inspectors. The manager was on the spot; he was supposed to visit the schools frequently, and he is asked here, in the last query (3) "Have you any suggestion that you should visit to make to the Commissioners for the improvement of the school, or are there any defects or any other matter in connection with the school, teachers, inspectors, or examination, that you think desirable to bring under the notice of the Commissioners?" That query 28 is the most important query in the annual report, and it was put in in that way, because the Commissioners did want to imply that there was any doubt, and there was no doubt, with regard to the fairness of the inspectors generally, but at the same time they gave the manager an opportunity there, if he thought that the inspector had not acted fairly, or had acted too harshly, or in any way unjustly to the teacher—as opportunity of letting the Commissioners know it

23rd May, 1913.]

Mr. P. E. LEWIS, I.S.O., L.R.C.S.I., examined.

[Continued.]

at the time, and when the teacher's increments came on for consideration, these annual reports were to be taken, and to be considered in connection with the inspector's report. That was out of the principal objects of that annual report. That object, I think, was either completely not seen or obscured by people who were interested in not letting it be seen. The Commissioners knew perfectly well that the managers generally throughout the country were very attentive to their duties as managers, and visited the schools day after day, but they also knew that there were a great number of managers who never, or scarcely ever, visited the schools. They simply confined themselves to sending the quarterly return, and writing "good," or something at the head of the return, and forwarding it up to the office. There was a case the other day where a manager lived 80 miles from the school, and he had not been near the school for two years. That kind of manager the Commissioners wanted to come at through this report. They wanted to make the managers real managers, and so asked them to note the dates and hours of visits, and if the rules and regulations had been attended to, as far as they had observed, and the Commissioners inserted a few suggestive questions. They were only suggestions, but they would make it appear that the people in the Education Office were aware that there were other schools where these things existed, or they would not be asking the questions. One of the questions asked was: "Is sufficient attention paid by the teachers to personal cleanliness on their own part and on the part of the pupils?" Another was: "Has thrift increased among the pupils? Is there a school savings bank?" The Commissioners knew perfectly well that there was not a school savings bank in the whole of Ireland perhaps at the time, but they thought it would occur to managers that a school savings bank would be a good thing, and they asked: "Is there provision for making the school comfortable and warm in winter?" "Is there any provision for bringing children in remote places to school, especially in inclement weather?" One of the Commissioners, who criticised this report, said to me at the Board: "Mr. Lewis, do you intend to provide them with motor cars?" I said: "No; they have been doing this thing in Switzerland for years. They take the children over the mountains, collect them, and bring them dry-shod to school." "Oh, no; it will never do in Ireland," he remarked. But, as a matter of fact, there are now many cars conveying children to school, and the Bishop of Clogher, Dr. Day, has a most elaborate school van. In the County Down and in the West of Ireland children are collected at certain points by these cars and are brought to school with dry clothes; the vans are covered, and the Commissioners pay the cost. That is one of the things that the Commissioners were very severely criticised for. They were spoiling the child. Another query is: "Is there provision for physical exercise, drill, swimming, or other school games in connection with the school?" That query was scoffed at, and laughed at, and severely criticised, and I was asked could I name a school in England where there were swimming baths; but I think there are several now.

11030. Mr. HARRISON.—Plenty of them?—And I think we have them in connection with some few schools in Ireland. But these were suggestions to the managers, and there was more intended. The Commissioners wanted to get the manager to take an interest in the school, and to see to it himself, and that would be preparing the way for a much simpler method of inspection. The manager would be really the inspector of the school, and if that report had been adopted and acted upon in the same spirit in which it was proposed, there would have been now a very simple way of dealing with the increments of teachers' salaries.

11031. Sir HIRSH WILKINSON.—What report is that known as?—As the Manager's Annual Report.

11032. The CHAIRMAN.—A confidential report?—At first it was not confidential; it was simply a Manager's Annual Report, and several managers wrote to us saying that they would not like to commit themselves to statements which might come into the hands of people afterwards, and the Board said: "We will make it confidential." Not that there was any fear of these re-

ports leaking out, but just to make the report accept-able.

11033. Sir HIRSH WILKINSON.—When was that report first issued?—It was issued with the new scheme, but I could not say the exact time, in 1900 or 1901.

11034. But it was issued with the new scheme?—Yes.

11035. And has been withdrawn since then?—Yes, it has been withdrawn; but for years the Commissioners held on to it in the hope that it would be adopted generally. At last, however, comparatively recently, the Commissioners decided to drop it.

11036. Can you say the time?—Well, I cannot say precisely, but I can get you the information.

11037. But it has been withdrawn?—It has been withdrawn.

11038. The CHAIRMAN.—It never took effect really?—Oh, we had some thousands of reports. Any mark on the top of this report will be considered in connection with the inspector's annual report.

11039. It was operative for some years, then?—Yes. Of course, it was copied from the English plan of getting an annual report from school managers; but there was another idea underneath it. It was to be considered with the inspectors' reports when questions of promotion or increment arose. The system of increments proposed for the teachers was to a large extent copied from the Civil Service system, and the teachers apparently have a very wrong notion of what the Civil Service increment is. They imagine, if you can judge from their journals, that a man entering the Civil Service gets an increment of salary automatically year after year. I may tell you no such thing happens. There is a most positive certificate to be given by the immediate superior of the man looking for an increment of salary. His immediate superior must state that his attention to duty during the preceding year has been satisfactory in every respect, and that he is highly efficient. This is all in compliance with an Order in Council, and if the immediate superior does not sign that certificate, the head of the Department himself cannot give him his increment. If the immediate superior of a clerk in our office refuses that certificate, Dr. Blakie and the Board of Commissioners have no power to give it to him.

11040. Mr. HARRISON.—Is the increment ever refused?—It is, repeatedly.

11041. Mr. HARRISON.—Are the rules of the Civil Service the same in Ireland as in England?—They are.

11042. I had to sign certificates, and I am afraid I should have to question a good deal of what you have said. To begin with, there is no such term (if I remember right) as "highly efficient." You have only to certify (and it is not necessarily the immediate superior) that his service has been satisfactory, and that is a very different thing from saying it has been highly efficient. The immediate superior must certify—I can give you the exact words of the certificate\* as prescribed by the Order in Council. It means that the man must have given efficient service.

Mr. HARRISON.—I should say it simply means that there is nothing notable against him, and that is the way it is interpreted in the whole Civil Service. I don't agree.

11043. Sir HIRSH WILKINSON.—Can you get us a copy of the certificate, as I suppose you have a form of certificate?—I have not one of them with me, but I will send one or bring one. I have to sign these certificates\* every day.

11044. Might I ask what is the date of the Order in Council?—I cannot recall, just now, the date, but in the rules of the Civil Service it is distinctly laid down that no man can get an increment without a certificate of good service from his immediate superior. I won't say that the words "highly efficient" are in it.

11045. Mr. HARRISON.—What do you mean by "immediate superior"—for instance, would anyone below the rank of secretary sign one of those in your office?—Yes.

11046. May I ask who would be the most junior official who would sign?—Well, the inspection office superintendent, and if one of the inspection office managers had service entitling him to an increment one of these forms is got and the superintendent initials it, and says "approved." That is sent on to the man

28th May, 1918.]

Mr. P. E. LEWIS, I.S.O., L.R.C.S.I., examined.

[Continued.]

immediately show him, who is the examiner, and the examiner marks it "approved," and then it comes on to the Secretary, myself, and if I have any objection I can stop it, and that has occurred again and again.

11047. Mr. KERR.—Only in rare cases?—Only very rare cases. For instance, in the case of ———, his increment was stopped.

11048. Mr. HARRISON.—That was for downright inefficiency. It was not that he failed to be highly efficient?—We have had recently one of our newly appointed inspectors, and his increment was postponed for a year, because he did not reach a certain standard of efficiency. He lost that increment under the Order in Council. If a man does not get his increment in any year, and it has been refused to him, he loses it.

11049. Are you perfectly certain that one officer alone can stop the increment by the refusal of his signature, without any appeal?—No, I did not say that.

11050. I gathered that you said that an officer could stop it absolutely?—I say this, that if the officer refuses to give his certificate, the Order in Council has laid it down distinctly that the man cannot get his increment; but no officer, if there is a case of appeal, and a justified appeal, would stop it, or it would be a very unlikely thing. If the officer is a comparatively junior officer, I think the head of the Department would say: "I think this man might get his increment." In the case, the junior officer, in 999 cases out of 1,000, would be unwilling to persist, and would waive his objection.

11051. Mr. COOPER.—You startled me by saying that you had to certify that your clerks were highly efficient. Do you withdraw that?—I do not withdraw it. I say that an increment is not granted unless the certificate is that the clerk has given approved service.

11052. But not "highly efficient" service?—Not, perhaps, "highly" efficient service, but I say he must have given good and efficient service before we give him the increment.

11053. The CHAIRMAN.—We have now come to the point in your memorandum where you refer to the inspection staff being recruited largely from the staff of National teachers. I think you had finished that question about the report of the managers?—There was just a point about increments of salary which was referred to before luncheon, and I took occasion to go back to the office and get the forms\* that we use. I have brought them now, and it would be just as well that I should make this clear about the question of increments to civil servants. There are two forms here which we use. This is the first:—"Mr. ——— through length of service and efficiency in the discharge of his duty as ——— has become entitled to an increment of salary according from ——— and his conduct during the year immediately preceding the date of this certificate has been approved." That is according to the Order in Council. For the Inspection out-door Staff it is signed by the chief inspector, as the "immediate superior," and it has to go through all those stages before a man can get his increment. Then we have a similar form for the office staff. This is the Order of Council, dated 10th January, 1910, Section 18:—"An annual increment of salary shall not be allowed to any officer at the date of which it would, in ordinary cases become due without a certificate from his immediate superior officer, countersigned by the head of the Department, or such other person as he may designate for the purpose, to the effect that the service of such officer for the year immediately preceding the date of such certificate has been approved." And no increment is given to any officer of the indoor or outdoor staff without such certificate being given and submitted to the Board.

11054. Now about the recruiting of the inspection staff from the ranks of the National teachers?—That is provided for.

11055. They were not taken from the ranks of the National teachers before?—They were, but it was put in the rules in 1930 that inspectorship were open to National teachers.

11056. Now when you refer to the new system of inspection and appointments of senior inspectors, what do you mean by that—there is one in each circuit, I suppose?—Yes; that was the appointment of 22 senior inspectors instead of 6 head inspectors. They have 22

circuits, and then there is the appointment of the chiefs of inspection instead of the chief inspectors, the abolition, in fact, of the office of chief of inspection and the appointment of chief inspectors.

11057. But you retained the name of head inspector still there?—No, it went out.

11058. But you keep it in rural practice, for you say, "increments of salaries to chiefs of inspection and head inspectors"?—Yes, at the time I refer to there was chiefs of inspection and head inspectors. These chiefs of inspection had a maximum salary of £750 a year at that time. Their salary was in 1900 increased to £800 a year. They were also made absolutely out-door officers, which added considerably to their emoluments in personal expenses.

11059. The head inspectors were absorbed in the ranks of the senior inspectors?—No, we had no senior inspectors up to then. The Commissioners made the head inspectors senior inspectors following the example of the English Board of Education. They wanted to reorganise their inspection staff on similar lines to the English one. They did not want to have head inspectors and senior inspectors. The head inspectors became senior inspectors at an increase of salary. They had £850 a year, and they got £700.

11060. Do all the senior inspectors get £700?—Yes, that is their maximum. Their maximum before was £650. Then 10 of the district inspectors were promoted to the rank of senior inspector to make up the 22, and the old head inspectors regarded that as a pulling down of their status. They said, "We were only 6 before, and now we are 22."

11061. That is what you mean by saying in your paper that no degradation of head inspectors or chiefs of inspection was intended by the change of name?—None whatever. That is a point I wish to make quite clear, as Mr. Deering's suggestion and Mr. Fisher's largely turned on that question of the change of name.

11062. They were very dissatisfied?—They were very discontented. Mr. Fisher believed that he was something very superior to a chief inspector in England. He said that he was a chief of the inspection and statistical department, and that meant something very much higher than a chief inspector. Well, the Board did not admit his contention at all. They said in appointing you chief inspector, we want to put you on a level with men of the very highest class in England, who are all very glad to be appointed to a chief inspectorship, and who are the highest educational people in England, and have very high salaries. We intend no degradation of you, quite the contrary. We want to make your position a better one and a more definite one than it was as chief of inspection.

11063. It seems to me that the head inspectors had some reason to complain, because they were absorbed in a larger body?—I do not think so.

11064. The BUREAU OF ROSS.—They got an increase of salary?—They got £700 a year as consolation.

11065. The CHAIRMAN.—Now you say there was necessity for absolute secrecy with regard to the proposals as there were negotiations going on with the Treasury?—Yes. This is a point that has been put by the chief inspectors in their appeal against some of the changes. They were not kept informed of those, but it would have been absolutely impossible for any of the officials of the Board to be kept informed of the negotiations that were going on with the Treasury affecting vast sums of public money, negotiations which were carried on by absolutely confidential correspondence with the Treasury and with the Government. Until the Commissioners had made up their minds as to the scheme they were about to put before the Government, and until the Government sanctioned that, it was absolutely necessary that these should be secret. If any inkling had got abroad, say, that such a great measure as the abolition of the results system was going to be carried out, the chances are that there would be a storm of difficulties raised on the part of some people to it. It is very easy to create difficulties, and I will allude to it later on.

11066. We might proceed to the point where you mention that Dr. Starkie's scheme was submitted to the Commissioners in 1898?—Dr. Starkie sent that scheme round to the Commissioners himself.

\* Vide Appendix XXVI. (B).

22nd May, 1913.]

Mr. P. B. LAMONT, I.R.O., L.R.C.S.I., examined.

[Continued.]

11067. Mr. CORRY.—When was that?—He sent it on the 16th of November, 1900. He sent a copy to each of the Commissioners, and he asked them to peruse it carefully, and make such ratings as they considered necessary, and to give him their views prior to the next Board meeting.

11068. The CHAIRMAN.—The Board met four days later?—The Board met four days later, and in the meantime the Commissioners had this scheme which sent out the details of proposals. It has been alleged that it was taken back from them. It was not taken back from them. They returned it, and a series of resolutions were proposed at that meeting by the Resident Commissioner with regard to the new scheme, and various points of the new scheme were embodied in the resolutions.

11069. And those resolutions\* were passed by the Board at that meeting?—They were passed unanimously by the Board.

11070. And then submitted to the Lord Lieutenant?—Submitted to the Lord Lieutenant on the 15th of November.

11071. What does that date of "January, 1900," refer to?—That is a letter from Dublin Castle conveying conditional sanction of the new scheme by the Treasury. The Treasury reserved to itself complete liberty as to the scale and conditions of payments, and the number of teachers in the higher grade.

11072. That is what now prevents men getting the full emolument of their promotion?—Quite so. They said that the numbers in the higher grades should not be altered by the Commissioners without their consent, and that the periodic increase of salary should not be regarded as merely increments in the Civil Service sense. They did not use the words "Civil Service," but that is what they meant; that they should be regarded as in the nature of a merit grant; and in connection with this whole question, it is very important to remember that the payment now made to the teachers consists of two parts—namely, a fixed salary called a grade salary, and a good service salary which increases by increments at the end of three years. There is a fixed salary for every teacher, and if he gives good service he may get an increment of a supplementary salary called a good service salary. I think from some of the statements I have seen that people nowadays are confusing the good service salary with the ordinary grade salary, and they are under the impression that the increments are increments of the ordinary salary. They are not such things.

11073. They are increments made on the reports of three years?—But they are additions to the permanent or fixed salary of each grade. Each grade has a fixed salary for which there are no increments, and there is a good service salary of which there are increments, and that good service salary is supposed to be only given for good service.

11074. But there is one point I want you particularly to explain.—"Scheme of payments designed to promote advancement of high-class teachers to best schools."—The meaning of that is, that in connection with the scheme of payments there would be migration of teachers from small to large schools. It was necessary—absolutely necessary—to satisfy the Treasury in the first instance, because they stipulated that the new scheme should not cost more than the old scheme. That was the condition they put before us, that we should make a new scheme out of the same money that we had for the old scheme, and in order to satisfy that condition we had to fit an average attendance of 50 for the second division of the higher grade salary, and an average of 30 for the first division of first grade salary; that is, that a teacher could not get the second division of first grade salary unless the average attendance at his school was 50, and he could not get the first of first grade salary unless the average attendance at his school was 30. Under the old regulations the teachers could get the second class salary or first class salary if the school had an average attendance of 55, but it must be remembered there is no proper comparison between class salary under the old regulations and grade salary under the new. They represent different things. Class salary under the old regulations only represented one portion of a teacher's income. The grade salary represents three or more portions put together. The grade salary, in fact, at present represents practically all the teacher's

income except the annual gratification grant. The class salary under the old arrangement merely represented a fixed sum of, say, £80 or £84, according to the class, and his other emoluments would vary with the average attendance, so that a man getting first-class salary under the old regulations would not necessarily be a loser financially by not getting first grade salary under the new.

11075. Mr. HENRY.—Were those numbers suggested to you, or did you suggest them to the Treasury?—Those numbers were the result of a consideration of a lot of things. We had, of course, to keep our scheme within the limits of the expenditure, and I think the way the numbers were arrived at, though I cannot say positively, was this:—We made a very exhaustive examination of the incomes of the teachers. Tables were prepared of every teacher's income in the country, and we found that the teachers having incomes that were like the incomes that we were going to give the teachers of the highest grade necessarily had attendances of 50 or 70, or the case might be; certainly they could not have a sufficient income under the old regulations unless the average attendance at their schools were so much, that is under the old results system, because every child counted financially then.

11076. The CHAIRMAN.—And you based it on the average numbers of 30 and 50 in the two grades?—We based the averages for the grades on the averages in the case of the teachers who had similar incomes. The scheme was designed to promote the advancement of high-class teachers to the best schools. We found that there was a number of high-class teachers in small schools, especially Protestant schools. Some of those high-class teachers worked in schools with an average attendance of only 10 or 15 children. We found very few of that class amongst the Catholic teachers. We gave those teachers, if they were content to remain in those small schools, a living wage. We also put before them this consideration—that if they got into a school, say, with an average of 50, they would get a very much larger salary, and if they got into a large school with an average of 50 or 70, they might get first grade salary. Their classification would have warranted in many cases the grant of this. That was put before them, if you like, as a bait to try and get them into better schools. We thought that automatically the teachers would gravitate towards the best class of schools by the fact that they would get increased emoluments there without further examination or test, and that that would be a sufficient inducement. That is the meaning of that provision, and that has actually taken place in some schools.

11077. Mr. HENRY.—Did not your scheme provide for this: that the initial income of a teacher under the new scheme was to start at the average for the previous three years, and that then he was fitted into the grade system in correspondence with that salary, and irrespective of class and irrespective of experience he had to work his way up to the top?—We had to fit them in.

11078. There was no inducement of getting an immediate increase of salary?—Certainly there was; we provided that if a man was a first-class teacher he could get the first grade salary. The only bar against that was that the average attendance in his school might be insufficient.

11079. You took the salary paid in the school for the three years previous to 1900, in a small school, and then when the scheme came into operation that salary was fixed on the average of the previous three years, and he was then fitted into the scheme wherever that average salary would place him, and he was graded in accordance with that?—That is, his salary was graded. Grading did not apply to the teacher at all. That is, a mistake that has been made through the discussion. They are called grades. "Sections." I had them in my original draft, but the word "sections" was unfortunately changed by a Commissioner, because he thought that "grade" looked better, and I said at the time "grade" will be interpreted as applying to the teacher, not to the salary. Those were sections of salary. It was intended that ultimately the grade of the salary and the class of the teacher should be identical, but it was obvious that that could not be the case in the beginning.



28-d May, 1918.]

Mr. P. E. LAMASS, I.R.O., L.R.C.S.I., continued.

[Continued.]

11060. "Existing teachers, however, to rank in the grades of the scheme to which their actual incomes from the State correspond, and which their position as principals or assistants permits. If such teachers are not in receipt of salary from the State equal to the maximum of the grade to which they would thus respectively become attached, they would be eligible for advancement in salary to such maximum in the same way as other teachers, that is, by annual increments; but such teachers would not be entitled to promotion from one grade to another, or from the first section to the second section of first grade except on the usual conditions provided in the case of any other teachers who are not detached from promotion." And then "as an example of the application of the new scheme to the case of existing teachers, the following will suffice.—Supposing the present income from the State of a male principal teacher is £89 16s. 8d. per annum, he would in future under the new scale become a second grade teacher rising from £99 by annual increments of £3 to the maximum salary of £109?—That is all perfectly correct. All that is provided for, and was provided for; but there was no injustice done to the teachers. Every teacher had his average salary given to him as an initial salary."

11061. But the point that I thought you were not making clear was this, that supposing he moved one month after that scheme came into operation from the small school to the large school, he carried with him the salary that he had in the small school and began with that portion of the grade salary and worked his way up to the top?—I say that man, if he was a first of first class teacher, and went into a school of 50 or an average, would immediately get the normal income of first of first class teacher as an initial income.

11062. He got seventy?—Every one of those cases was specially considered, and we gave a special normal salary. We considered a thousand and odd cases.

11063. The CHAIRMAN.—Now, you refer to letters of the 24th and 25th of March, 1900, from Mr. Downing to the Secretaries which involved the suspension of Mr. Downing. What did those letters refer to?—The new scheme. What happened was this. Dr. Starke gave those gentlemen a copy of this memorandum, as they were chiefs of inspection, for them to read and to know what the Commissioners had in their mind, and for any criticisms they might wish to make on it. There are two letters from each of them. I have the letters here.

11064. Now, will you read Mr. Downing's letters of the 24th and 25th of March?—Yes. This is Mr. Downing's—

11065. Mr. CONWAY.—Was there a letter from Dr. Starke to Mr. Downing?—No, there was no such letter so far as I know. He sent these copies to them as well as I understood. He will tell you all about that himself; but he left them these copies. He did not send them through me or through any other official that I am aware of. Perhaps he told the Secretary. I was not Secretary at the time, and he may have told the Secretary, that is Mr. Seymour. This letter from Mr. Downing, at any rate, is addressed to the Secretaries, and not to Dr. Starke:—

Office of National Education,  
Dublin, 24th March, 1900.

Gentlemen,

Having studied the purport of the memorandum in which the new scheme of National Education is sketched, and with a copy of which I was favoured last week by the Resident Commissioner, I beg leave to submit to the Board a respectful protest against the terms of that portion of it which refers to my office, the status and character of which it is proposed to degrade. I earnestly request the Commissioners to consider if my long services deserve to be thus requited. I ask attention to an incorrect statement of a seriously misleading nature to be found at page 15 of the document, and on the strength of which the objections proposed seem to be based. This statement is that in the estimate for the year 31/3/1900 provision is made for the inspection staff, consisting of two chiefs of inspection, etc. The fact is, that in the estimates my colleague and I are described as chiefs of the inspection and statistical department, and our salaries are included, not with those of the inspectors,

but under section 3, under the head of administration or office in Dublin, and that has been the invariable practice since the first appointment of a chief of inspection. I most respectfully submit that strict inquiries should be made as to what official is responsible for thus attempting to mislead the Board, for, of course, it cannot be admitted that that is a mere inadvertent mistake. The document bears no signature; no one seems to be responsible for its accuracy or authenticity, notwithstanding its grave import. If the inaccurate statement to which I have referred has been submitted to the Treasury, as to the justification of the change in the position and duties of the chiefs of inspection, I respectfully submit that due correction should be made at once. The memorandum refers to certain details of inspection and of school organisation about which I think it will be admitted that the chiefs of inspection should have been consulted, particularly as the anonymous author of that document has displayed such extraordinary ignorance of the circumstances and requirements of primary education. With all the defects attributed as the past to this great institution of the National Board this memorandum is unworthy of it. If the new scheme is to be made a success, some more intelligent advisers must be taken into counsel, and I hope the Commissioners will recognise the wisdom and necessity of again availing of the services of their senior officers. Referring to the proposal to remove the chiefs of inspection from the Education Office, I suppose I may presume the inspectors will still have to furnish reports as heretofore. If so, in order that those reports may prove of any use, they must be read and dealt with by skilled educationists conversant with the difficulties in the way of primary education throughout the country, competent to judge if the inspector is working on sound principles, competent also to draw from the reports generally information on which to base instructions for the guidance of managers, teachers, and superintendents, and finally in a position of superiority to the inspectors, so as to secure respect for and obedience to the instructions issued. The new scheme will call for more skill and more labour in dealing with the reports than did the results system ordinarily, and then there are several other important duties that must still be performed by someone in the Education Office, and that seems to have been overlooked. The Irish system of National Education differs so essentially from the English system that an attempt at perfect assimilation must result in failure. I may be permitted to add that retrenchment in this office should not commence in the one department in which alone work of a directly educational character is done. In conclusion, I beg to state I am in a position to prove that during my time of service as chief of inspection and statistical department I have initiated some very important improvements in the character of inspection and reports, improvements which I maintain have prepared the way for the new order of things in no inconsiderable degree. I have performed a number of duties during a trying period, and, therefore, I hope I shall be excused for saying that I feel grievously disappointed at the absence of all recognition of my past services, and that I am quite unable to estimate what I have done or left undone to warrant the treatment foreshadowed in the memorandum.

I am, Gentlemen,  
Your obedient servant,  
R. DOWNING.

11066. Now, the letter of the 25th?—There are statements in that letter which I have just read which are entirely incorrect. He was suspended on that first letter, the letter of the 24th, was subseguent to his suspension. The date of his suspension was the 25th of March.

11067. Sir HENRY WILKINSON.—Might I, at this stage, ask what was the state of a suspended officer—did he continue to do any work, and did he continue to receive any salary?—He did not do any work once he was suspended, and he would not have received any salary, but that the Board subsequently made an order when removing the suspension that he was to be paid for the interval. He was suspended on the 25th on the first letter of the 24th.

23rd May, 1913.]

Mr. P. E. LEAHY, I.R.O., I.R.C.S.I., examined.

[Continued.]

11088. THE CHAIRMAN.—The suspension was on the 29th?—Yes, this is the letter of suspension:—

Education Office,  
28th March, 1910.

Sir,  
I am directed by the Resident Commissioner to inform you that in consequence of your letter to the Secretaries of the 24th inst., on the subject of the new scheme of administration of this department, the terms of which are considered to be insubordinate and subversive of official discipline, you are suspended from your functions of chief of inspection from this date pending the further consideration of your case.

I am, Sir,  
Your obedient Servant,  
M. S. SHERMAN, Secretary.

11089. Then Mr. Downing's reply?—

15 Kenilworth Square, Bathurst,  
28th of March

Gentlemen,

May I request of you to bring immediately under the notice of the Board the fact that on this afternoon I received a communication of which the following is a copy:—On receipt of this letter I wrote to the office under protest, and I now respectfully request the Commissioners to carefully inquire into the circumstances. I utterly disclaim any intention of doing anything insubordinate or subversive of official discipline. I deny that I have done anything of the kind, and I fail to see in my letter anything that could properly be so considered. My letter was for the Board, and, therefore, it was for the Board to decide if it contained any improper matter. The Resident Commissioner could not be justified for interfering with my right of communication with the Board. His act, I submit, was one of unlawful intimidation. I claim the right of appealing at any time to the Board for the protection of my rights and privileges, and in my letter I have done no more than that. The Resident Commissioner has far exceeded his rightful authority in putting such a high-handed affront on an officer of my standing and length of service. I request of the Board to give a ruling to that effect, and to direct the official withdrawal of the letter of suspension, coupled with an apology for that wrong insult offered to me. In considering the question of the Resident Commissioner's authority in this case, the following extracts from the evidence given before the Royal Commission on Primary Education will, I believe, prove instructive. In volume 4 at page 1648, question 23,611, Sir Alexander MacDonnell, the Resident Commissioner, is represented as stating that "whenever an important question arises with reference to dismissal or punishment of any officer they (the Commissioners) are consulted and take an active part in the business." Question 23,622: "We may understand then that practically the system is administered by yourself and the secretaries and chiefs of inspection?" Answer: "The routine administration of the system is carried on in that way, but whenever, even in the routine administration, anything of importance or of a novel nature takes place we are always bound to consult the Board, and so on." Page 1651, question 23,648: "Who dismisses the clerks?" Answer: "The Board." Question 23,649: "Would the Sub-committee?" No, we should never venture on such a thing as the dismissal of a clerk or inspector." Answer 23,652: "The Sub-committee never venture to recommend dismissal or non-dismissal in the case of officers like clerks or inspectors; they leave that entirely to the Board." In volume 3, Mr. Cowie says: "I should like to ask you about the gradation of officers of the Board. You have a Resident Commissioner, Secretaries, Chiefs of Inspection, and so forth. Is that the gradation in rank or quality?" The late Sir Patrick Keenan answered: "I can hardly say that is the exact gradation of rank. I should say the Board (Mr. MacDonnell being its Resident member), the Secretaries, the Chiefs of Inspection, and so forth." Is it not perfectly clear from these statements that the Resident Commissioner had not authority to punish the humblest clerk in the office without an order of the Board, and does it not follow

that he has not the right of suspending the humblest clerk unless under exceptional circumstances that would not admit of delay for a meeting of the Board? I assert that there was no reason whatever in my case why such an offence as the Resident Commissioner supposes me guilty of should not be reserved for the verdict of the Board. The fact that he was to some extent responsible for the grievance of which I complain was but an additional reason why he should not constitute himself sole judge in the matter. If the Resident Commissioner was justified in his treatment of me, then my vested interests as a civil servant are a myth, and my position one of slavery. Of course, I feel confident that the Commissioners will protect from such unreasonable and insulting treatment one who has spent over 40 years in their service in various capacities, and whom they have deemed worthy of promotion, step by step, from the very lowest to my present rank. I leave my case with perfect confidence to the justice of the Board.

I am, Gentlemen,  
Your obedient Servant,  
B. DOWNING.

11090. Now, there remain two letters of Mr. Purser for the tone and terms of which he was suspended?—Yes; the letters are addressed to the Secretaries, dated the 22nd and 29th of March. I may mention that Mr. Downing's case was brought before a Committee of the Board, and his suspension was confirmed, and Mr. Purser's letters too, which I will read, were submitted to the Committee:—

Office of National Education,  
22nd March, 1910

Gentlemen,

I request you will lay before the Board the accompanying memorandum relative to the proposed abolition of the office of chiefs of inspection. In this memorandum I endeavour to show (1) that the chiefs of inspection are not inspectors, but are the heads of a department in the Education Office, namely the inspection and statistical department; (2) that our office is one that cannot be done without, and that cannot be properly filled by anyone not having a thorough practical acquaintance with schools and school work; (3) that to make the present chiefs of the inspection and statistical department chief inspectors would lower their status, and debase them again to the rank of head inspector.

I am, Gentlemen,  
Your obedient Servant,  
A. PURSER.

Then there is a very long memorandum from Mr. Purser.

11091. He was condemned for the tone and terms of his letter?—Yes; I expect, of course, that Dr. Sturkie will go into this matter very fully. Here is the second letter:—

National Education Office,  
Dublin, 29th March, 1910.

Gentlemen,

A Committee of the whole Board having been appointed to consider the proposed re-organization of the inspection staff, as well as the proposal to abolish the office of chiefs of inspection, I beg to forward herewith notes of an interview I had on the 24th inst. with the Resident Commissioner, at which he advised the Resident Commissioner, at which he advised, verbally criticized my action as regards this matter, and the statements in my memorandum which I understood to be submitted to the Committee. In the margin of the paper I am now forwarding will be found my answer to the objections raised by the Resident Commissioner, which I was unable to furnish without further inquiry. Should the Commissioners be quite satisfied that the position they appointed me to is that of head of a department in the Education Office, and that I do not belong to the inspection staff, they need not be troubled with the whole of the enclosed document, but from the red line on page 2 to another red line on page 7.

I am,  
Your obedient Servant,  
A. PURSER.

2nd May, 1918.]

Mr. P. B. LEWIS, I.R.O., L.R.C.S.I., continued.

[Continued.]

11102. Might I suggest that there can be no possible objection to copies of these documents being furnished. It is only a question of getting them upon our notes?—Well, as they are confidential documents (this letter of Mr. Purser is marked confidential), I would not like to take on myself to hand them in without consulting Dr. Sturkie. You will have him here next week, and I am under the impression that he would have no objection whatsoever to hand them in.

11103. Now, as to the recommendation to the Treasury to sanction the retention of the titles of head inspectors and chiefs of inspection?—They appealed to the Board not to have the titles changed.

11104. And the Board seems to have assented to that appeal at first?—They assented to it and forwarded a recommendation to the Treasury, and to the Irish Government.

11105. And that was not accepted?—The head inspectors at the same time were admonished for communicating with individual Commissioners with regard to their representations to the Board.

11106. They had communicated with the individual Commissioners?—Yes.

11107. And they were admonished that they had no right to do so?—Yes, and that it was quite contrary to the regulations.

11108. Sir HERMAN WILKINSON.—Perhaps you could give us the regulation on that subject?—The regulations are embodied in three or four circulars that were issued at various times by the Commissioners, that no one was to attempt to influence individual Commissioners in their own interests, or to communicate on matters—

11109. Matters in which they were personally concerned?—To communicate with the Commissioners in which they were personally concerned, or to do anything in the way of canvassing for appointments. Those rules and regulations of the Commissioners are based on old Treasury regulations, and some modern Treasury regulations.

11110. The CHAIRMAN.—They date long before 1907?—Yes; the Treasury have very stringent regulations about civil servants communicating with members of Parliament, and canvassing them or trying to influence the decision of the Treasury in any way. They have repeated those regulations over and over again.

11111. Mr. KERR.—Of course, it is notorious that civil servants never do canvass?—It is notorious that they complain of that regulation.

11112. The CHAIRMAN.—And then you say that the Resident Commissioner accepted the apology of Mr. Purser, and proposed the removal of his suspension?—Yes, the Resident Commissioner accepted the apology of Mr. Purser, and proposed that the suspension should be removed. I have the apology here. This is Mr. Purser's letter.

15 Palmerston Road, Dublin,

2nd April, 1903.

Gentlemen,

I have to acknowledge the receipt of your communication of March 31st, notifying that I have been suspended from the duties of my office, owing to the tone and terms of my letters of the 22nd and 29th of March. I regret extremely to learn that the tone and terms of those letters have been deemed unbecoming an official of my position, and such as to merit suspension. In laying my case (perhaps with undue warmth) before the Board as to my position of chief of inspection I had no intention whatever of doing anything whatever discourteous or calculated to impair the authority of the Resident Commissioner or the Board. After 29 years service, I feel keenly the censure which my suspension implies. I unreservedly retract and apologise for anything in the tone and language of my letters that are deemed by the Board improper or worthy of disapproval. While respectfully requesting the Board to accept this apology, and to remove the suspension, I venture to assure them that it has ever been my desire to maintain the discipline and promote the efficiency of the department to which I have given the best years of my life, not, I trust, without some measure of success.

I am,

Your obedient Servant

A. PURSER.

11113. Mr. CORRY.—Have you the letter of the 11th of March?

Office of National Education,  
31st March, 1903.

Sir,

I am directed to inform you that at a meeting of the Committee of the whole Board to consider the appointment of a Head Organizer of Manual and Practical Instruction, and to make other preliminary arrangements in connection with the scheme, at which certain statements made by you relative to the change involved in the new system were also considered, the following recommendation was adopted, viz.:—That having regard to the tone and terms of Mr. Purser's letters to the Secretaries on the 22nd and 29th of March last, he be suspended until further orders of the Board.

I am, Sir, your obedient Servant,  
M. A. SHANNON, Secretary.

11114. Mr. KERR.—They call that a recommendation?—It is a recommendation of the Committee.

11115. Had it the effect of an Order of the Board for the time being?—Yes, for the time being; it was pending the next meeting of the Board.

11116. The recommendation had immediate effect?—Yes, it had immediate effect. So far as the power of suspension is concerned, Dr. Sturkie was perfectly within his rights in suspending Mr. Downing. The Resident Commissioner expressed that power on former occasions. I have not had time to look into all the cases, but there was the case of one of the staff of the office, whose name I need not give, who was suspended by the Resident Commissioner.

11117. CHAIRMAN.—Who was the Resident Commissioner at that time?—Sir Patrick Keenan.

11118. Mr. KERR.—For what was he suspended?—Well, I could not say, and perhaps it would not be desirable to say. I would not have the slightest hesitation myself in suspending an official under certain circumstances if the Resident Commissioner was not there. I could give you half a dozen cases of suspensions, but I do not want to mention names.

11119. Mr. KERR.—Have you known the power of suspension to be exercised on previous occasions by the Resident Commissioner?—Not by the Resident Commissioner on several occasions, but I certainly know one case where I could give you the name, and I believe there are many other cases if I had time to examine the records.

11120. Mr. CORRY.—Have you any case where an inspector was suspended?—I think so. I knew of an inspector being suspended.

11121. Mr. HANCOCK.—The right to suspend an officer is not in dispute?—In this letter of Mr. Downing he implies that Dr. Sturkie had no power, and he refers to evidence given at the Public Commission, and deduces from those questions and answers a meaning that I hold they do not contain, and he indicates that the Resident Commissioner was acting with care when he suspended him.

11122. The CHAIRMAN.—Do you not think it is for the Resident Commissioner himself to state what powers he believes he has, and then possibly to have them challenged in his own presence?—I think so.

11123. Now we might go on to the apology from Mr. Downing. Have you got that?—Yes, Mr. Downing presented an apology. On the 2nd of April, Mr. Downing writes:—

Gentlemen,

I beg, as in duty bound, to the decision of the Board which has just been communicated to me, and I beg to apologise for any expressions or statements in my letters of the 24th and 29th of March, that, in the opinion of the Commissioners, are of an insubordinate character or subversive of official discipline or improper in any respect. I sincerely regret if I have so expressed myself as to convey that I meant any disrespect towards the Resident Commissioner. I certainly meant to do nothing of the kind.

I am, Gentlemen, your obedient Servant.

E. DOWNING.

23rd May, 1918.]

Mr. P. R. LEMASS, I.S.O., I.R.C.S.I., examined.

[Continued.]

11114-15. Mr. Coffey.—We have missed a little link in the chain. He refers to a decision of the Board that has just been communicated to him. We want that decision of the Board?—I think the letter he refers to is the letter suspending him from the Secretary, Mr. Seymour.

11116. He says, "The decision of the Board which has just been communicated to me." On the 29th of March, Mr. Downing appealed to the Commissioners, and I want to know what became of that?—I referred to that.

11117. And the next that we have is an apology from the Mr. Downing of the 2nd of April. And an acknowledgment of a decision of the Board which had just been communicated to him?—That was in a letter of the Secretary of the 2nd of April—"I am directed to inform you that at a meeting of the Committee of the whole Board on Saturday, the 31st ulto, the following order was made:—That having regard to the tone and terms of Mr. Downing's letters to the Secretaries of the 24th and 29th of March, his suspension by the Resident Commissioner be confirmed and continued until further orders." That was at a meeting of the Committee of the whole Board on Saturday, the 31st of March.

11118. Was that the standing Committee?—No, a special Committee meeting of the whole Board.

11119. Mr. Kettle.—That means the whole Board sitting as a Committee?—It means as many members of the Board as wish to turn up.

11120. Mr. Coffey.—It was curious to hold it on a Saturday?—The matter was urgent.

11121. The CHAIRMAN.—Now you say that Messrs. Purser and Downing in future were loyally to use their best endeavours to put into operation the new system, and to recognise and respect the authority of the Board?—Yes, that was an order of the Board.

11122. Can you show us that order?—Mr. Downing sent in his apology, and it was not accepted, and he sent in a further apology to the Resident Commissioner.

11123. Mr. Coffey.—What date was that?—That was on the 6th of April. This is the order:—"That the Board having now removed the suspension of both chiefs of inspection think it right to put on record that they have adopted this course in the confident expectation that both of those gentlemen will in the future loyally use their best endeavours to put into operation and to carry out the newly-inaugurated system of National Education, and further, that each of them will recognise and respect the authority of the Resident Commissioner."

11124. The CHAIRMAN.—What was the date of that order?—The 10th of April.

11125. Now there is a letter from Dublin Castle refusing to sanction the retention of the titles of head inspector and chiefs of inspection?—That was in reply to our letter of recommendation.

11126. Of the 8th of May, 1909?—Of the 9th of May.

11127. Next comes a letter from Mr. Purser appealing against the change of title?—I told you about the origin of the chiefs of inspection. I intended to go pretty fully into this. For 24 years—from 1831 to 1855—there were no chiefs of inspection. The inspectors' reports were sent to the office, and were noted by clerks there, experienced clerks. They were noted from the Registers and Precedent Books and submitted to the Secretaries with the suggested action noted on them. There were neither examiners, in the sense that we have examiners now, nor chiefs of inspection. That went on until the year 1855, when the office, as I stated earlier to-day, became congested, and the chiefs of inspection came in. When the chiefs of inspection were made chief inspectors, more than three-fourths, I think, of the work that they did was of this character, approving of notings on reports. The whole thing, so far as anything in the way of a general scrutiny of the reports by the chiefs of inspection was concerned, was illusory. Occasionally if a report had any very important matter in it, it was undoubtedly scrutinised by the chiefs of inspection, but 75 per cent.

of the reports that we get from inspectors are perfectly straight reports; there is nothing to note on them, and everything is satisfactory, but they are scrutinised by the clerks and examiners to see are the answers to the queries satisfactory, and the usual noting on the back of these reports is "may go up" or "send minute."

11128. Sir HENRY WILKINSON.—The first noting you mention is "may go up"?—Yes, that means that the report may go up to the records. That was the first noting. Then when we began to send minutes, about 1864, the noting was altered to "send minute." And to this day that is the noting that is made on the majority of the reports that come in. Those reports are noted in the office now as they were 50 years ago by the clerks. A clerk entering that office, from the day that he comes in, is trained in this practice, and the older clerks assist him. He is bound to examine the records, and to put on the back of the report anything affecting the teacher or that is referred to in the report, say, neglect of rule or matters of that kind, and after some time he gets an experience of the kind of noting that has been approved of for years in regard to the different matters in the report and the action to be taken. He gets to know this, and as he gets older and gets more experience this becomes a very easy matter with him, much more easy than it would be for a new man coming into the office. Well, when the examiners were appointed, the two men who got the positions were senior first-class clerks, men of mature years, and very able men.

11129. The CHAIRMAN.—Had they served under the chiefs of inspection?—One man had.

11130. The same Man of duty?—Yes. I think there is a little misunderstanding about serving under chiefs of inspection. Both chiefs of inspection sat in the one room, and had a clerk there in attendance on them, and he made notings occasionally on reports that came up, but the vast majority of the notings were made by members of the ordinary staff, and there are a very considerable number of these notings made at the present moment by members of the ordinary staff. They pass up now to the examiners, who scrutinise them. Then they were submitted to the chiefs of inspection. If there was any report on which one of the ordinary members of the staff did not think himself competent to make a noting, he would call the attention of the chiefs of inspection to the report, and he would say, "Query action to be taken," and in that case the chief of inspection or the clerk in the room with him made a noting that he thought would suit the case. The clerk submitted it to the chief of inspection in the room, and got him to initial it and to approve of it, and it was sent back to the Inspection Office, and the action was taken as indicated. Well, a similar system practically prevails to the present moment. The only difference in this respect is that the examiner is now the man who sees the report finally. He puts on his initials to the noting, or he makes a noting as the case may be, but practically it is the same class of men that are doing the work who were doing it when the chiefs of inspection were there, or before they were there. It became evident after the appointment of the Most Reverend Dr. Walsh to the Board that he and the other Commissioners had come to the conclusion that the chiefs of inspection were wasting a great deal of their valuable time, and could be better employed in looking after the inspection service in the country. I remember some members of the Board sending for some hundreds of the inspectors' reports, which were carried up by porters, and laid on the Boardroom table. They were gone over by the Commissioners present, and they found that in about 75 per cent. of these cases the reports were perfectly straight, and that there was no action to be taken, that they were simply noted by the clerks in charge. They were duly initialled. I must say, by the chief of inspection, but in very few cases were there any blemish notings by the chiefs, comparatively few. They might occasionally put in a word. Here is one of Mr. Downing's that I am looking at this moment, where there is a noting by a clerk, "Inform Inspector so-and-so," altered by the chief of inspection in blue ink, so as to make it read "Inform Inspector, Mr. so-and-so," etc.

11131. Mr. Kettle.—Do they have time?—They had ample time. During the results period much of

23rd May, 1918.]

Mr. P. E. LEHANE, I.S.O., L.R.C.S.I., examined.

[Continued.]

their time was occupied with questions arising from results inspections, where a man's fees depended on the answering of a child, such as whether a pass would be allowed for reading or whether No. 2 passes or No. 1 passes would be allowed in certain cases, or whether a teacher whose results report was very bad should not be further punished, say, by getting 20 per cent. of his fees taken off, or the whole of his results fees disallowed. Many questions of that kind were submitted to them by the clerks in the results department, and they made little rulings on them; and then with the abolition of the results system that vanished immediately, and they had nothing but the ordinary reports. Of course, they had other things to do which they have to do still, such as looking after the arrangements for the examinations of teachers and the training colleges, but the intention of the Commissioners at the initiation of this new system in 1900 was never carried out—to do away largely with the annual examination of the teachers. It has never been carried out in full, but it has been carried out to some extent. They were inclined to abolish the examinations altogether, and to accept diplomas from places like Trinity College or the Royal University. I think we were actually in correspondence with the Royal University at the time to see whether they would not examine teachers and give them certificates, and the Commissioners were contemplating the accepting of those certificates in lieu of the disqualification that they would give themselves. That would have got rid of a great deal of work and a great deal of expenditure in connection with the National system. That was to Mr. Redington's time—he was Chancellor of the Royal University, and he was trying to get that scheme sanctioned.

11132. Mr. HENRY.—There are no examinations now except of students who leave the training colleges?—We have monitors' and others.

11133. The CHAIRMAN.—Now about the power of the secretaries?—Well, the examiners are not at all in the position of the chiefs of inspection. They are really men who scrutinise the reports, not in a purely mechanical way, but generally they simply act on precedents and rules and regulations in which they are experts in the making of notings, but these notings are not finally approved of until letters go out that are signed by the secretaries, and the secretaries (I can speak for myself) frequently return the notings or call the attention of the examiners to notings that they do not approve of. When the letter based on an examiner's noting has to be signed by the secretaries, all the documents on the file are sent down with the letter. A great many of these letters, of course, are of a routine character that one glance is sufficient to deal with, but occasionally a very important letter will come down, and that has to be carefully scrutinised, and the file has to be closely examined. Some time ago I found a very important letter submitted for my signature. It was going out to the Bishop of ——— as patron of a certain school, in connection with the case of Father ——— as manager of the school, and a big file of papers was sent down to me with the form that is now sent out to patrons. I searched through the file, and it took a couple of hours, but I found nothing to show that the Bishop was the patron; however, I noticed a gap in the file of two years, and I asked for the papers of those two years, and after two or three days this portion of the file was produced, and the examiner said, "I find that Father ——— is the patron." Had I written that letter to the Bishop, and had it come to Father ———, I could not have held my position in the Education Office.

11134. The HONOR. or ROSS.—Was he both patron and manager?—Both patron and manager. We found actually on the file that the Bishop had been asked some years before would he be patron, and he refused, and he said, "I prefer that Father ——— should be patron," and he was both patron and manager.

11135. The CHAIRMAN.—The head inspectors made an application to send a deputation to the Lord Lieutenant to be allowed to retain their titles?—Yes, and it was refused as against precedent.

11136. That was with reference to their change of title or status?—Yes.

11137. Sir HERMAN WILKINSON.—And that was refused?—Refused.

11138. The CHAIRMAN.—Will you please continue?—Now with regard to the arrangements for the instruction of inspectors under Messrs. Boyce and Heller, the Board ordered that all the inspectors should be instructed in the new system of hand-and-eye training and elementary science, and the inspectors were summoned in batches to Dublin, to go through a course in the Central Model School in these new subjects. This was preliminary to introducing them into the schools. We commenced at the bottom of the inspection list, and we gradually got up to some of the seniors, and some senior inspectors did not like the idea of being lectured by Messrs. Boyce and Heller. Mr. Purser was asked by the examiner to name the inspectors to come up to Dublin, and he demurred, though the Board had ordered them to come, so the examiner came to me about this, and asked what was he to do. The answer had to go to the Honorable Commissioner, and the Resident Commissioner directed Mr. Purser to comply with the Board's order, which he did.

11139. There it ended?—It ended there so far as that was concerned; I only mention it as an instance of Mr. Purser's attitude towards the reform.

11140. Mr. COWEN.—The Board had ordered it through the secretary, or was he to give certain directions to the inspectors?—No; Mr. Purser was to do it on the Board's order. The chief inspectors were directed to nominate the inspectors for training in these new subjects, and that went on for some time, and he was simply asked to name the next batch of inspectors (as he was chief of the inspection branch) to be summoned.

11141. The CHAIRMAN.—Now about the payment of the results fees?—The results fees were paid in different months for different schools. Each school had a results period. In one school it might be the 31st of March, and in another the 28th of February, and so on. It was intended to bring the new system into operation from the 1st of April, 1900. We proposed to consolidate the salaries of all teachers after the 31st of March. There were some schools which had not been examined, say, from the previous July, and would have a results examination in the following July if the results system continued, and a certain amount of money had been earned. Then the question arose, how we were to settle with those teachers whose results year did not coincide with the 31st of March, and there were several suggestions; that was one of the difficulties of introducing this new scheme. The first plan was to allow the teachers a consolidated salary, and give them each year in future as much as they got in income in the past, and when the teachers should leave the schools or die, make a rectification payment. That would not be listened to, and then the question arose whether we should make an estimate of how much fees had been earned in the previous results period, and give an equivalent. We found that would cost an immense lot of money which the Treasury were not ready to pay down, and then we had to adopt the system of waiting till the end of the results period of each school before we brought the new system into operation in that particular school. Say a school was to be examined for results in June, we waited till the month of June, 1900. The school period ended on the 31st May. We gave them the equivalent of a whole year's results fees to the teachers of that school. We had no examinations after the 1st of April, but we made a calculation by averaging the earnings of the school for the previous three years, and we gave an equivalent grant with the sanction of the Treasury for the results fees, then we commenced the system of consolidated payments.

11142. That would go on for some months after you introduced your new system?—It could only go on for twelve months, so that our new system did not completely come into operation until 1901, and there were other complications about payments that arose at that time that I do not think I could succeed in making clear to you. In connection with the balance of the residual grant, which gave us a great deal of trouble and correspondence, we only succeeded in wiping out what were alleged to be our arrears by having a big

2nd May, 1913.]

Mr. P. E. LEWIS, I.S.O., I.R.C.S.I., examined.

[Continued.]

balance one year that we did not know what to do with, until we decided to go to the Treasury, and ask them would they allow us to pay off this balance of the residual grant. We went to the Treasury, and they allowed it to be paid off, and we got rid of the teachers' claims against us, and we were no longer considered as persons desiring to deprive them of their just earnings.

11143. Mr. CORRY.—Did it ever strike you that the Treasury were having the best of the bargain?—No, it never did, because the new scheme cost the Treasury about half a million of money.

11144. They got rid of the liability to pay under the head of the grant to the schools, and that would have made Ireland advance as in England they are advancing?—No, but the basis of assessment of the amount of the school grant was changed. His Grace Archbishop Walsh made a great fight for the arrears of the school grant, and Lord Chief Baron Pollock endeavored to prevent surrender to the Treasury of the annual balance of residual grant. He made a very learned statement, a very important legal pronouncement, but the Treasury, in a very short letter, said that while they regarded the Lord Chief Baron's opinion with great respect, they had referred to their own law advisers, and that the money should be surrendered.

11145. Mr. HENLY.—And did the Treasury not pay the arrears that his Grace the Archbishop of Dublin contended for as a set off?—Certainly, we got that, and that was entirely due to the Archbishop, and the teachers ought never to forget that—that was £92,000.

11146. Mr. KERRIN.—You had to get a special vote for that, and it was not the Treasury that gave that, but Parliament?—Yes, but we know nobody except the Treasury. If the Treasury wishes Parliament will do it.

The Bishop of Ross.—Parliament will do it without the Treasury.

11147. The CHAIRMAN.—And the last proposal that the head inspectors should be allowed to retain their title was refused?—Yes, and there was no further correspondence.

11148. And then you refer to the issuing of a tentative programme of school work authorized by the Commissioners?—Yes, the teachers and the public were demonstrating for the new programme.

11149. What was the date of issuing that—was it in June, 1907?—Well, it was just immediately before the receipt of the Treasury letter in June, 1900.

11150. What was the Treasury letter about?—Sanctioning the proposals that had been made to it in connection with the new scale of salaries, provided that no supplemental grant was asked for, and that the expenditure should not exceed what it had been in previous years. There were details as to whether a teacher should lose his grade on being transferred to another school, and matters of that kind, and also there was a very important rule that the Archbishop got inserted, and that we feared the Treasury would not sanction. It was to this effect, that if there was anything in the rules that would be found to be inequitable to the teachers on joining the grades, the Commissioners could make an equitable settlement. That was the substance of it, and they availed themselves of it very largely.

11151. Did they appear in your next regulations?—They appeared in the next regulations, 1901.

11152. Mr. HENLY.—That was not done till his Grace had retired?—That had nothing whatever to say to it, as far as I am aware. I do not say why his Grace retired. You will have to ask his Grace that.

11153. The CHAIRMAN.—Now about the necessity for paying teachers partly by capitation grant?—We intended to pay them one consolidated salary, but that depended on the Government passing a little Act of Parliament rescinding that portion of the Irish Education Act of 1892 that dealt with the money grant, the school grant of £900,000 or its equivalent. By some unfortunate accident or other that portion of our proposals lapsed out. The Episcopalians at the time got alarmed. Under the Fourth Schedule provision is made for giving third class salary to teachers of small schools. Most of those small schools are Protestant schools. The Episcopalians at the time conceived that these provisions in the Schedule did

a great deal more than that, that they gave the small Irish Church schools a right to get third class salaries at any time they desired to come under the Board. They considered that by this repeal they would lose their right to get a grant for their small schools, and they also had a fear that the Commissioners would not give the very small Church schools a third grade salary. However, they raised such a storm about it that they frightened, I think, Mr. Gerald Balfour, who was Chief Secretary at the time, and he said that he could not go on with the Bill; that he would go on with the Bill if it was non-contentious, but otherwise he would have to drop it, and that came like a bomb-shell on the Commissioners. There was also a considerable number of people who wished portion of the emoluments of the teachers to be by capitation payment. I think some of the people interested in the convent schools wished for capitation payment alone, and there were other large schools where they wished a portion of the money to be capitation payment. The two things coming together necessitated the reconsideration of the whole scale of salaries, and an enormous amount of trouble. We had provided for annual increments under this scheme. The annual increments had to be abolished, because the £900,000 under the Act of 1892 had been taken off the bulk sum. The initial salary had also been raised. We had £92 and £89 for teachers in the first scheme, with annual increments; and they were raised to £95 and £84, and those two distinct elements made us abandon the proposal for annual increments. The funds as our disposal would not satisfy them. We would have had to make the annual increment so ridiculously small (21 or something of that kind) that we could have no control over it, and after a time it would not be satisfactory to the teachers in comparison with the Civil Service increments of £10, and in addition to that it would entail so much trouble as if it were a £30 increment, for we would be getting periodic reports on them, and all that sort of thing. The scheme then had to be revised, and the scale of salaries recomputed, and annual increments substituted.

11154. The initial salaries were raised?—Yes; we would have raised them more if we could, but we were not allowed to go outside the limits of the grant. Then as to the teacher's rights, before a teacher lost grade we insisted on his getting a year's law. If a teacher went out of the service, and was out for a year, and came back he would retain his grade rights, and there were a great many other matters of that kind which the Commissioners considered with the Treasury in the teacher's interests, and which nobody has known about. We preserved the rights of teachers in training colleges, and we also got the Treasury to sanction for the teacher with a first grade salary that he was not to lose it unless the average fell to 35. When he got it the average was 70, and he would not lose it till it fell to 35, so that he had practical security of tenure. There are very few schools where the average would fall from 70 to 35, unless there was something very exceptional about it, so that the teachers retain their first class grade salaries on an average of 85, which was the retaining average for the old first class salaries.

11155. Mr. HENLY.—Did not the teachers in 1900 complain bitterly that their rights were not preserved by that scheme?—Some of them did, but when you examine their cases as we have examined them carefully you find that there are no grounds for that. We challenged the teachers to produce any bona fide case, but they have not been able to do it in many instances up to the present. The Commissioners are always willing, and after thirteen years, far beyond the statutory period for debate, they are open at any time to consider the claims of teachers.

11156. Every teacher who left the training colleges and passed the examination at that time left as a second class teacher, but when the new scheme came in he left as a third grade teacher, and that was sprung upon him although he entered the training college on the strict understanding that if he passed the examination he would come out as a second class teacher?—That did not affect his pocket in any way, or any right that he would have. I think in the case of every teacher who entered the service from a Training College in 1900 we gave classification.

11157. I know of the case of one we had in Kildare Street, who applied again and again—no, at least, I am informed—to the Board (and I drafted some of the letters for him), he complained that he could not get his rights, and I know that there was an agitation carried on through the country with regard to those teachers who were known as transition teachers, and I think they are complaining still, and I think they are likely to continue to complain?—There was a case where a man named Miller, who was before this Commission, put in a claim, and we investigated it many times, but it is not unlikely that Mr. Miller will get something out of the Commissioners now, because he has put a new aspect of his case before us that he had never done previously, and we have investigated it, and are trying to give him something. We found a couple of bona fide cases where men had not been treated fairly. We found one case in which \$24 would be paid.

11158. The CHAIRMAN.—Now about the letter of July, 1900, from the Treasury approving of the new rule and the method of starting the new system, as explained in a circular to managers and teachers?—I think you have got a copy of that circular. We had an enormous number of teachers trained in the Model Schools in these new subjects, and they showed the greatest possible earnestness as a body in connection with this new scheme. I am very sorry for the non-success of the hand-and-eye portion of it, which is owing, I think, very largely to the writings of teachers and others who did not understand what Archbishop Walsh so clearly expressed in his address to the Lord Lieutenant—namely, the object of the hand-and-eye training in the schools; that those people not understanding it had condemned it as if it was trifling with the time of the children. It was really, in my opinion, one of the most important parts of the whole curriculum.

11159. The paper-folding?—The paper-folding and wire-twisting.

11160. They were all good if you had time for them?—The chief inspectors prepared a draft revised programme. That draft revised programme was submitted to the Resident Commissioner and considered, and was also, I believe, submitted to the other Commissioners, including, I think, his Grace Dr. Walsh. Dr. Starke will tell you all about that. This was prepared by either Mr. Purner or Mr. Downing, by one or other or both of them. I have a draft programme, and it is only signed by Mr. Downing, but I do not know whether it is the identical one that was submitted or not, because it is a thing in manuscript undated, and not very many pages. It did not at all meet the wishes of the Commissioners. It is an outline programme without suggestions about the new system, or lines and notes, and that kind of thing.

11161. A skeleton?—A skeleton programme.

11162. And then Dr. Starke invited you to help him in preparing a scheme?—Yes, when he saw this programme of the chief inspectors. He expected a complete and detailed thing, and the teachers were calling out for the new programme, and one day he said to me, "What can we do; do you think you can give us any help?" I said, "I will do anything I can," and that was the beginning of the programme. Well, I have had a very wide experience of these manual instruction matters in Sir Patrick Keenan's time, and I prepared a very full memorandum on manual instruction for Mr. Roddington long before the Manual Instruction Commission. I also prepared a scheme in the time of Sir Patrick Keenan, and I had read up a lot of reports, and English and Scotch programmes, and I outlined a programme, following the recommendations of the Commissioners as closely as possible.

11163. Mr. COCKRY.—When was that?—That was in the middle of 1900. When that was drawn up Dr. Starke looked over it, and Dr. Walsh looked over it, and Professor FitzGerald, and I think other Commissioners, and they made suggestions and changes, and we printed a draft of it, and that printed draft was again examined and gone over most carefully. I remember his Grace's handwriting as well as anything on it.

11164. Gone over carefully by Dr. Starke and Dr. Walsh?—Yes, and by other Commissioners. It was Dr. Starke who had charge of the programme.

11165. In the case of music and needlework, and matters of that kind, you had it drawn up by experts?—It was revised by experts, but that was at a later stage. The programme in music was at first largely based on the English programme. I think Cookery was based on the English and Scotch programmes, modified to suit our schools. Mr. Goodman was our Inspector of Music, and the Most Rev. Dr. Walsh is a great musician, and he went all through the music programme himself, and Mr. Goodman prepared the Tonic Solfa portion. We had been working on the Hullah system for many years. Then the elementary science was more elaborate than it is now, and that was revised by Mr. Heller, and he reconstructed it, and Mr. Davis revised the hand-and-eye portion. Professor FitzGerald went over it, and some of the changes in the Elementary Science and the Arithmetic programme were Professor FitzGerald's. Other portions of the programme were similarly dealt with, for instance, the needlework, by the Director of needlework. It was really a programme of experts, and all that was done in the way of amendments by those experts was put in.

11166. And you sent it to the various colleges?—The programme was made as complete as the Committee of Commissioners could make it, and it was sent round then to the heads of every training college in Ireland. It was sent to the two chief inspectors, and this is very important, because I think that Mr. Purner said that he never was consulted about this programme. It was sent in that rough proof state for any alterations they chose to make on it, for any criticisms they chose to make on it; and it was sent to the 25 senior inspectors. It was also sent to some of the district inspectors, whom we considered had special knowledge, such as Mr. Bonaparte Wyse, and others who had assisted in the Manual Instruction. It was also sent to Dr. Joyce, who was a man of vast experience in training teachers and one of the best National teachers in Ireland. It was sent to Sir Joshua Fitch, who was an authority on educational matters, and he came into the office to me afterwards, and told me it was the best programme he had ever seen. I think he wrote the same to Dr. Starke. It was sent to Mr. Struthers and some other people, and everyone that we, by any means, thought would be helpful, or people who had given helpful evidence on the Manual Instruction Commission. When that was done, we embodied all their suggestions, or as many of them as the Commissioners thought proper, then when it was made as perfect as it could be by them, it was submitted to every Commissioner individually, it was left with them, and they had ample time to make as many amendments or suggestions or changes as they pleased. I have most of the copies returned by the Commissioners, a great many of them with annotations and suggestions. When all that had been done, the final draft was submitted to the Board on the 28th of August, and by the Board it was referred to a Committee of the Board on the 31st of August. On the 25th of September the Board directed that the draft revised programme should be printed for use. The new scheme was received with acclamation by the teachers. I have extracts from the teachers' journals saying that the Commissioners at last had done the right thing, and that this was a change—a very radical change for the better, and all that. A year or so afterwards there was a change—a very great change, and the programme began to be criticised. The only explanation that I can give of these criticisms is, that the critics did not understand what was the merit of the new programme, which was that all the subjects of the programme were to be made more or less interdependent. While the teacher was teaching reading he was to try to instil a little grammar. We were not to have formal grammar. The teacher in a reading lesson might give some small hints about grammar, and in teaching the geography of a country he could have a map beside him or on the desk before him, and could explain those things, and bring them home to the minds of the children in a way that could not be done from a map on the wall. Nine out of ten children have no idea of how a map represents land and water till you put the map down flat before them.

2nd May, 1918.]

Mr. P. E. LEMASS, I.S.O., I.R.C.S.I., examined.

[Continued.]

11167. Mr. HENRY.—You submitted that, you say, to the training colleges?—Yes.

11168. Now year after year the staff of the training colleges are asked to express their opinion of the programme in operation in the colleges?—That is the programme for teachers?

11169. That is the programme for teachers. I wrote several times, and I was speaking to the staff of Drumcondra quite recently, and their experience and mine is, that anything we write has never got the smallest attention?—I must differ with you entirely, because there was a conference (you have alluded to it just now) on some day last week at which the heads of the training colleges were present on that very question of the programme.

11170. I was present at that conference myself?—Then why do you say that?

11171. I am speaking of the written recommendations we send in every year?—Those written recommendations are considered, and I know as a matter of fact whenever I am at the Board (and I generally am at the Board when these programmes are submitted for approval) that the written recommendations of the principals of the training colleges are there.

11172. We are asked what book ought to be taught in connection with this, that and the other subjects?—They receive very careful attention, and I know Mr. Dilworth, my colleague, has actually embodied the suggestions of the training colleges in the programme, and it is as part of his special duty to look after this and see to it. As he was in the training college himself, that particular duty has been handed over to him, though certainly enough I generally have to bring the programmes before the Board owing to the elaborate system of attending the Board. I have seen on the file the recommendations of the training college people, and I have heard them discussed, and I think that in that way that Commissioners cannot be accused of any neglect or any oversight whatever.

11173. They do not set eye to eye with some of us?—That is another matter altogether.

11174. The CHAIRMAN.—Will you now proceed to the arrangement of the new inspection circuits?—I have here in my box a file referring to that, and I have a printed letter. I have a copy of the original letter that I sent to the chief inspectors, asking them to consider the new arrangement of circuits, and to give the Commissioners the benefit of their advice, and I have also their reply. I have a printed copy of the whole thing here.

11175. Shall we have that reply?—I think I can hand in the printed copy.\* They made a very full reply. Their attention was called to the proposed new arrangement, and it was explained to them that in Scotland a system somewhat similar to what we had in our minds was already in operation; here is the original file. We sent it to them, it is a printed file, it has an order of the Board on it. I will send in a copy to the Committee. Perhaps it would be well to read this letter of instructions.

Office of National Education, Dublin,

Sir, 31st December, 1900.

I am directed to request that you, in conjunction with Mr. Purser, will at once consider the question of the arrangement of the inspectors' circuits, and report fully for the information of the Commissioners the result of your deliberations. The report should be a joint one, and you should, when preparing it, bear in mind that it is the desire of the Commissioners that each school in the circuit should, if possible, be inspected by three different inspectors in every three years, so as to satisfy the public generally and the school managers that the judgment by the Commissioners of the work done at the schools, and their decision in the matter of promotions and grants of increment and continued good service salary, are sound and impartial. You will also consider what arrangement of circuit work would best secure the object the Commissioners have in view, and say whether, in your opinion, it would be feasible, and if feasible whether it would be desirable to have a common centre for each inspection circuit at which the three inspectors of the circuit would reside, or whether it would be better and more practicable to have one centre for

each circuit where the senior inspector would reside, with two sub-centres connected by railway with the senior inspector's centre, at which the two other inspectors of the circuit would reside.

11176. That is what has been adopted now?—Yes. If you do not approve of either of the above arrangements you will be good enough to state your reasons for not approving of them, and to make any suggestions that you think more suitable for carrying out the Commissioners' views; but if you approve of the system of centres and sub-centres, you should select sub-centres that would not be very far apart from each other, so that the additional locomotion expense incurred by an interchange of work would not add considerably to the cost of the inspection establishment generally. The centres selected should be foci of railway communication if possible, and ought to be as near the geographical centre of the circuit as may be, so that (a) the senior inspector should be able to reach the confines of his circuit with facility, and (b) that many schools should not be beyond a 15 miles' limit from the centre. You will further consider and report as to the arrangement of the work of the inspection staff of each circuit in future. The number of schools to be assigned to each inspector, whether the senior inspector should have a small number of schools in the immediate vicinity of a centre under his own special charge, what arrangements should be made for doing the work of inspectors that may be sick or on leave, the amount of control and the nature of the control the senior inspector should exercise over the other inspectors, etc., see also questions on which the Commissioners desire your opinion. Further, while remembering that efficiency of inspection is the principal object to be attained by whatever arrangements may be ultimately adopted, the economy of the public funds should not be lost sight of, and any points that occur to you in this connection should be placed before the Commissioners. As this matter is pressing, you will be good enough to take it in hand without any avoidable delay, so that the Commissioners may be able to make proper arrangements before the commencement of the financial year, 1901-2.

I am, Sir, your obedient Servant,

P. E. LEMASS.

E. Downing, Secy.

A similar letter was addressed to Mr. Purser, and we have the memorandum\* of the chief inspector's in print in reply to that.

11177. Mr. HENRY.—Did they modify it?—They made some changes.

11178. The CHAIRMAN.—Will you let us have that document?—Yes.

11179. Now the letter from the Treasury sanctioning the new rules, and the new rules are to be sent to the press, and 12,000 printed for distribution, and the revised rules to be placed on the table of the House of Commons?—Yes.

11180. And the resignation of Dr. Walsh?—Yes.

11181. And the appointment of examiners for the first time?—Yes; that was simply a Board's order appointing them.

11182. Then there was a motion of the Resident Commissioner in February, 1902?—Well at the present time I cannot say what that motion was. The date of promulgation of the new rules was 31st of March, 1901. I have put in the date of the promulgation of the rules because of a difference of opinion. Mr. Purser stated (he did not state it before this Committee, but he might possibly state it) that those rules were not promulgated, and that that accounted for his action in certain years.

11183. You say the manager's report was made confidential?—Yes, because, as I said to-day, the managers wished it.

11184. Sir EDWARD WILKINSON.—You were speaking about certain rules that were promulgated?—Those were the new rules. I think you have already had a copy of them supplied.

11185. General rules?—Those were the new rules for schools.

11186. The CHAIRMAN.—Then there was a Board's circular of June, 1900. What did that relate to?—That is the fixing of the salaries.

\* Vide Appendix XXXI.



23rd May, 1918.]

Mr. P. E. LUNN, I.R.O., L.R.C.S.I., examined.

[Continued.]

11187. The settlement in that circular was final?—Was final.

11188. And then the back stops were abolished in March?—That was largely to please the teachers. It was to please other people as well.

11189. What is the meaning of that note?—How exceptional cases were treated?—That was in connection with the memorandum of the financial assistant secretary. It was not exactly a memorandum, but a kind of report of what had been done for the previous three years in the way of granting increments and increases of salary generally. It is a very explanatory memorandum, and I would not like to put it in myself, but I am sure if the Committee ask for it, it will be sent over.

11190. We will convey our request through you?—Very well; I will make a note of it. It was a report by Mr. Young and a memorandum.\* This is a very important document.

11191. Sir HIRAM WILKINSON.—What was the date of it?—March, 1909, or about that time.

11192. The CHAIRMAN.—Now that concludes your paper of notes with regard to your evidence, and then follow certain corrections of errors of Mr. Pinner and Mr. Downing?—Mr. Pinner says he was not consulted about these inspection circulars, or something like that.

11193. You say that is not correct?—I say that is not correct, because his own letter is here, and my own letter that I am just after reading.

11194. The statement as to the conference is not correct?—I mean the statement that there was a conference going on in the office, and he knew nothing about it. Well, as a matter of fact, I do not know positively, but I am inclined to believe that he knew of the notice to the senior inspectors, the 22 of them, brought up to the office, as they were called there officially. That was early in the year 1908; and then there was a later conference in the same year, 1908, about which I issued him a letter, of which I have a copy here, and also Mr. Downing, telling them this conference was to be held of chief inspectors and senior inspectors.

11195. And then Question 881?—He said the examinees were chiefs of inspection. I say they are not, as I think I have explained here.

11196. And Question 400?—That was as to the relations between the secretaries and the chief inspectors. In 1902 the Board made an order that the secre-

taries and the chief inspectors and the financial secretary should be independent of each other, save that an order given by the secretaries in writing should be obeyed by any of their officers; that was repeated in 1904; and the old status of the secretaries was restored.

11197. Then there is the statement that the secretaries were always appointed from the inspectors?—That is not the fact.

11198. Who makes the statement?—That occurs in Mr. Pinner's evidence. As a matter of fact, Mr. Taylor was not an inspector; Mr. Young was not an inspector; Mr. Cross was not, as far as I remember, an inspector; the first secretary was not an inspector; I was not an inspector; and, on the other hand, we had inspectors who came into the office, one as chief clerk; another came in as financial assistant secretary—Mr. McCallum, so that the office were occupationally interchanged, but there was no hard and fast rule laid down by the Commissioners. And then in 1900, 1901 and 1902 Mr. Downing made a number of statements. He says that reports were submitted to the Board. They were never submitted in any form. Reports were, of course, always an nothing initiated by the chiefs of inspection, and they came went before the Board. Occasionally when a case was before the Board they recommended teachers, but recommendations, as recommendations, were never submitted to the Board, nothing under fire or disband. Then at 1900, 1901, 1902 and 1903 another statement of Mr. Downing's is altogether untrue. He said that the chiefs of inspection used to be in attendance at the Board meetings. Never in any time, or in the modification of any Commissioner, was a chief inspector ever present unless specially sent for, which happened very rarely indeed. I have only notions here of some inaccuracies, but there are a lot more.

11199. What does 2803 relate to?—Mr. Downing said promotion always went by seniority. He was a living instance himself to the contrary. He was promoted over the heads of senior inspectors who objected to a junior inspector being put over them. He said that seniority always got promotion. Quite the contrary in many instances. He himself in 1895 was made chief of inspection, and I have extracts from the Independent of 1895 in which there were complaints that he was promoted over the heads of others. And he says there was little or no corporal punishment under the old system. Quite the contrary.

The Committee adjourned.

## TWENTY-FOURTH DAY.—WEDNESDAY, MAY 28TH, 1913.

At 23, Kildare-street, Dublin.

Present:—Sir SAMUEL DILL, M.A., LL.D., LL.D. (Chairman); The Most Rev. DENIS KELLY, D.D., Bishop of Ross; Sir HIRAM SHAW WILKINSON, LL.D.; Mr. JOHN COFFEY; Mr. HENRIE E. B. HARRISON, B.A.; Mr. JESSEMAN HENTY; Mr. WALTER McMURROUGH KAVANAGH, D.L.; Mr. THOMAS MICHAEL KITTLE, B.L.; and

Mr. ARTHUR J. DONNELLY, M.A., B.Sc., Secretary.

Mr. W. J. M. SPARKS, M.A., LL.D., LL.D., Resident Commissioner of National Education, examined.

11200. The CHAIRMAN.—You began your career as a Fellow of Trinity College?—I was in Trinity College, Cambridge, before that. I was educated in Cambridge and Dublin. I was a Fellow of Trinity College, Dublin, from 1890 to 1897, when I was appointed President of Queen's College, Galway.

11201. You were a tutor of Trinity during that time?—Not for all that time. For the first couple of years I was not a tutor.

11202. And an examiner?—Yes; I examined in Mathematics and Classics.

11203. And did you examine for scholarships?—Yes.

\* Vide Appendix XLIII.

† Vide Appendix XL (2).

11204. And for Fellowships? Not for Fellowships. I was too junior.

11205. When were you appointed President of Queen's College, Galway?—In 1897; I went into residence in Galway in the beginning of 1898, and I was there for exactly a year. In addition to being President, I was Professor of three subjects, History, Metaphysics and Logic, and English Literature.

11206. And those were amalgamated?—In one Chair.

11207. Did you leave Galway at the end of 1898?—In February, 1899.

‡ Vide Appendix XL (4).

28th May, 1913.]

11208. And was that also the year in which you were appointed Resident Commissioner?—Yes. I left Galway on my appointment as Resident Commissioner.

11209. Now, you speak of an interview with the Irish Government at that time. Does that bear on our inquiry?—I think so; very distinctly. At the first interview I had with the Irish Government after my appointment as Resident Commissioner in 1899 I was told much of the difficulties that awaited me in the Education Office. My predecessor, Mr. Redington, who had held the office for four years, had died shortly after the presentation of the report of the Manual Instruction Commission, of which he was a member. Of course, as you know, that report was a very important document. On that Commission, which drew it up, was included, I think, five or six members of the Board, of whom Mr. Redington was one. Naturally, the Government discussed their findings with me, and I was informed that this report about which I must say I knew nothing at the time, as I had not hitherto been concerned with primary education, proposed many revolutionary changes and involved many others still more revolutionary. Some of these had already been unanimously adopted by the Board, and submitted to Lord Cologan.

11210. That was indeed your appointment?—Yes. They had been submitted to Lord Cologan, who deferred his decision upon them until they had been considered by the new Resident Commissioner. That was at the beginning of February. I was informed by the Government that I had been specially selected to undertake a very critical task, although I was not a candidate for the vacant position, and had only recently gone to Galway. The fact was I knew little about the Education Office until I entered it as its head.

11211. You were approached to take the position?—Certainly. When Lord Cologan wrote to me, offering me the post, I had no intention of leaving Galway. At my first interview with the Government, I was informed that they had heard on the highest authority that the Education Office was an Angan Stable; that the system of education was antiquated; some of the higher officials were incompetent and in the absence of a strong supervising head "things were in a very bad way." These were the words that they used.

11212. You mention the disorganisation of the office. Are you going to explain that?—To treat that properly will take a very considerable time. I intend to go into it thoroughly. It is a very important question, and it will be necessary for me to treat it exhaustively. The Government told me they could not conceal from me that they were asking me to fill what was perhaps the most difficult position in their gift; but I was assured I could count upon their confidence and support if I undertook to reform the system of administration. There was no doubt that the Irish Government at that time were thoroughly in sympathy with the aim of the Manual Instruction Commission, and especially of those Commissioners of National Education who were members of it. There is no doubt about that from what I heard.

11213. One of the things they suggested was a change in the mode of inspection?—Yes, they suggested many things, most of which, as you know, have been carried out; but they were in the air at that time.

11214. They suggested an extension of the mode of inspection suitable for hand and eye training?—They implied that. About the same time I had an interview with a couple of the most prominent members of the Board. Their account of the state of business in the office corresponded closely with what I had heard from the Government. I was told that, through the incompetence or dilatoriness of the higher officials, neither the Board nor the Resident Commissioner had proper cognizance of what was going on in the office.

11215. That was the view held by two of the most important members?—Certainly. I do not like to mention names. I do not think it is necessary, but, on the other hand, there would be no harm in doing so. I am not anxious they should appear on the notes, but I wish it to be understood that I have not the slightest objection to giving them. The system of appointing old inspectors to the higher internal positions, such as the secretarieship and the chiefship of inspection had broken down. Inspectors who had no experience of indoor work were eminently unfitted at 60 years of age or later to

adapt themselves to clerical work, and, as a matter of fact, it was found that at any rate at first, they were entirely in the hands of subordinates clerks, who had to instruct them in their duties.

11216. Had the secretaries that you found in the office been inspectors?—Yes. The two secretaries were well over 60 years of age, and incapable, from age and infirmity, to cope with the exceedingly heavy labours of their office, and it was quite out of question to expect any help from them in giving effect to the recommendations of the Vice-Regal Commission. An inquiry had recently been held into the official conduct of the two chiefs of inspection and of some of the head inspectors, and many circumstances had come to light which had thrown a very unpleasant light upon their competence. In fact, one of the chiefs of inspection (Mr. Downing) had narrowly escaped dismissal, as a most important member of the Board had actually drafted a resolution dispensing with his services.

11217. Mr. HAMMOND.—In the précis you say that occurred with reference to Mr. Downing in 1895?—That was the year, but I am now talking of the year 1899.

11218. THE CHAIRMAN.—In 1895 he was threatened with dismissal?—Yes, an important member of the Board had actually drafted a resolution to that effect, but Mr. Downing apologised. Such was the condition of things in the office at the time when, according to Messrs. Downing and Purser, the millennium prevailed in the educational world. For some years I was troubled by constant complaints of the incapacity or ineffectiveness of some of the most important officials. Thus, on December 19th, 1900, one of my most eminent colleagues wrote to me:—"The way in which the ——— case seems to have been dealt with in the office raises the very serious question—why should the reputation of the Commissioners as men of judgment and common sense be at the mercy of irresponsible officials?"

11219. Was there mismanagement of business by officials that ought to have gone before the Resident Commissioner, and finally before the Board?—I can tell you in a word what I found. I found that the whole place was in disorganisation. My predecessor, who was one of the most charming of men, was appointed Resident Commissioner without any experience of official or educational work. Sir Patrick Keenan had held the post for a long time. He was in his day a man of great ability, but he was 60 years of age when he died and in feeble health, and the consequence was (as the Archbishop of Dublin complained on many occasions) that the chiefs of inspection acted really as the Board. They constantly omitted to bring important matters to the Resident Commissioner—I mean things that ought to have gone to him. That was the state of things in the office which I found when I went there, and that was the cause of many of the troubles which developed later on. One of the most serious circumstances was that important action was often taken by the chiefs without being submitted to the proper authority. A clerk suggested fines and dismissals of teachers and things of that kind, which were initiated by the chiefs of inspection and issued, without being really discussed with the Resident Commissioner. They may have been brought into him for formal sanction, but so far as I know they were not discussed. They were put in the Office Committee book which lay on the table of the Boardroom. Any Commissioner might look at them if he liked, but it was given in evidence at the Purser Commission that no Commissioner ever did.

11220. And they were dismissed without the Board considering the matter?—Teachers were dismissed without the Board considering the matter. That was what I found. The writer of the letter mentioned above went on to say: "With the praiseworthy experience that I have of the assumption of authority on the part of some of the officials to act as if the administration of the system was in their hands, not in ours, it never occurred to me to suspect for a moment that any of them could have taken it upon himself to act for us in the present case." Again, in March, 1901:—"It is not reasonable for us members to go on complaining that we are being misrepresented by officials who act in our name as if authorized by us. If we wish to avoid being misrepresented by these people, we are bound to take such action as will effectively

stop them. The Belfast proceeding seems to be a singularly audacious one"; again, "the conduct of these officials is simply intolerable"; again, "I have been worried out of all patience by the bungling of our officials; the situation is intolerable." On the 17th of May, 1901, I wrote to the Archbishop of Dublin as follows:—"...and...are perfectly hopeless. I can't get the former to read the rules or to adhere strictly to them. He is always interpolating ideas and interpretations of his own, and submitting them to me for 'formal' sanction. I have to initial 300 notices a week, and I cannot be expected to study each of them. I have to take a great deal on trust, which is bad security in this office." That was written a fortnight before the Archbishop of Dublin resigned.

11251. What was that Belfast case that you refer to?—I asked for information with regard to it which I have not got. If you want it, I will try to get it at a later stage. My officials are searching in it. The reference in the letter is rather vague, but I will try to get it. The next point in my abstract is the Board's proposal to sever the connection between the office and the inspection staff. This is very important.

11252. That is the very root of this disorder?—The conviction of prominent members of the Board, a conviction they had formed before I came on the Board, was that the system of having old inspectors in the office was fatal to efficiency.

11253. They had formed that opinion?—Yes, and I shall prove it by documents.

11254. Mr. CORRY.—What about the prominent members of the Board?—The prominent members of the Board were those I mentioned before, whose names I did not care to put down. In the early days of my official life I had been informed by some of my colleagues that the Board was determined to sever the connection between the office and the inspection staff; routine work should be committed to the internal staff; the inspectors should be confined to their proper work of supervising the education in the schools. In this connection I may quote from a letter from an eminent colleague, dated July 8th, 1900: "I am sure I must have told you before this what I think on that point (the secretaryship). It is the weak point of the whole organisation. We have two divisions on our staff, one dealing with office work, the other dealing with work in the schools, and it has always seemed to me the height of absurdity to take the man who have earned promotion by seniority and good service in the scholastic department and give them as the great prize of the service an appointment which is essentially an office one. It is not fair to the men themselves. They are taken from work they are familiar with, work that presumably they have come to like, and they are run into a busy post with work of a totally different kind which they have to begin at the A.B.C." A very short experience of the office convinced me of the accuracy of the information I had got from the Government and my colleagues. The secretaries were so incapable of measuring the cases to be submitted to the Board, and of explaining them in an intelligible way, that I had practically to act as secretary myself until they resigned one of them at my request, in October, 1900. The work done in the room of the chiefs of inspection was equally unsatisfactory.

11255. The noting of reports was chiefly done, was it not, by the chiefs of inspection in those days?—It was their duty to note reports. They had a good deal of the work now done by examiners, and also a good deal of the work done by the present chief inspectors.

11256. A point in connection with this which we have had a great deal of evidence on is that they did the work in one respect of the present examiners, and that was the noting of reports?—In addition to other work they certainly were entrusted with that. I remember quite well that the opening words of the letter I have just quoted from (I have not the letter itself here), were: "I am glad to see from the Agenda paper that you are getting on with the work of reorganisation." That was written at a time when I had just before the Board certain proposals as to the creation of higher and lower staff officers. We had

none of this class as well as I remember, before. The writer went on: "I don't know how far you have been able to get with the work of reorganisation. I know nothing of the office work, and so I have no opinion about it, except at the one point where the office and the Board meet, viz., the secretaryship," and then he went on to say with regard to the secretaryship: "I am sure I must have told you before this what I think on that point."

11257. The CHAIRMAN.—Now, will you continue about the chiefs of inspection?—The work done in the room of the chiefs of inspection was equally unsatisfactory. So far as the Board could ascertain the major part, at any rate of the routine work, was done by the clerk of the chiefs of inspection, who was an ordinary member of the labour staff. The chiefs never visited the schools and soon lost touch with them, so that the Board had no confidence that their views corresponded with the actual circumstances of the schools.

11258. Mr. CORRY.—Was there a Board's Order for bidding them to visit the schools?—I do not know of it. I remember an answer to a question at the Pears Commission which I think would perhaps clear up the point. Someone was asked (I think Sir Alexander MacDonnell, whether the chiefs of inspection visited the schools; he replied that they did occasionally, but that they were not asked to write any reports, and that their visits were quite informal. I gather from that answer that they could visit the schools if they liked. I never heard of a Board's Order forbidding them.

11259. There was a Departmental Committee in 1872, and arising from the recommendations of that Departmental Committee, I understood that there was a Board's Order forbidding them to visit schools?—I am not aware of it. At any rate, whether there was a Board's Order or not, the fact is that they did not go to the schools.

11260. You will find that there was an express Board's Order forbidding the chiefs of inspection to visit the schools, and that that was following the recommendations of a Departmental Committee in 1892 or 1894?—I may say, en passant, that that was a very extraordinary recommendation.

11261. The BISHOP OF LIMERICK.—Was it in accordance with the statement before the Pears Commission, because the statement before the Pears Commission was that they were free to go if they wished to go?—

Mr. CORRY.—The Board's Order was made subsequent to the Pears Commission. The Departmental Committee set in 1874, and acting on the recommendations of that Committee there was subsequently a Board's Order expressly forbidding the chiefs of inspection to go to the schools?—That is extraordinary.

11262. Of course, I may be mistaken—I am not quite sure that I am accurate—I will look up the report which is in my office.

11263. The CHAIRMAN.—Will you now continue your statement?—The chiefs of inspection exercised no immediate supervision over the inspectors, who worked in complete isolation, except so far as their work was checked on very rare occasions by the head inspectors. The head inspectors, who since 1888 numbered six, were originally appointed for the purpose of maintaining, "as far as practicable, a uniform system of marking of the answering of pupils, monitors and teachers at their respective examinations," but since 1888 each had been given a district, for which he was entirely responsible.

11264. The head inspectors had districts of their own?—Yes.

11265. Besides their duty of superintending?—Yes, districts to which they devoted a portion of their time equivalent to about half a year.

11266. Was that district as large as the ordinary district under a district inspector?—No.

11267. It was a small one?—Small, but still it occupied a head inspector for about half a year.

11268. And during the remainder of the year he would visit about a fifth of the whole of the schools?—Yes, that would be about it. They gave six months of the year to their small districts, and for the other six months, you might say, they were to devote as much time as they could spare from their other multifarious duties to the task of maintaining uniformity.

11230. How many districts had they each at first?—Eleven each. During the other six months of the year they had all kinds of avocations, not directly connected with the schools; for instance, writing annual reports, examining in the Training Colleges, examining teachers, and so on, and you will find that the time they had for supervision of the work of the inspectors was extremely small. Appeals from teachers were often submitted to these officers, and they were also required to hold investigations on important cases referred to them. Experience, however, showed that the amount of supervision they had time for was very small, e.g., in 1898, the last year of the old system, Mr. Power held only six "check results."

11240. He was then head inspector?—Yes. Dr. Moran held rather more, 22; Dr. Alexander, 5; Mr. Barley, 33; Mr. Sturges, 6; and Mr. Sullivan none. It was clear that the head inspectors were too few for the satisfactory performance of their important duties, and, as they were generally appointed on the grounds of seniority, they were in some cases far too old.

11241. Was there no way of controlling the men who did not hold any check inspection?—I inquired carefully into that, early in my career, as I got this pattern when I went to the office, and the state of affairs it disclosed seemed to me extraordinary, considering that it was the main duty of the head inspectors to supervise the other inspectors. I thought it strange, for instance, that Mr. Sullivan did not hold a single check inspection in the whole year.

11242. That came under your notice?—Certainly; and I asked for written explanations, which were, no doubt, satisfactory from the point of view of the individuals, as they explained to me, and the explanation was satisfactory enough, that their whole time was occupied, as, indeed, it was. It soon became clear to me, and clear to the Board, to whom I submitted these facts, that the system was really to blame.

11243. There were too few of them?—There were too few of them, they had too much extraneous work, and some of them were far too old. There was really no justification for referring for final review the mature judgment of an inspector in the prime of life to an old and tired man within a year or two of his retirement. The Archbishop of Dublin wrote to me when the institution of senior inspectors was being discussed: "the fact that the head" (viz., the senior) "inspectors will be much more free than formerly to visit the schools of their whole district, enabling us to have with ease two judgments on such points, ought to secure the effective working of such a plan" (viz., to secure uniformity). That was his opinion of the proposal to substitute what really meant twenty-two head inspectors for six.

11244. Had you many complaints in your first year of the want of uniformity in marking?—Plenty.

11245. Coming up to the office?—Certainly. The want of uniformity was very marked under the old system. I think everybody asked it.

11246. The teachers complained of it?—Certainly, they were always complaining under the results system.

11247. And what remedy was there for it?—These complaints were treated very much as appeals are treated at present; that is, if there was an appeal, it was sent to the inspector who had held the examination, and he wrote his observations. If his observations were satisfactory, in our opinion (viz., in those days the opinion of the chiefs of inspection), nothing further was done. If the inspector's decision seemed questionable, the head inspector would probably be asked to make a check inspection. The return of check inspections mentioned above includes visits to the schools in the ordinary course of the carrying out of their duties of superintending, and also special visits ordered in consequence of appeals.

11248. Mr. COOPER.—You were suggesting that the number of appeals received against reports of inspectors was very small at that time?—I think not.

11249. You said that in Mr. Sullivan's district not one check inspection was held?—I said it was only when the explanation of the inspector was considered unsatisfactory that the head inspector was asked to hold a check examination; and I said that Mr. Sullivan had satisfied us that his time had been fully occupied

during the year. I cannot give you the particulars right off, but I have the material for doing so if it is necessary; as it may be that there were no appeals in his district.

11250. Did the head inspectors hold check examinations at that time independently of any order to do so?—I said that.

11251. And then the number of check examinations held by the head inspectors was very small, taking Ireland as a whole. It would seem that it ought to have been more. What would be the total of the figures that you have given us?—Seventy-two.

11252. Seventy-two check inspections for six head inspectors seem few, having regard to the fact that these check inspections (or check examinations as they were at that time) were held without any order whatever?—I cannot speak of the results system with the same authority as I am entitled to speak of what has happened since.

11253. Mr. HARRISON.—What is the exact meaning of a check inspection?—A check inspection, I believe, was an inspection for the purpose of checking the marking of any subordinate inspector.

11254. I thought you used it in a different sense when you said at first that these chiefs might hold an inspection of a school with the object of checking the general standard of their colleagues? Of course, that would come in, would it not?—If an inspector is directed by the Commissioners to hold an investigation into the marking of a certain inspector that might be called a check inspection; that is a checking of the marking of a single inspector; but if he went promiscuously over a district, inspecting one school here and another school there, and so on, for the purpose of ascertaining the standard, these might be called check inspections also.

11255. Then it is used in both senses?—Yes.

11256. The CHAIRMAN.—But the strict sense is when he is ordered to do it?—Yes. To continue, the question of the administration occupied the attention of the Commissioners all through the first year I was in office, and it was decided to reorganize the inspection staff. I suppose you are quite familiar with the titles and salaries of the new classes of inspectors. Is it necessary to read them out?

11257. You may assume that we know that. We have had it from two or three officials. What point do you propose to take up now in your price?—Before passing on, I may observe that in the new scheme the senior inspectors correspond, not to the old district inspectors, but to the head inspectors, who were thus increased from 6 to 22. As the head inspectors were responsible for the uniformity of the inspection work in eleven districts each, it was arranged, under the new system, that each senior inspector should be responsible for the uniformity of the inspection work in three districts called a circuit. It was expected that, as his supervision was less extensive, it would be more thorough and effective.

11258. You absorbed the six head inspectors in the new senior inspectors?—Yes, certainly.

11259. They took their places as seniors?—Yes.

11260. At the same salary?—They got £100 a year each. I come next to the change in the office of the chiefs of inspection. It was arranged that their duties should be divided between the newly created officers called examiners and the new chief inspectors, so that merely routine work should be assigned to the former, all points of difficulty arising out of the reports of the inspection of schools, etc., and all matters involving expert knowledge of the schools or of education to the chief inspectors.

11261. Those examiners you appointed, I suppose, on the analogy of the English system?—Yes, quite so. We provided that for the future the chief inspectors should rank as officer officers, and be immediately responsible to the Resident Commissioner for the due performance of all the work connected with the inspection, examination, and organization of the schools in all the circuits. The new chief inspectors were not to be under the superintendence, as in the previous organization the chiefs of inspection were subordinate to me alone.

28th May, 1915.]

Mr. W. J. M. STARKIE, M.A., LL.D., LL.D., examined.

[Continued.]

11202. Mr. CONYER.—There was an express resolution of the Board to that effect?—Yes.

11203. The CHAIRMAN.—I suppose those changes were all made in consequence of resolutions of the Board?—Yes, everyone of them.

11204. And you have the resolution on the books?—Yes. It was subsequently arranged, in 1900, that the chief inspectors should be the most highly paid officials of the Board, and that the secretaries' salaries should be reduced (for new appointments) from £1,000 and £800 per annum to £700. It was intended in this way to break the link between the indoor and outdoor officers, so that in future the chief inspectors should have no ambition to be appointed secretaries. I will now go on to the working of the new organization. It has been tested by the experience of 15 years, and has proved very satisfactory.

11205. Do you mean the organization of your office in relation to the inspectors outside?—The whole organization as arranged in 1900, both indoor and outdoor. The new organization has been tested by the experience of 15 years, and has proved very satisfactory, at least in the opinion of the Board. By the secretaries appointed under the new system, and the examiners, who now number three, the routine work of the office has been admirably carried out.

11206. Do you think three enough?—I should like more, but that is a Treasury matter. I mean you, I shall have plenty to say about the Treasury before I am done. While aiming at efficiency, we consulted economy as far as possible. Thus, we had only two examiners for a very long time, and we got the third only by representing that there would be a break-down in the office otherwise. I suppose you have been told that, in addition, Mr. Wyse has been doing the work of a fourth examiner, and that some of the most important work since the re-organization of the office. I do not remember a single case where the Board has made any complaint as to the way in which the routine business has been submitted to it. You have had the two secretaries before you, and you will probably sympathize with me when I say that I have the highest opinion of their efficiency. They have satisfied the expectations of the Board in very troublesome times during the last 10 or 12 years; as compared with their predecessors, they have filled their offices most efficiently. On the inspection side the results have been also in the main satisfactory. That they were not more satisfactory in the early years, and in one or two cases in more recent times, has been owing to the dissipation and incompetence of some of the heads of the inspection staff. I deplore the necessity I am under of dragging before the public the careers of old officials; but others must bear whatever discredit attaches to my words. Of Mr. Hynes I will say little; in his references to me here, he was only ingenuously. But his colleagues, Mr. Purser, is more formidable, and cannot be dismissed so summarily. By his malignant influence he has done more than any other man to check the progress of education during the last fifteen years; and he has crowned his beneficent career by securing the appointment of this Committee. The character of the means he employed for this end I may safely leave to the judgment of honorable men. What I shall say of him and Mr. Downing, who, in truth, hardly merits mention, is derived from the Minutes of the Board, private letters, and my diaries for 1902 and 1903.

11207. I see you mention in your prices that Mr. Purser was censured in 1887?—I am going on to that. In 1900 the late chiefs of inspection and the head inspectors appealed against their change of name, and the Board was compelled to suspend Messrs. Downing and Purser from their offices.

11208. Was that in consequence of the form their appeal took?—Did not Mr. Lemass head in Mr. Downing's letters on the occasion of his appointment as chief inspector?

11209. Yes. I have not looked over them?—Messrs. Downing and Purser were suspended in consequence of the tone of their letters. The official record of these two officials had previously not been unblemished. In 1884 Mr. Purser, as Secretary of the Committee of

National School Inspectors, was censured by the Lord Lieutenant for approaching the Government without the intervention of the National Board, and for seeking to further their claims for increases of salary by an appeal to Members of Parliament. In 1892 an investigation was held by the Board into the conduct of Mr. Purser in relation to the Training College, Marlborough Street, which resulted in the College being placed in charge of another head inspector. In 1895 an investigation was held into the conduct of the examination of National teachers, for which the chiefs of inspection, one of whom was Mr. Downing, and the head inspectors, one of whom was Mr. Purser, were responsible. The Board ordered a revision of the papers. On this occasion the conduct of Mr. Downing was so unbecomingly that he narrowly escaped dismissal.

11210. What was the matter with the papers?—This was before my time; but I have been informed that in the opinion of the Board, who held an investigation, the papers had been in many cases marked haphazard.

11211. It was the marking that was found fault with?—Yes.

11212. It was not the drawing up of the reports?—No; I have been told that some papers got, for instance, no marks, which deserved pass marks.

11213. And do you say that the examination was revised by order of the Board?—Yes, certainly.

11214. In 1895?—Yes. Mr. Purser refused to accept the decision of the Board, and wrote two letters asking that the papers should not be revised, but that he should receive a certificate that the marking of the exercises had been careful and accurate. The Board expressed its surprise at the tone of his letters and refused to comply with his request. The fact is, as one of the Commissioners told me only yesterday (I had heard of it before) that the Archbishop of Dublin drafted a resolution, which he showed to Dr. Evans. The latter asked to take charge of it for a few minutes, and went to Mr. Downing, and having shown it to him, implored him to moderate his attitude. As he refused to yield, Dr. Evans said or wrote to him:—"Before the end of this meeting of the Board you will find you are no longer an officer of the Board." Upon this Mr. Downing apologised. I must come now to what is within my own knowledge. When the Commission on Manual and Practical Instruction had published its report a Committee of the Board, composed of the members of the Board who had been on the Commission, was appointed to give effect to its recommendations. As I was not then in office, I am unable to say, from my own knowledge, whether the chiefs of inspection were consulted as to the report of this Committee, which was submitted to His Excellency. But there was no particular reason why they should have been, as they were not experts, while the Committee were, in the subjects recommended in the report of the Commission to be adopted in National Schools. But I think Mr. Lemass told you a fact that I did not know before, that in December, 1906 (this was in Mr. Redington's time), when the Board were discussing the matter, the chiefs of inspection were asked to send in a report on the recommendations of the Manual and Practical Instruction Commission, and that from that day to this we have not received their report. Subsequently to my appointment another committee was appointed for the purpose of drawing up a working scheme for Lord Cadogan. I think Mr. Lemass has put that in also. It is dated July, 1909. Mr. Purser was summoned before this committee, but he showed such a disinclination to co-operate, and such a disrespectful attitude towards the recommendations of the Commission, already unanimously adopted by the Board, that he had to be reminded that he was not a member, but an officer of the Board, and should not criticise, but carry out its orders. Whereupon he left the room, and abstained from giving any assistance such as we expected and should have welcomed. Mr. Downing, who was also consulted, supplied a memorandum, a copy of which Mr. Lemass has handed in. The chiefs of inspection were naturally not consulted as to the Board's resolutions (explained in the so-called "Resident Commissioner's memorandum") of Novem-

ber, 1899, as these, being mostly financial, were outside their province. I don't know that these resolutions are in your hands, but I have them here and I will put them in.

11975. I have an indistinct recollection that Mr. Downing, in his evidence, said he had been consulted on the financial question, and had sent in a memorandum on that?—I really cannot say. There was no particular reason why he should have been consulted on a question of finance. I do not remember. On this occasion (that is in November, 1899) nothing final was decided about any purely educational matter such as the rules for evening schools, the programmes, school organisation, etc., except that they should be revised so as "to secure greater simplicity of the work of the teachers." We did not go into the question of the programme at all on that occasion. What we had to do was to get rid of the old system of payment and to substitute something else thereof.

11976. The most pressing thing was the financial matter?—Yes. The only thing outside finance had done by the Board in November, 1899, was the general principle that the programme should be revised. The negotiations with the Treasury touching the alteration in the mode of paying teachers lasted four months.

11977. Without any increase in the grant?—Without any increase in the grant. Messrs. Downing and Purser assert they were kept absolutely in the dark as the preparation of the Revised Programme. This is not true. As Mr. Lemass has informed you, they were directed to prepare a programme on the lines of the Board's order of November; but as the programme they sent in was the results' programme with a few alterations, it was set aside as entirely unsuitable, and "a tentative programme" was prepared by others, and submitted for criticism not only to the chief inspectors, but (by Order of the Board, June 13th, 1900) to the senior inspectors and heads of training colleges. In fact, it was submitted to a number of other people as well, for example, to the late Chief Inspector of the English Education Board, Mr. Edmund Holmes, Sir John Struthers, and Sir Joshua Fitch. The memorandum of the chief inspectors on this programme, about which they assert they were not consulted, has been handed in by Mr. Lemass. It is not a very suggestive document, but I made sense use of it, as well as of the more valuable notes of the senior inspectors, when I was drafting the Revised Programme, which we issued in September, 1900. Mr. Purser also states that the new arrangement of circuits in 1900 was introduced without any reference to the chief inspectors (Q. 3781). I find that, on 31st December, 1900, Mr. Lemass addressed an official letter to each of the chief inspectors, directing them to consider at once the question of the arrangement of the inspectors' circuits, and to report fully for the information of the Commissioners the result of their deliberations. On 5th February, 1901, a joint reply was received, extending over eighteen pages of folio, which was printed, and specially submitted to the meeting of 19th March, 1901. This also has been handed in by Mr. Lemass. The Board resolved "that it be recorded that the Commissioners approve of the system of common centres, and of the principle that each shall be inspected by three inspectors in each triennial period." In pursuance of this resolution, the details of the new centres, and the distribution of the staff among them, were taken in hand; and in all these arrangements the views of the chief inspectors were obtained, and received full consideration. Much of the evidence given in this room by Messrs. Downing and Purser, on this and other cognate topics, assuredly comes under the late Lord Mersey's definition of a lie as a statement which can be proved to be false by documentary evidence. In 1900, when "the Resident Commissioners' memorandum" was handed by me to the chief inspectors, they showed such open hostility to the Board's proposals and such an insubordinate spirit to myself that they were suspended from their functions by the Board. Having subsequently repented they were restored, but it was stated in the Minutes that the Board thought "it right to put on record that it had adopted this course in the confident expectation that both these gentlemen would in future loyally use their best endeavours to put in

operation and carry out the newly inaugurated system of education, and, further, that each of them would recognise and respect the authority of the Resident Commissioners." I agree to say that neither of the chief inspectors made the slightest attempt to fulfil the expectations of the Board as expressed in this record, or showed the slightest appreciation of the leniency with which they had been treated. They neither of them attempted to adapt themselves to the duties of their new office; they paid few visits to the schools; they exercised little supervision over the inspection staff; they tried, under an altered organisation, still to cling to the duties, as indoor officers, of the old chiefs of inspection. All this is amply proved by their own evidence in this inquiry. For example, Mr. Stronge, Senior Inspector, had examined St. Catharine's National Schools, Dublin, and his report had been furnished to the Education Office. The Reverend F. Greer, the Manager, applied to Mr. Purser to have it amended. This action was a violation of regulations, as the appeal should have been addressed to the Board through the Secretaries; instead of returning the letter to the writer, Mr. Purser wrote to the Secretaries, stating that he had recommended that Mr. Stronge's annual report should be returned to him for "the modification now suggested by the manager," and that he understood the report had not been returned because the examiner had not approved of his recommendation. He added that, in his opinion, this manner of dealing with his suggestions was improper, and "if a secretary or examiner or clerk" considered action suggested by him to be irregular he should return the paper to him with some noting "by a proper authority." It is obvious that if Commissioners, managers or teachers corresponded privately with the chief inspectors, and if the latter were at liberty to order a revision of the inspectors' marks, the control of the Board or the Resident Commissioner over the administration would be nugatory and the inspectors' reports would not be trustworthy documents. Again, in June, 1901, the Board ordered that all their inspectors should undergo short courses of training in hand-and-eye work and elementary sciences. The chief inspectors were informed of this order, and were requested to nominate the inspectors who were to be summoned to Dublin. Instead of doing so, Mr. Purser wrote on the file that it did not seem to him a profitable employment of the time of the inspectors and organisers to have them occupied with these classes. These are illustrations of the spirit in which he entered upon his new duties. Touching the latter case, I write to Mr. Purser in the following terms:—"My attention has been called to a noting of yours on a request from the examiners that you should name certain district inspectors to be summoned to a course of instruction in elementary science. Your noting is to the effect that the advisability of continuing the course of science for inspectors should be submitted to the Board. I am of opinion that a recommendation of this kind, which questions the wisdom of a Board's Order, should not be appended to a report such as Mr. Hand's, but that it should be communicated privately to me. It is obviously improper that notings by officers of the Board questioning the wisdom of the Board's action should be recorded on official documents." It cannot be said that this course of a most insolent proceeding came on the side of severity. During the first year of the new system the incapacity and disloyalty of some of the senior officials were so injurious to its success that I was constrained to use very strong language to some of my colleagues who had made complaints to me on the subject, and on several occasions to lay my complaints before the Board. I made no copies of these letters, but passages from some of them, addressed to the Archbishop of Dublin, have already been published. Thus, on 15th May, 1901, I wrote to the Archbishop:—"The present state of affairs is intolerable. I have no control even over the staff of my office, for which I am chiefly responsible. I could put my finger on the men who are, and have been, the cause of all the dislocation both here and in the inspection work; but it would be useless asking the Commissioners to support me if I proposed as much as the supersession of an officer." (In explanation of the last words, I may state that the Treasury was

induced by me, in 1900, to offer generous retiring terms to officers under 60 years of age, whom the Board might desire to retire in the interest of the Public Service. This proposal, which was pressed several times by the Treasury, was brought before the Board, but it took no action, although it was aware how I was hampered in carrying out its policy, by the incompetence or disloyalty of four or five higher officials.] The purpose of most of my complaints to my colleagues is summed up in a single sentence from a letter to the Archbishop, dated May 17th, 1901: "It is very difficult for a man in my position to deal with the class of men we have here among the higher officials." You have had two or three of our ex-officials in the past here before you, and you may judge for yourselves whether I exaggerated. To the same effect was my assurance to the Board in May, 1900, that one of the senior officers (Mr. Pomeroy) should be dismissed; and on another important occasion, in the same year, that the success of the new scheme had been endangered through the inefficiency of some high officials, and the absence of loyal co-operation on the part of others. In February, 1903, the Treasury demanded the resignation of one of the chief finance officers: he sent in his resignation, but subsequently I persuaded the Treasury to allow me to cancel it. In August, 1900, I had to censure Mr. Pomeroy on the inconsiderate tone of a letter which he had addressed to me. In March, 1903, I wrote to him in friendly terms, reminding him of the old friendship I had with members of his family, and suggesting that he should resign in case he found himself unable to comply with my orders as head of the administration. He replied that he was disinclined to adopt my suggestion, as he could not afford to retire on a reduced pension. In reply I wrote a very amiable letter, in which I regretted the unpleasantness and strained relations of the last two years, but said I was willing to consign them to oblivion if there was any prospect of our living on better terms for the future (from my diary of 1903). But my overtures met with scant return, as may be seen from the following letter, addressed to him, in October, 1903:—"You will remember that I wrote to you last year about the tone of your annual report, in which I thought you displayed a desire to criticise the delicate policy of the Commissioners. I said that I should always be glad to receive criticism from officers in the Board's service in the form of private memoranda, but that I could not permit officers to give expression to such criticisms in documents intended for the public eye. You did not reply to my letter, but I presumed you would carry out my instructions. The perusal of your report for 1901 shows that you have not done so. This report is most objectionable in tone, indeed as much as that, were it not late in the year, I should ask you to re-write it. As it is, I am satisfied by existing the most offensive paragraphs. I cannot tell you how pained I am that you should show signs of continuing a policy which has led to many heart-burnings in the past. Some months ago I thought I had succeeded in establishing better relations between us. I certainly endeavoured to do so." In April, 1903, I requested Mr. Pomeroy to hold, in conjunction with a senior inspector, an investigation into the case of a certain school; Mr. Pomeroy refused to comply with my order unless it was confirmed by the Board. The Board recommended Mr. Pomeroy and required him to carry out his orders without delay.

11278. That Board Order\* will be put in?—Yes. "I repeated on this occasion what I had said long ago about 'dislocation,' and I said Mr. Pomeroy was to blame for the whole of it. I told Mr. Deane (the Chairman) that he and Mr. Downing were causing disaffection in the country, and were the main cause of the present weakened position of the Board" (extract from diary, 1903). Subsequently, on the receipt of an explanation, the censure was removed, but Mr. Pomeroy was informed that his letter to the Secretary, refusing to carry out this order, was an improper one. On June 16th, 1903, the Bishop of Killarney (Right Rev. Dr. Archdall, Member of the National Board), "agreed with me that the chief inspectors could not be depended on. I asked him whether the Board would support me if I

asked Mr. Downing to resign. He said he did not know" (do.). At a meeting of the Board on June 22nd, 1903, "Mr. Molloy's proposal to ask the chief inspectors, in conjunction with the senior inspectors, to report on the working of the new scheme, was negatived, as I told the Board what I was doing in the matter. I pointed out that the chief inspectors had been disloyal to the Board from the beginning, and I disapproved of making them pass judgment on a scheme which they had tried to kill. . . . The Chief Baron said that the new scheme had been introduced in the teeth of the chief inspectors" (do.). July 6th, 1903: "discussion with Mr. Pomeroy as to the programme. He is very amiable, and much softened. Apparently he has decided to work in harness, as he wishes I am determined to see things for myself, whereas I am much pleased" (do.). November 2nd, 1903: "read Downing's and Pomeroy's (annual) reports, which were meant to be an attack on myself. Sent them to the Chief Baron, asking for his opinion" (do.). November 6th, 1903: I wrote to the Vice-Chancellor of Belfast, "I have always told the Board that the chief inspectors had had themselves out to thwart the policy unanimously adopted by the Board, which it was my duty to carry out. I have tried to conciliate Mr. Pomeroy and failed. It has always seemed to me to be an impossible position for the (administrative) head of a department, who is responsible, and who is held responsible, to the Board and public not to be able to depend on the loyalty of his subordinates" (do.). November 7th, 1903: wrote to Rev. Dr. Wilson (member of the National Board), "if the Board will not help me, I will put on record my conviction of the impossibility of conducting the administration efficiently. The action of the chief inspectors is leading to the dissolution of the Board, as they are the cause of most of the dissatisfaction among the managers" (do.). November 10th, 1903: "the Board decided that Pomeroy's and Downing's reports should not be printed, and that a senior inspector should be placed in the office until the retirement of the chief inspectors. I suggested Mr. Stronge's name."

11279. That was the beginning of the position Mr. Wyse holds now?—Yes.

11280. Mr. Stronge preceded Mr. Wyse in performing those duties?—Yes; this was on November 10th, 1903. "Dr. Traill wished Messrs. Pomeroy and Downing to be retired; but I stated I was nervous from being hard on one who was related to an old friend. I said I was sure the Board would agree I was never harsh to Mr. Pomeroy. They said 'Not No!' (do.). On the same occasion the Board directed that, in future, the chief inspectors should be relieved of the duty of writing the Annual Report, which, according to the regulations of 1900, was one of their most important duties. Some time subsequently the following article appeared in a Dublin journal:—"The current issue of the Irish School Weekly contains a couple of paragraphs dealing with prospective changes in the staff of the National Board which are of considerable public interest. These changes have been talked about."

11281. Are you going to give us many passages from newspapers?—No; there are only one or two.

11282. If you are allowed to do that, of course, it may raise the question in other cases. If we begin admitting those, of course the same permission will have to be extended to other people?—What I am quoting here, I do not quote as being for or against me; but as part of my indictment of Mr. Downing.

11283. Sir HERMAN WILKINSON.—Is it considered that this is a statement of Mr. Downing's?—I will discuss that later on.

11284. If it were a letter in Mr. Downing's name there might be no difficulty?—No; it is not that.

11285. Then it can scarcely be received unless it is in some way connected with Mr. Downing?—I do connect it with Mr. Downing, and I will show you how.

11286-8. The CHAIRMAN.—We have to be cautious in admitting extracts from newspapers?—The other paragraphs are only a few sentences. This is rather longer.

\* Vide Appendix XI. (8).

29th May, 1918.]

Mr. W. J. M. STARRS, M.A., Litt.D., LL.D., examined.

[Continued.]

"The current issue of the *Irish School Weekly* contains a couple of paragraphs dealing with prospective changes in the staff of the National Board, which are of considerable public interest. These changes have been talked about in a more or less vague fashion, in educational circles for some time past; but now they have been publicly forecasted in a journal which is said to be in close touch with the National Board's officials. Here is the first paragraph:—'The teachers of the South need not be surprised if there are some great changes among the senior inspectors in the Cork circuit soon. One of the present chief inspectors will be asked to make Cork his headquarters about the end of June. As this gentleman will be entitled to full pension at that time, and as he has many ties in the metropolis, he will avoid the difficulty of breaking up his home by retiring. He being a Catholic, his place will be filled by a co-religionist. One of the senior inspectors of Cork will almost for a certainty be offered the vacant chief inspectorship. As there is only one Catholic senior inspector in Cork there is no need to name the gentleman. Cork will then be the centre for the Catholic chief inspector.' We need not comment upon the clumsily concealed attempt in this passage to 'boom' for the promotion a particular official over others of equal efficiency, greater experience, and more obvious educational distinction. What calls for serious notice is the retirement, here foreshadowed, of one of the Board's officers, whose disagreement with Dr. Starke's views on the managerial question has already led to the suppression of his report from the official Blue Book, and whose inability to see eye to eye with the Resident Commissioner has now drawn upon him this further exercise of that autocratic gentleman's authority. The arrangements were to have taken effect in February, but the postponement, here indicated, of its execution until the end of June was due to the remonstrance of Dr. Starke's colleagues on the Board, whose action in this matter should be noted as typical of their position, as the only check—important, no doubt, but still a real check—on the Resident Commissioner. Last this postponement should lead to further investigations, and perhaps frustrate the whole plan, it would appear that attempts are now being made to rush the Board into filling the vacancy hitherto—attempts of which the passage we have quoted are a somewhat naive exposure.

'But,' says the omniscient *School Weekly*, 'changes will not end there. It is probable that Mr. Steneage, who is taken into the Education Office temporarily, will be kept there entirely. He will be responsible for the administration of the office during the absence of the Resident Commissioner.' This paragraph, it will be seen, differs markedly from the former in carefully avoiding all mention of religion—so as to conceal the fact that what is here aimed at is in virtually the creation of a Protestant Resident Commissioner—the extension of the 'half-and-half' system to this highest official position, and the establishment of a dual control—with Mr. Starke as the Catholic half! The steps already taken to this end may be thus recapitulated:—First, the 'chiefs of inspection' converted into 'chief inspectors' were removed from the office, and made peregrinatory; then the old procedure of filling the secretariats from among the subordinate officials was dropped, the Resident Commissioner being thus left without the assistance of anyone possessed of practical experience of the working of the schools; a Protestant senior inspector is brought into the office 'temporarily' as 'adviser' to Dr. Starke; and now we have the suggestion that this 'adviser' is to be permanently retained, and to act, practically, as a second Resident Commissioner, possibly with a view to subsequently superseding the National Board altogether. The whole situation is one that deserves to be carefully watched by all Catholics interested in the primary education of the country."

The following letter received from a man occupying a responsible position in education, who had ample means of knowing the truth, throws light upon the provenance of this article:—"Dear Sir—You will probably remember two paragraphs that appeared some weeks ago in *Irish School Weekly* with regard to the

appointment of one of the senior inspectors of Cork as chief inspector, and also referring to Mr. Steneage. Subsequently there appeared some paragraphs in the relative to this information in *I. S. W.* It might interest you to know that the para. in — were inspired by Mr. Downing. As this cannot have been done with your approval, but rather the contrary, I think it my duty to let you know, more especially as I have experienced a great deal of kindness from you." I think it will be quite clear that there is a great distinction between an opinion expressed generally upon the Commissioners and an attack on an individual. In December, 1908, I requested Mr. Downing, who had attained his maximum pension, to send in his resignation; he appealed to the Board against my decision, but the Board rejected his appeal. As the Treasury reduced Mr. Downing's pension on account of his official misconduct, Mr. Purser asked me in 1904 whether it was probable that his pension would be similarly reduced. I said that, so far as I was concerned, I would use my best endeavours to help him by recommending him to the Treasury for a full pension. This promise I carried out in 1911, in spite of the serious protestation I received in the Comodaff case. On the solicitation of Mr. Downing, I wrote privately to the Treasury requesting them, in the interest of peace, to make no reduction in his pension, but I was unsuccessful in my appeal.

11926. The CHAIRMAN.—What was the ground of the reduction?—It was on account of his official misconduct. I was unsuccessful in my appeal, as the following letter from an official of the Treasury shows (July 2nd, 1904):—"I am sorry to hear that a man in Mr. Downing's position has stooped to supplicate about a matter which, after all, affects only 5 per cent. of his pension. I don't think it at all likely that the Treasury will alter its decision. The last official letter from your Board appeared to show that, apart from the occasion on which he was suspended, he had from time to time evinced a good deal of unseemly cantankerousness, and had not been a thoroughly satisfactory and loyal official, such as a man in his position ought to be, for some years past. One of the members of the Treasury Board, who is specially charged with questions of superannuation, takes the view very strongly that, as we constantly make deductions from the pensions of people in humble positions on similar grounds, we cannot make exceptions in favour of bigger people like Downing; and I am sure you will agree that there is no question of 'mercenaries' in the difference between an income of £246 lbs. 4s. and one of £443 6s. 8d." In consequence of my promise, I determined to allow Mr. Purser to qualify for his full pension, although after 1907 I had the power to retire him without consulting the Board. Indeed, after Mr. Downing's retirement, in his official conduct for some years, though perfectly useless, he was not openly insubordinate. But so far as I can learn, he never carried out his duties as chief inspector in the spirit of the regulations. He exercised little supervision over the marking of his subordinates; he made no attempt, by means of conferences, to introduce uniformity into the methods of inspection—all this he admits—he allowed his subordinates to perceive that he was not in sympathy with the policy of the Board. His visits to schools, including even inspections ordered by the Board, were confined to about 30 days in the year. Some important circuits he hardly visited for 5 or 8 years. Even his reports of investigations ordered by the Board were so unsatisfactory in tone and judgment that they were rarely listened to with patience and the Board let me see that it wished no little business of an important character to be referred to him as possible. The same remark applies to Mr. Hynde. The exaggerated and ludicrously partisan style of both these gentlemen always prejudiced the Board against any cause they supported, and often gravely embarrassed our counsels, as in the case of their joint report on the grievances of the Belfast teachers. And this was an occasion on which I had implored them to make their report as calm and judicial as a proposition in Euclid!

11930. I think that in that report they rather attacked the teachers.—There is no doubt that, as you can see from the letter of the Board to the Belfast teachers, we



28th May, 1913.]

Mr. W. J. M. STANLEY, M.A., LL.D., LL.D., *examined*.

[Continued.]

were dissatisfied with the tone of the inspectors' report, and that fact really led, as I will tell you later on, to my visiting myself the Tipperary circuit. As I said at the beginning, the Irish Government wanted me that the post they were appointing me to was the most difficult one in their gift. My experience of the last 14 years has not shown that their prognostications erred on the side of exaggeration. During the first year of my administration things went happily enough, although the sultry attitude of the chiefs of inspection was ominous of future trouble. Lord Cadogan, Mr. Arthur Balfour, and Mr. Gerald Balfour were most sympathetic, as the following letters show:—*The late Professor George Fitzgerald wrote to me on November 22nd, 1899:—"I saw A. J. Balfour in London, and told him of your coup d'état. He was very much pleased, and evidently wished he could wreck the House of Commons as well. He approved highly of what I told him of the changes proposed, and was surprised that the Treasury consented, till I told him of the gold free question."* The Chief Secretary (Mr. G. W. Balfour), who, in April, 1899, had promised me the full support of the Government, if I undertook the needed reforms, wrote to me on May 6th, 1900:—"On the whole, I think you have every reason to congratulate yourself on having been able to carry your scheme through so nearly intact. Like others, you have experienced some of the difficulties which all legislation for Ireland presents; but I consider the results of your efforts to be a really great reform, and it is in no conventional sense I heartily felicitate you on your success." The Archbishop of Dublin had previously written to me on the same subject:—"As yet, I have been able to get only a little way through your stupendous opus. I can form even already some idea of the amount of thought it represents." There was no cloud on the horizon except the position of the Irish language, to which the Irish members invariably devoted themselves in the annual debates on the Estimates. The abolition of the *rezultat* system, the new scheme of salaries, the re-organising of the inspection staff, etc., were passed in November, 1899, and on 14th February, 1900, I outlined our new proposals in a speech at Glanassara, which I have sent to this Committee. The reception of my speech was most favourable, not to say enthusiastic. I blush to quote some of the Press comments, but they may pass as striking a note which is somewhat unfamiliar in these days. I begin with the *Freeman's Journal*, (February 22nd, 1900).

11292. I do not think you need give them?—Then I will postpone my blushes. To a similar effect was the *Daily Nation* of the 21st of February, 1900. The reception of that Glanassara speech by the Press was very favourable, and compliments were showered on my head, at which I should have been covered with confusion if I had to read them. Even after the carefully engineered agitation of the teachers against the new system had begun there was no change in the tone of the *Freeman's Journal*. Thus, after my second speech to Mr. Bevin's class, of August 31st, 1900, outlining the programme and replying to criticisms, it said:—"In an address to the teachers assembled for a course of hand-and-eye training, the Resident Commissioner has developed his defence of his scheme. We question, however, whether he does not exaggerate the importance and the representative character of the criticisms, and in doing so reflects unjustly upon the public interested in educational progress in Ireland." But the criticism of my criticism were in the dark. The attacks on the new system, however contemptible in the eyes of well-informed men, had already produced a result of which I was aware. As will be seen from the following letters, nine days previously the Archbishop of Dublin was contemplating sending in his resignation to Lord Cadogan. His Grace wrote to me then as follows:—"For myself I am rapidly coming to the conclusion, and, in fact, have practically come to it, that the position of a Commissioner of National Education is inconsistent with the ecclesiastical office I hold. We are being kicked about by every ignoramus in the country. The Board cannot or will not defend itself. I feel that I cannot defend it. I

made a bold effort to stand in the gap before the public over the Irish language question. . . . I have practically made up my mind to end my connection with both Education Boards. . . . You need not be afraid; I can fight a much better fight for you and your work outside the Board than as a member of it. That is perfectly plain to me now." I replied:—"I am not surprised at your Grace's resolve in severing your connection with the Education Board. The atrocity of the attacks upon us from all sides has been so exaggerated that I fully understand that no occupying your Grace's position could not fail to think the situation intolerable, especially since, in a certain extent, we are individually unopposed. The Board is in the unfortunate position of having no effective Parliamentary representative, for the Chief Secretary has no real authority."

11293. Is that intended for publication?—It is not marked "private," and the Archbishop would very much like the same thing himself in a speech at the time.

11294. He might not like to see these things in print?—He expressed himself in similar language in public about that time. I should be sorry to quote his Grace if I thought he would object to it, but what I reproduce here does not materially differ from some speeches he made during that crisis.

11295. Very well?—Then I may go on with my letter. "The Board is in the unfortunate position of having no effective Parliamentary representative, for the Chief Secretary has no real authority of the system, and is too ready to thank us over whatever it suits him. As for myself, I seized the only opportunity I had at Glanassara, in February, to put my views before the country, and I tried to show, in my short address, that the whole National Board as well as myself sympathized with the legitimate demands of the country, and your Grace, in the reported interview with the representative of the *Freeman's Journal* [quoted in by Mr. Leeson?], fully expressed your sympathy with the new scheme in all its details. But we could not escape the fate that dogs every attempt to better the condition of this country. Jealousy, malice, and vindictiveness have been rampant, even amongst the very men who have most to gain from the new system of education. It is all sadly disappointing to me, but as I am a more Government official, whose sole ambition is naturally to draw my salary, and to secure preferment and a 'ribben to stick in my coat,' it is absurd for me to talk of my feelings. As a matter of fact, I never expected to win gratitude from anyone, but I thought that, at least, your Grace's successful efforts to raise the standard of education would have been recompensed with confidence. It might have been remembered that to your Grace were due the two Commissions that have collected the mass of evidence without which it would have been impossible to take a step forward. Thus, while I fully sympathize with your Grace's course, I cannot conceal the fact that I regret it, as I have never regretted anything before. Your Grace's sympathy and confidence have lightened the labours of my office." The outcome of these letters was my address to Mr. Bevin's class on August 31st, 1900. The recent agitation among the teachers in Tipperary has been, in my opinion, happily engineered and conducted by Mr. Pinner's trenchant correspondence with the teachers formerly under his control against his own official superior. I am told, on the very highest authority, that this kind of correspondence has been going on for a very long time. Indeed I have heard rumours of it for many years. I was told, in 1900, from many sources that the attacks on the new scheme in one of the "class journals" were inspired by Mr. Pinner and his friends. The criticisms were, in general, harmless enough on account of their vulgarity and ignorance, but every week certain articles appeared which showed a very unusual knowledge of what was going on inside the office. The chief result of this campaign was the killing of the training of hand and eye, which is now regarded by all interested in practical studies. Ten years ago we were in advance

\* Vide Appendix XXXII.

28th May, 1918.]

Mr. W. J. M. SPARKES, M.A., Litt.D., LL.D., examined.

[Continued.]

of England, at least in the prospect of giving a practical turn to our education.

11296. How long was that in force?—It is in force still for junior classes.

11297. But abolished for the seniors?—Well, it never was really in force for the seniors. Our intention in 1900 was to introduce manual instruction gradually. We began with paper-folding, and such practical training as belongs to kindergarten. When I first went round the schools in 1900 I found to my surprise that they were teaching paper-folding to senior boys, and as that seemed to be ridiculous I stopped it at once. Of course, originally we intended to introduce suitable practical employment for the senior classes, but we never got as far as that, because the Treasury stopped the organisers before we reached it. The result of the agitation in 1900 is, we are now very far behind England in the studies which expired ten years ago among the facile virtuosi of the class journals. As I have said, I told the Board on many occasions that the success of the new scheme was being endangered by the disloyalty of the chief inspectors. The Board was willing to dispense with the services of Mr. Downing, but Mr. Foster was allowed to continue dropping venom into the ears of managers, inspectors and teachers, partly through a disastrous, though generous, disinclination to be severe to an old officer, but partly through the differences on the subject of the Irish language, and the model schools, which, in 1901, divided the Board against itself, and which, in leading directly or indirectly to some important resignations, almost caused the dissolution of the Board. An eminent colleague wrote to me on 24th May, 1900, touching a motion of a member of the Board, that he would resign unless he had a guarantee that no further communications should be given to the study of the Irish language: "I would not continue on the Board for a single day after the adoption of a motion such as that—the has given notice of. I decasy it will come to that sooner or later, but the later the better." Again, on 13th May, 1901, on the motion of a member of the Board that the rule allowing Irish to be taught within school-hours should be expunged from the code: "On the question about Irish I think the sooner—the motion is faced the better. Hence I should not be inclined personally to support any dilatory motion such as was carried by—on the occasion of—'s outbreak. I am rather inclined to vote against any such motion if—makes it again, as I decasy he will. There will be endless unrest until we have a formal vote one way or the other. I have very little doubt that if the Board adopts—'s motion, it will go far to wreck itself."

11298. With what purpose are you reading this?—This is a sketch of the introduction of the new system, for the purpose of showing the difficulties we had to contend with. The above motion was defeated, the voting being 7 to 7. The most important of the resignations was that of His Grace the Archbishop of Dublin, which was caused, not by our difference as to the position of Irish, though His Grace felt this acutely, but by the misunderstandings following upon his letters to the Press of June 2nd and 4th, 1901.

11299. That was with reference to the Financial Secretary?—Yes. These unfortunate misunderstandings were partly due to my absence from Ireland on two crucial occasions, first, during the four days subsequent to the refusal of the Board to alter a certain "minute" of its proceedings which the Archbishop—so he wrote to me—held to be not sufficiently explicit; and, secondly, during the preparation of the official reply to his Grace's letters, in which he gave in detail his reasons for retiring from the National Board. My attitude during the crisis of the Archbishop's resignation has been misconstrued. To what extent it was open to criticism may be judged from the following extracts from a letter addressed by me to an eminent person, in July, 1901: "The Archbishop's resignation was a 'very real grief to me,' as I have already told His Grace, especially as I am convinced it was due to a misunderstanding. His Grace's first letter to the Press, about which (as he wrote to me on Trinity

Sunday) he had thought it right not to consult me, was an attack on Mr. ———, and confined itself to his treatment of salary questions. When these letters were being discussed at the Board, I supported His Grace's proposal that Mr. ——— should be censured for not adhering to an order which I had drawn up for his guidance, and that he should be warned not again to exceed the authority delegated to him by the Board. I conveyed the Board's censure to Mr. ———, and directed him, in future, to issue the circular which had been drawn up in accordance with my orders. For the form of the record of the Board's discussion on His Grace's letters the Secretary, not I, was responsible. In fact, I expressed my opinion to him that the views of the Board should be fully detailed, but he objected, on the ground that he had not been able to gather what they were. I urged that it should be on record that Mr. ——— was intimated to send out the aforesaid circular in future; but he replied that Professor Dowden had suggested this, but had received no support. Some days after this His Grace and another Commissioner wrote to me that the 'minute' was not full enough. These letters were read to the Board, and I expressed my willingness to amend the record in the way suggested by His Grace, if the Commissioners would state what their 'views' were. I found that some thought one thing, others another, so that it was generally felt that it was hopeless to attempt to arrive at an agreement. In these circumstances, a member of the Board proposed that the 'minute' should remain unaltered, while another proposed, as an amendment, that the 'views' should be defined. It being quite clear that the Board had no views, I voted for the former proposal, which was passed by a small majority. I ought to have replied at once to His Grace's letter, but I assumed, as I had reason to do, that the Commissioner who proposed the amendment would tell him how things had gone, and, besides, I had to start for London immediately after the meeting, and did not return until after the Archbishop's resignation. I thereby lost the only available opportunity of setting myself right with His Grace as to my reasons for voting against the amendment." Looking back on these events, after twelve years, I see very clearly that my untidy omission to answer his Grace's letter, though excusable in the hurry of the moment, was one of the causes of all the trouble that ensued. Another cause was my failure to secure that, in the memorandum drafted for Mr. Wyndham's information, there should be an absolutely full and candid admission of our shortcomings, so far as I was aware of them. The genesis of the memorandum was as follows. During my visit to London in connection with the Archbishop's resignation, I was asked by Mr. Wyndham to supply him with a "brief," as there was going to be a debate on the subject in Parliament. As the requisite documents were not available in London, I requested a member of the staff at headquarters to take it upon him the preparation of a statement, intending to revise it myself before submitting it to the special Board which Mr. Wyndham requested me to summon. On my return to Dublin, two days before the meeting, I found that only the first few pages were ready for revision. The remainder was not available, until it was handed to me in the course of the meeting of the Board. Though ably conceived, the draft statement was much criticised; indeed, as the "minute" records, the whole time of the meeting was consumed in discussing it "in detail, paragraph by paragraph," so much so that we had no opportunity of considering its effect as a whole. It was very long, and had to be largely re-written in the space of two hours. For a document so prepared I have no larger personal responsibility than the rest of my colleagues who voted for it. In particular, as I told my above-mentioned correspondent at the time, I was not personally responsible for the passage beginning, "If instead of turning to discredit, etc.," which seems to have given most offence to His Grace. Indeed, I proposed to omit these words, as being needlessly provocative, but I was not supported. Though far from being as candid as I intended, and as I should have tried to make it, if I had been in Dublin, the Board's reply, as it seems

to me, admits by implication a great deal more than it expresses, at least to those who endeavour to read between the lines. For example, take the following: "The Resident Commissioner formed considerable difficulty in inducing all the officers to accommodate their ideas to the new order of things"; "an error of judgment may have been made by some of the executive officers"; "some letters may have been unguarded in dictum and possibly ill-considered in terms"; "in departing from the instructions of the Resident Commissioner ———— laid himself open to censure"; "the staff as a body deserves to be congratulated," and "the officers almost without exception loyally threw themselves into the work." Those who are familiar with the cautious tone of official reports will be the first to admit that these sentences display a candour highly unusual in such documents. The original draft contained other candid admissions, which were struck out by the Board as being inconsistent with its former decision, that ———— should not be severely censured. Soon after the meeting I returned to London with the Board's "apology," which I handed to Mr. Wyndham. On reading it, he asked me whether honestly the Archbishop had no case, and whether the Board's defence was as unanswerable as it seemed to him at first sight. I replied "Yes," so far as it was contended that there was neither "shame" nor even serious "confusion" in the office; but I pointed out our admissions touching certain high officials, against whom, I said, the Archbishop's case was very strong indeed—in fact, much stronger than His Grace had hitherto represented. I forthwith put Mr. Wyndham fully in possession of the substance of my complaints to the Archbishop, so that my letters did not come to him as a surprise when they were published, in parts, some days later in the *Dublin Press*. Indeed, I had often written to him in terms very similar to those which I had used to the Archbishop. Again, looking back, I see clearly that we erred through trying to make our defence too complete; that in our anxiety to exculpate our staff, which, as a whole, was above praise, we appeared to gloss over the serious delinquencies of some of the members of it. My private letters to the Archbishop related only to the latter, though they were sometimes expressed so unguardedly as to seem to have a wider application. But for the errors of judgment in the Board's defence my colleagues were quite as responsible as I. I had always kept them posted as to the shortcomings of some of our higher officials; and, consequently, the indignant reprobation by four of them of the "suggestion that they were unwilling to support the Resident Commissioner in the exercise of his legitimate authority, or to sanction the steps necessary for the maintenance of discipline and efficiency in the office," has always seemed to me, on a candid review of the true facts, somewhat overdone. A year previously the Board had failed to take adequate measures to restrain Messrs. Downing and Purser's insubordination, and defiance of authority. Instead of retiring these officers, on the exceptional terms offered by the Treasury, as being obviously "not capable of performing their new duties with full efficiency"—to quote a letter from the Treasury, which often passed on to take suitable action—the Board, out of sheer kindness of heart, made vain attempts to conciliate them. The leniency shown on that occasion, to which I was, indeed, myself a party, was no act of great magnanimity, but it was disastrous to the service, as it may be directly traced the series of troubles which have hampered our progress ever since, and of which, as it seems, the full crop has not yet been harvested. Thus, through misunderstanding, directly traceable to the disaffection and incompetence of some higher officials, a valued friendship was sacrificed, and I became the unwitting instrument whereby a lasting blow was dealt to the cause of reform. For many years after the calamity of the Archbishop's resignation we resembled a tree whose roots had been severed. Another serious loss to the reformers was the death, in March, 1901, of Professor Fitzgerald, who was mainly responsible for the introduction of the training of hand and eye and elementary science. After his death the Archbishop wrote to me:—

"Fitzgerald's death is a great blow to the cause of

reform in many ways. I think that his views and mine were practically identical on all points of principle."

11300. Was he the first who took it up?—I think both he and the Archbishop took it up simultaneously.

11301. He took a leading part in the Committee, of course?—Of course. It was he who secured its appointment.

11302. Mr. Harrison.—Professor Fitzgerald was an M.P.—Yes; it was he and the Archbishop who were mainly responsible; but they got great support from the Lord Chief Baron also. I came now to the attitude of the Government and the Treasury.

11303. Are you going to produce letters from the Treasury?—When you have heard what I have to say you will consider whether I should, but I ought to tell you that the letters from the Treasury practically appear in our annual reports. In 1905 we published them in *extenso*, but the Castle rejected the report on the ground that it was unofficial to publish letters between the Government and a department. Thereupon we removed the inverted commas and returned the letters, otherwise unaltered. After a delay of six months, they were published in this form. A further obstacle to the successful introduction of the new scheme was the attitude of the Irish Government and the Treasury. At first the chief difficulty was the Treasury, which insisted that the alterations of salaries and the training in the new subjects should involve no increase in the grants. Thus in 1905 the problem before the Board was, as an eminent colleague put it to me in a letter of 11th February: "Whether the reform is to be stopped until an additional grant can be got; and I think that to this there is only one possible answer." Again, on 25th November, 1909: "But here we are, twenty Irish gentlemen, a number of us at all events knowing what the work of primary education in Ireland really needs to get out of its present rut, and we are told that the Treasury—plainly a non-educational body—is to force an opinion possibly adverse to ours on this purely educational question. The thing seems to me perfectly monstrous. I, for one, would not continue a member of the Board for a week if it were established that we are in setting so humiliating a position." Another eminent colleague wrote to me somewhat later: "I think that it will be otherwise between the Board and its members on the one side, and the Treasury and the Irish Government on the other. I consider the conflict of these two bodies to be absolutely inevitable, and I shall deem it my duty to steadily resist the slightest encroachment by either of them on our rights. It has given me a foretaste of the action of the education department contemplated for Ireland, with the irreconcilable rule of English and Irish Treasury and Castle clerks." But, as usually happens, the Treasury had their way. A new Chief Secretary arose, "who knew not Joseph." The analogy of what was being done in England to co-ordinate education induced Mr. Wyndham to entertain doubts against the National Board, whose then attitude towards Irish was, politically, very unpopular. Hence the adoption of the policy of publicly discrediting the National Board, which has been pursued ever since, and which was then particularly useful, both as paving the way for its destruction, and also as enabling the Chief Secretary to lay his hands on the Development Grant, which we had claimed for the teachers as early as 18th July, 1902. At this point begins the catalogue of our "rejected addresses." Building grants were stopped "until the whole question of education could be considered." Higher grade schools and scholarships suffered suit. There came the impetation of Mr. Dule, in order that the Government might have a financial control at the spot to keep his eye on the Education Vote. But this was a coup *manqué*, as his recommendations led to the institution of junior assistant masters, costing £65,000 a year.

11304. Do I understand that Mr. Dule was sent over here for that particular purpose?—Certainly. It was stated in Parliament.

11305. I think he desired that the other day; he desired it point blank in his evidence. I asked him.

as the last question, whether that report was true, and he said not a word of it?—I have an extract from the *Freeman's Journal* of the 2nd of March, 1903, giving the reply of the Chief Secretary, Mr. Wyndham, to Mr. John Redmond:—"It was necessarily so. It was appointed in 1837" (That was a mistake of Mr. Wyndham's; it was in 1831), "and that year marked a distinct advance upon the condition of education in Ireland. Since then the practice was that when one member died another was appointed in his place. He believed the National Board worked hard and earnestly for the good of Ireland, but he did not disguise his own opinion, that it should be possible, not in this year, but in some other year, to suggest improvements (obscure), but they must at present make the best of the things as they are, and he would be deceiving them if he were to say that he should attempt to do anything with it now. The proper plan, in his opinion, was when they were engaged upon another subject, which was likely to occupy all their energies, to devote themselves to that question. Therefore he suggested, and he thought the suggestion would be accepted, that there should be in Ireland an expert in British Education, who knew all these questions of pounds, shillings and pence, and who would look into the Irish system, and assist him (Mr. Wyndham) and the Treasury in dealing with the financial side of the Irish Education question. He would be deceiving everybody if he pretended to have either the time or the leisure to go into the financial questions underlying the Irish Education Scheme. With regard to the difficulty about the subjects selected at the Evening Continuation Schools, it was not for him to defend or interpret, or even to understand, the conclusions arrived at by the National Board (Irish cheers and laughter), and he declined to pass blame or censure for decisions which he was unable to fathom (laughter and Irish cheers)." That proves my point.

THE CHAIRMAN.—He denied that.

SIR HIRAM WILKINSON.—There is nothing in that statement that is inconsistent with the instructions to Mr. Dale when he came over, I think, but what he denied was, that he had any interview with any member of the Government directing him to any particular line. I think that is the distinction that I would draw.

11106. MR. HENLY.—He said that he did not come for the purpose of suggesting economies—I am sure that he did not come with the intention of suggesting economies, but I am perfectly certain that those who sent him had that object.

11107. But he said distinctly that he got no instructions?—Positive instructions are never given in such circumstances.

11108. THE CHAIRMAN.—He said he saw no official?—He saw Sir Anthony MacDonnell, as I know.

THE BISHOP OF ROSK.—Not until he had been at work for some time.

11109. SIR HIRAM WILKINSON.—Might I read the terms of reference to which Mr. Dale drew attention himself?—To inquire and report how typical Irish elementary schools compare with similarly circumstanced elementary schools in England as regards premises, equipment, staff, and instruction, and to what causes the differences in economy and efficiency appear to be due. The question of finance was distinctly included in the terms of reference?—I haven't stated that Mr. Dale came here for the purpose of making economies, but that he was sent over here to keep his eye on the Education Vote. I fancy that Mr. Wyndham's object at that time, when the Development Grant was in progress, was to prevent an increase of the Education Vote, which was then imminent on account of the recent report on buildings. This involved a great increase in expenditure, and consequently a claim on the Development Grant, which Mr. Wyndham wanted for other purposes. I think that is the explanation. Now, although the projected reconstruction of Irish education did not materialise, the policy of starvation still continues. Upon this sketch of the last 15 years it suffices to make a single observation. Either the National Board is worthy of support or it is not. If it is not, why should it be

allowed to cumber the ground any longer? If it is, why should it continue to be treated with deliberate disrespect, such as has been the habitual attitude of the Government towards it since the advent of Mr. Wyndham in 1901? After all, it is composed of distinguished and impartial men, who are performing for the Irish Government the chief of its functions, which it is unable itself to undertake. Publicly to discredit it, and to cap the discipline of its servants, as has been done by the heads of the Government in recent years, is a criminal policy, which will bear, under an altered form of Government, the most bitter fruit. Parliament has been told, time without end, that the Chief Secretary is not responsible for the National Board, and, on one occasion, that "it was not for him to defend or interpret, or even to understand, the conclusions arrived at by the National Board (Irish cheers and laughter), and he declined to pass blame or censure for decisions which he was unable to fathom (laughter and Irish cheers)." Its policy has been criticised before the Teachers' Organisation by the only representative it has in Parliament, and that in the very first speech he delivered in Ireland. The present Committee of Inquiry, which, if the true source of the teachers' grievances is to be found, should be sitting on the Government, not upon us, was appointed, without consultation with the Board, after an interview with the Board's servants, and on evidence, such as Mr. Purser's letters, which was not submitted to the Board for its observations. The members of the Board are a long-suffering race, but I fancy that their patience has reached the breaking-point, as may be shown on the conclusion of this Inquiry. I have not asked for an indemnity before making these observations, which are forced upon me by my sense of the responsibilities imposed upon me fourteen years ago by Lord Cadogan, without my asking, on an understanding which no single attempt has been made to fulfil. Between the Government, which appointed me for certain purposes and then deserted me because they turned out to be unpopular, and the teachers, whose growing indiscipline and resistance to recognised authority have been incited by Ministers and other politicians, possibly innocently, possibly for ulterior ends, my task as an administrator has been harder than most men could bear. I am aware that the path I tread leads neither to honour nor preferment; but I have fought the good fight and I am not without my consolations. "On evil days though fallen and evil tongues" I have had the support of my staff, whom I have trusted, and who, with a few notable exceptions, have been loyal and honourable men, and of my colleagues on the Board, who in the most trying times have not lost confidence in me. As one of them lately wrote to me: "There is no fear but you will have the whole-hearted support of every one of your colleagues. I should myself like to see them all give evidence, if it was only as to the practical unanimity of the whole Board on the subject of this Inquiry. For such a mixed body as ours, I think that alone is a very striking argument in favour of our being in the right, and it ought to be made use of." As to the teachers, I have spent the best part of my life in mixing with them for months in the each year, so no head of a department has ever done before, and in doing them daily services and kindnesses; and I do not think so meanly of human nature as to believe that they are not grateful. However the intrigues may run, the great body of our teachers know well that I am the true friend of merit wherever I find it. That I am capable of doing any one a deliberate injustice, as alleged by Mr. Purser and his unscrupulous friends on the teachers' organisation, is a ridiculous charge, which recalls upon the heads of the wicked men that have made it.

11110. THE CHAIRMAN.—What point do you propose to take up now?—I am going on to the state of education in Ireland before the new system was introduced, and down to the time when Mr. Dale visited the schools, in 1903. I wish to quote a couple of sentences from Mr. Graham Balfour's "Educational Systems of Great Britain and Ireland," and Mr. Dale's report. I think it would be well to show you what we have tried to do since by taking the points in order, if you do not mind. The opinion of

28th May, 1913.]

Mr. W. J. M. SPARKES, M.A., LL.D., LL.B., continued.

[Continued]

most writers on education is well represented, I say, by Mr. Graham Balfour, who wrote in the 1st edition, page 18—"Last comes Ireland, poor and in desolation, passionately attached to her faith; lovable and unlovable and helpless, the child among nations; the Celtic genius, mysterious and impractical, 'always bound nowhere under full sail,' abandoned to obsolete methods and inadequate in their aim, because reform means the calling up of many quarrels." I agree with the last words, at all events, that reform means the calling up of quarrels. A good description of the old system is given by the same writer (ib., 1st ed., p. xxi.).—"A large part of the elementary grant is still paid for the results of bare examination, and no alternative to individual examination (except in the case of infants) is allowed. Singing is taught in only one school in every seven, and this in a country which has some of the best Celtic melodies in the world. Drawing has not been introduced generally into the schools, manual training has been grossly neglected by a people with a natural gift for decorative art, whose crying need is to develop manufactures and industrial pursuits."

11811. Mr. HERMAN WILKINSON.—What is the date of the first edition?—The first edition is 1899, and the second edition 1908. There has not been one since, I think. He says—"The study of agriculture, the only practical subject which has received attention, has fluctuated between ruinous extravagance and a mechanical study of text books" (ib., 2nd ed., p. xxi.). "The inadequacy and insufficiency of the education given (in Ireland) during nine-tenths of the last century can hardly be exaggerated. . . . The elementary curriculum was hopelessly obsolete." It is curious that the programme had been reduced to such a meagre content, since 60 years previously Mr. Wyse (afterwards Sir Thomas Wyse, grandfather of my secretary), as Chairman of a Select Committee of the House of Commons, had made recommendations similar in terms to those of the Vocational Commission of 1899, viz., singing and lessons on objects should be obligatory; manual and physical training, agricultural teaching should be introduced, as far as possible. Very striking are the following words of Wyse's report, which, after the best part of a century, we are only now fully taking to heart—"There does not seem to exist any valid reason why the elements of at least linear drawing should not be taught as universally as writing." These recommendations and those of the Vocational Commission, according to Mr. Balfour, "implied nothing which is not common or even compulsory in England, and what a measure of the deficiency of the Irish curriculum does this afford!" It is not strange that the Vocational Commission reported that while the old results programme fitted boys for intermediate schools, "it left them unfit to enter a technical school, even if they had such at their door"; and the Technical Instruction Commission reported, in 1894, that no progress could be effected in Ireland until primary education had been placed on a proper footing. The recommendations of the Vocational Commission have been carried out in Irish schools since 1900; but even still there are found self-styled authorities on education who belittle them. In comparison with the stringy fare supplied before the new system. For the advance which has been made in my time I may refer to my second Belfast address (1911).

11812. Was that the case at the University?—Yes. I will take the comments in Mr. Dale's report. The first has reference to the buildings, insufficient class-rooms, etc. According to Mr. Dale, "the children are occasionally pushed into these rooms like bees in a hive, with terrible consequences to the atmosphere." I do not think any description for hard language could exceed that of our experienced Inspector, Mr. Kelly, who speaks of them as like the "Black Hole of Calcutta." I do not know what this was like, but I saw in Belfast 70 children packed in a room of 17 feet by 9, with only one little window in the upper part of the wall. That was in Ballymacarrett. Since then I cannot say that there has been much improvement, but we do not recognise schools now unless each child has 20 square feet, and we have made a rule that if there

is not sufficient accommodation for the children they must be excluded, beginning with the youngest of them.

11813. Mr. KAVANAGH.—And what becomes of them?—They enjoy the superior air in the streets. I refer you to rule 183. The younger children are to be excluded when there is insufficient accommodation. A paper was sent to me this morning stating that Belfast is waking up, but they have been waking a long time. We had a meeting with the Corporation six years ago, and they made several proposals. The first of them was that Belfast should be treated as a congested district, that is that they should get a full grant for buildings, as being a poor and congested area, just like Achill and such places; but that was not a proposal likely to be favourably entertained by the Treasury. Want of sanitation is the next point. According to Mr. Dale, "many town schools are in a condition which can only be termed disgraceful. Dying walls or ceilings, broken woodwork or plaster, and dirty floors. It is difficult to give in words any adequate conception of buildings which are classified by the Irish inspectors as bad." As to the rural schools, "the floors are generally dirty, and the walls and cupboards are often covered with dust; the out-offices are rarely quite clean, and at times indescribably filthy."

11814. Mr. CORRY.—How many rural schools did Mr. Dale visit?—I should say about 80.

11815. The CHAIRMAN.—He visited 80 altogether?—He mostly confined himself to rural schools.

11816. The majority were rural?—The majority were rural. I was with him practically the whole time, and we spent most of our time in Mayo, Clare, Kerry, Donegal, and Sligo.

11817. He says that urban schools were far worse than the rural schools?—They are worse in Belfast. What he said was perfectly true, that in the rural schools, at any rate, you have got sufficient floor accommodation. They are generally built for a very much larger number of children than attend them.

11818. Mr. CORRY.—I only wanted to know the number of rural schools in which he based his judgment. I presume you visited ten town schools at all events between Belfast and Dublin?—I suppose so. It is very hard for me to say how many he visited, but at any rate what he said I can vouch for from my own knowledge. After my experience with Mr. Dale I got a circular (I have it here) issued by the Board, which gives a veracious description of the rural schools of ten years ago. I refer to our memorandum to managers, of May, 1903:—

"The Commissioners of National Education wish to direct the earnest and immediate attention of managers generally to the extremely unsatisfactory condition of many of the National School houses in regard to repair and cleanliness, and particularly to the disgraceful state of the out-offices, which in numerous instances have been reported to be in such a state of filth as to constitute a grave menace to the health of the children attending the schools in question. Broken and dilapidated doors and windows, damaged roofs, dirty walls, and damp floors are not calculated to make the schools attractive to the children, and in too many instances this is a true picture of the defects to be found in the school houses."

11819. The CHAIRMAN.—Could we have that circular sent in?—Yes. As I have read it, it will appear on the Notes. It is right to say that few such schools now exist. Mr. Dale points out that the same fact about the condition of the country schools was noticed by the Powis Commission, and he draws the inference that in respect of cleanliness there had been little improvement in the thirty years. As such schools are rarely to be seen now, it is equally obvious that there has been an immense improvement during the last ten years. "Old thatched cottages, with low roofs, broken floors, tiny windows" were common enough ten years ago. There are some still remaining, but in every case practical steps have been taken to provide new buildings, according to our improved plans, in their places. Thus, in Achill and its neighbourhood eight new schools have

been built by the Board of Works without any charge to the locality to replace eight unsanitary cabins which I imported five years ago. The schools in Aethy, I must say, were as bad as any I have ever seen, but their place has been taken by eight new schools built without one shilling of charge to the locality. I persuaded the Treasury to agree to give the whole of the cost of building in very poor localities.

11320. Did they not suspend the building grants?—Certainly; but they were restored in 1908, that is five years ago, and since then these schools have been built. The next point is as to improvement in plans. New buildings cost from £8 to £10 per head; the buildings erected before 1908, £4 to £6 per head. The new buildings provide a classroom for each teacher and a seat for every child, also a science and cookery room where the attendance is above 160; the playgrounds are concrete. The grants are confined for the present to cases where the health of the children is imperilled from unsanitary surroundings. Under the old rules, as no more than a "two-thirds grant" was ever given, and as this rarely covered more than a-half or a third of the expenditure, poor localities were totally neglected on account of the incapacity of the managers to provide the local contribution, either in cash or labour. Thus Mr. Dale noticed that many schools had been condemned by the inspectors for 30 years without any attempt being made to erect others in their place: "the central authority has to wait in helpless inaction for the appearance of local effort." That is still the case in Belfast. We have to wait till somebody takes it into his head to provide schools. The same is still true of towns, since we can give higher grants only where the valuation is low. This is a bad system in Ireland, since, for example, in a rich city like Belfast, whose valuation is high, the expense of providing new schools falls on individual employers, whose contributions may be as poor as in the most congested parts of the country. Again, the Protestant parishes in towns are unwilling to vest their schools, as they wish to use them for parochial purposes; in consequence of this unwillingness the greater part of the grant falls to Roman Catholics, whose practice it is to vest their schools in trustees. As to improvements in floor space, before 1907, 8 square feet per unit of average attendance was sufficient; at present 10 square feet on the mean between the average attendance and the number on the rolls is required; and where this accommodation is not provided for the number of children on the rolls, we require, as I said above, the exclusion of the younger children. Then as to maintenance of the schools. Mr. Dale reported that, at least in rural schools, minor repairs, cost of fuel, etc., were borne by the teachers. These annual disbursements ranged from 15s. to £4. Since the Government annual grant of £21,600 for heating and cleansing I have not come across any teachers who told me they were any longer liable for any such charges. That is one great advantage that the teacher has no longer to pay for these things out of his salary.

11321. You forbid that?—Oh, certainly; we always forbid it. But what is the good of forbidding a thing that is constantly done.

11322. Mr. HENRY.—Is not the grant inadequate?—Of course it is, Mr. Henry. Every grant from the Treasury is inadequate.

11323. So that the teachers have to make up something still?—I do not think that the teachers pay anything now. My knowledge on this subject is not exhaustive, but during the last few years I made inquiries wherever I went, and I took down in my notebook how much the teacher said he was liable for, but I have not come across any case in the last year and a half where the teacher said he was liable for anything. There may be cases, of course.

11324. The CHAIRMAN.—What is the next point?—The causes of the unsatisfactory conditions of Irish schools. According to Mr. Dale the chief reason was to be found in the comparative lack of local interest in primary education, both on the part of the parents and the managers: "it is impossible to see the condition of the out-offices in many Irish country schools, and the dirt and dust of the interior without being forced to the conclusion that even the managers in Ireland, though frequently visiting their schools and taking an

interest in them, do not, in numerous cases, consider the supervision of the cleanliness and sanitation of the school buildings to be one of their primary duties to the same degree as the managers in England." This is no longer true to anything like the same extent as ten years ago.

11325. Mr. COFFEY.—Are you in a position to prove that managers take much more interest in their schools now than they did seven years ago?—Well, Mr. Coffey, I can only judge by appearances; if I find a school indescribably dirty, as I used to find them, I would come to the conclusion that those in authority, if interested at all, did not take an interest in the school in that particular respect; but when I found a school with a decent appearance I would come to the conclusion that the people in authority were not unmindful of such things. My conclusions are based on evidence of that kind.

11326. Would you not say that there may be a number of circumstances that might make for improvement in the school, even if the manager still continued indifferent?—No doubt. I have noticed an improvement in the social condition of Ireland for the last ten years. There is no doubt about that. It may be that the labourers' cottages are giving examples of what private houses should be. I now often see flowers in the windows and creeps, and the places are nicely kept, and if you compare them with the cabins of some years ago there is an enormous difference, and no doubt that reacts on the school.

11327. I think I understood you to say that local interest had increased very much?—What I said was that persistent neglect of appearances is no longer true to the same extent as it was ten years ago. What I meant was that it was no longer true to speak of the conditions of the out-offices as being indescribably dirty and so on; I can say that of my own observation; but to what the improvement is due I can only conjecture.

11328. But you agree that there are other causes awakening local interests, and amongst those causes is the fact that the general conditions of the people have gone up?—I fancy that people realise to a greater extent the value of cleanliness.

11329. The CHAIRMAN.—The parents will not tolerate the former condition?—Quite so; and then there is the high standard of certain secondary schools, which, I suppose, might react on the managers of primary schools, too. They are influenced by the new spirit like everybody else.

11330. Mr. COFFEY.—I thought it was something that you could support by evidence, that the managers were taking very much more interest in the schools than they used to?—Well, personally, I believe that.

11331. But except that the condition of the schools has improved, just as the whole locality fortunately has improved, you have really no evidence to support that view?—I do not admit that. From going round the country, I find that the managers visit their schools very much more than they used to. I constantly see them there, and see their names in the daily report book to a very much greater extent than I used to. I have often visited the girls' schools are now models of neatness, even where the buildings are unsatisfactory. The boys' schools have not made such an advance and are often dirty and untidy; but even in those a great advance has been made since the "tone circular" of 1911. During the last year I have rarely noted a boys' school as being deficient in cleanliness. They are still often "neat and unadorned," but I have recently remarked many attempts to improve their appearance by means of pictures, etc. I have asked inspectors why it is that boys' schools have recently improved in cleanliness, and they tell me that it is due to the fact that we emphasise the necessity of the school being neat and clean in that circular, so that the change is not altogether due to the improvement in the social condition of the people. There has not been, so far as I know, a tremendous alteration in the social condition of the Irish people since the year 1911, but these improvements have taken place since then. I have my note-books here, and I always note facts of that kind; indeed that is one of the chief reasons I had for visiting the schools, I have noted here all the dirty schools I have been in since 1911. Notes of this kind

are rare. As to the equipment, in 1902 desks were provided for only half the children; they are now provided for all; there were rarely kindergarten desks for the infants; they are now obligatory in all schools where infants are enrolled, although I do not say they are always provided. In 1902, slates were universal, or at any rate portions of slates were. I have seldom seen them during recent years. They have mostly gone out. Now, with regard to the appearance of the rooms, in 1902, they were bare and unattractive, and flowers were rarely seen; but now flowers are universal. In 1902, there were very few museums or libraries; both are now frequently seen, but are not sufficiently common. As Mr. Dale said, "the neglect (of appearance) was due not to want of local funds, but to want of appreciation of the importance of attractive surroundings. The Board has long insisted on the importance of the external aspect of a school. See Rule 86.

11332. The CHAIRMAN.—Do you make grants for libraries?—No; I do not think we could; but we might make a grant for a press to keep a library in. A grant for equipment is given when a school is first started or when a large amount of money is expended in improvements, and by a new rule a look-ahead is held to count under the head of equipment. We have no power to make a grant for books, although we have asked for it. As to staffing, even in 1902 the means of training were more abundant in Ireland than in England; in 1900 we required training in the case of principal teachers; we now require it from male assistants, and will require it in the case of all as soon as the women's colleges can supply enough trained teachers to fill the vacancies for women teachers. Again, in Ireland monitors and pupil teachers are regarded as disciples, not as teachers, as in England. I do not know whether they have changed that lately in England. Are they still regarded as teachers?

11333. Mr. HANCOCK.—Do you mean pupil teachers?—Yes.

11334. Well, they did count for a small number when I left.—Even in 1903, the staffing in Ireland was better than in England; for instance, in England it is rare to find a trained assistant in rural schools of 100 children.

11335. I may say with regard to that the chief local authorities certainly do not count them; their staffing scheme is irrespective of them; but I think that by a new code they do count for a small number?—In England it is rare to find a trained assistant in rural schools of 100 children, and it is fairly common to find that the principal teacher is not trained; even trained principals are not universal or even common. Since 1903 there has been a further improvement in Ireland. Thus, a trained assistant may be employed even in the schools where the average attendance has fallen from 50 to 40; a junior assistant mistress may be employed in all mixed schools where there is no other woman teacher, and in boys' and girls' schools even where the average attendance falls to 30. As to the status of teachers, the changes in 1900 were designed to substitute fixed salaries for salaries partly based on payment by results.—Mr. Dale strongly favoured this reform: "English experience is entirely at one with the views of the Irish department in regarding this change as a marked improvement." The weakness of the Irish system is that the number of teachers in the higher grades is very much less than the number of schools eligible; thus in grade 1' there are only 610 places, while 1,500 schools are eligible for teachers of this rank. The Treasury never allowed us, except to a small extent, to increase the number of teachers in the higher grades and there are now more than 100 teachers who have been promoted to the first of first and second of first grade but who cannot get their money.

11336. How long has that arrangement with the Treasury been made as to the fixing of the numbers?—We provisionally fixed the numbers for the higher grades in 1900, somewhat in excess of the number of the teachers eligible. For some years we regularly promoted deserving teachers, both male and female. The higher grade in the case of women is not yet full; but the men have been blocked for the last five years, so that we can give them when they qualify for the highest grade only what is called paper promotion.

11337. How long is a man kept out of his proper pay?—Two years at least.

11338. He has to wait till there is a vacancy?—Yes.

11339. And the Treasury never re-considered the numbers in all these years?—We arranged originally in 1900 that the numbers in the higher grades should be altered from time to time after consultation between the Treasury and the Commissioners. But the Treasury has refused point blank ever since to make any alteration.

11340. They have never made any addition since. Well, they did; they added 40 places, I think; and then Mr. Birrell offered to give actual promotion to all the men who still had only paper promotion, on condition that no more teachers should be promoted in this way; but, of course, we could not accept that. By Mr. Birrell's proposal all the men who were disappointed to get their pay would have been satisfied; but it would have been a great hardship to all future candidates, and so we refused the offer, and that is the state of things at present. To return to the status of teachers. In England the salary varies as the size of the school; the initial salary is large, and increments and promotions are not directly controlled by the central authority, although His Majesty's inspectors are often consulted privately. The Irish system is unsatisfactory, as being too centralised, thus imposing, in the words of Mr. Dale, "on the central authority, and in particular on the Irish inspectors, a responsibility which, in England, the central authority has always avoided. The present position of the inspectors is in several respects hardly compatible with the performance of such a delicate and onerous task."

11341. The CHAIRMAN.—Mr. Dale said the duty of inspectors, with regard to promotion, should be one of rejection and not of selection, and he explained to us that a serious responsibility is thrown on the inspectors in Ireland in asking him to select from a number of candidates, persons for promotion?—As promotion in Ireland depends on the character of the inspector's report, whereby unsatisfactory teachers are rejected, I do not understand what Mr. Dale means by using the word selection.

11342. It should be rejection?—But it is by rejection.

11343. It is rejection?—At least, I think so, so far as I understand the question.

11344. Mr. HANCOCK.—Was he not referring to a certain number who might be specially selected on their services for promotion?—Special promotion is given by selection, but in the case of the men, at any rate, all special promotion is stopped, so that the question of selection does not trouble us very much in their case. Hence, I think Mr. Dale must misunderstand our system. Our method of ordinary promotion is this. The inspectors report in ignorance whether the teacher is a subject for promotion or not. They report on the school as they find it. The report comes up to the office with a mark assigned to the school. Mr. Wynn, who looks after promotions, collects a number of these for report, and finds out whether they reach a certain fixed standard. The promotion is really given on the result of that scrutiny. The inspector has got really little to say to promotion, except in giving a mark to the school. No doubt the list of eligible people is sent down to him, and he has to say with regard to each teacher on the list whether he recommends him or not. That is what Mr. Dale refers to.

11345. That is what he refers to?—But the final judgment of the inspector has very little to do with promotion, because most teachers who have got the requisite marks are recommended by the inspector and receive their promotion. The reports are referred back to the inspectors in accordance with an old rule, and we do not think it worth while to change it; but it has little effect on the promotions. Promotion really depends, as a rule, on the mark given to the school.

11346. The CHAIRMAN.—The school marks carry a certain grade?—Yes, so that the process is neither by selection or rejection. Of course, it may happen, and I do not say I could change my memory with a very few instances where, although the teacher had got the required marks, the inspector would subsequently say:

28th May, 1913.]

Mr. W. J. M. SHARKE, M.A., Litt.D., LL.D., examined.

[Continued.]

"This teacher should not get his promotion"; but I am rarely satisfied with such an opinion without further inquiry. In such cases I usually write again to the inspector and ask: "Why do you think this teacher does not deserve promotion, whom you have given him 'very good' or 'excellent,' or whatever mark it might be." It generally happens that the inspector in the end gives in and recommends the teacher.

11347. Would he not be bound to recommend him to first of first class if he had got three "very goods"?—As a rule, but in a few cases the inspector, for some reason or other, may not recommend, but we do not allow that fact to block the teacher without further explanation. You may take it from me that in the great majority of cases, possibly 99 out of 100, the promotion is given on the marks given to the school.

11348. That is what Mr. Wyse acts on?—Yes.

11349. Mr. CHURCH.—What do you think would be a good reason, if the teacher got three merit marks that entitled him to promotion?

11350. The CHAIRMAN.—What reason might the inspector have for refusing to recommend?—It is so rare that it is not easy to say; but it might be on account of something that had turned up subsequently to the last report, for instance, the teacher may have got into trouble of some kind or other. The inspector might draw attention to that. If you asked him for an explanation, he might say: "Oh, well, this teacher has got into trouble, or has done something wrong." I wish to make it clear that we are not satisfied, except there is some solid reason of that kind.

11351. But that does not often happen?—Oh, no.

11352. Mr. HENRY.—Surely the inspector would not prevent him from getting promotion subsequently in the year?—I am speaking now rather theoretically, as I do not remember a particular case; but I can conceive, that although the teacher had got three "very goods," he might subsequently be disqualified by a charge, say, of intemperance, or something of that kind. Although such a charge might be subsequent to the three reports, the Board might hold that they could not promote a teacher who was actually convicted of intemperance.

11353. But that ought to be mentioned?—But it would be mentioned.

11354. The CHAIRMAN.—I think we might proceed?—Mr. Dale points out that it can be represented, with an appearance of truth, that the inspectors have not sufficient knowledge of the schools to pass judgment upon the comparative merits of teachers—"their visits are few, they cannot acquire full knowledge and evidence which would enable them to compare unsatisfactorily the respective merits of several candidates for promotion." There is a basis of truth in this, and there is no doubt that Mr. Dale was a veracious prophet when he anticipated that "appeals to the Central Office, or to individual Commissioners, against the judgment of inspectors will be common; in order to avoid the difficulties thus created there will be constant pressure put upon the Commissioners by managers and teachers to increase the number of teachers in each of the higher grades, so as to make it coincide more nearly with the number qualified by the size of the schools. The immense increase of expense to the State if this pressure, which will be difficult to resist, is yielded to, is obvious." The recent agitation against the marking of the inspectors has been due to this weakness in our system, which cannot be removed without revolutionary changes, such as rates and local control, for which the country is not prepared. But the Board has done everything in its power to lessen the friction, which is inseparable from the Irish system. In the circular of 1911, and in earlier circulars, the inspectors have been warned not to make their marking of a school turn upon such aspects of a school as vary from year to year, e.g., a decline, possibly accidental, in the answering in arithmetic or geography. The mark should not vary greatly from year to year if the character of the teacher and the permanent aspects of a school are mainly regarded; nor should it be reduced without a warning; the senior inspector's judgment should be consulted; satisfactory schools should be allowed to develop on their own lines, and should not be harassed by too close

supervision. If this circular were sympathetically interpreted, the increments would be largely automatic, as they should be, in satisfactory schools; the inspectors' attention would be concentrated on the schools which were doing unsatisfactory work. I am drawing particular attention to these sentences which deal with a very important point.

11355. Has that circular been obeyed by the inspectors?—I have a good deal to say on that subject, as I am determined to be very frank. I do not think that the spirit of that circular has been sufficiently grasped, but I am doing everything in my power, by means of the chief inspectors and others, and by my personal influence, to bring home to the inspectors the true gist of our educational policy. I firmly believe (and I have experience of this subject such as nobody else has got) that the inspection of schools, as it has been carried out for probably the last 60 years in Ireland, is often an offence on the best teachers. I believe that a good teacher ought to be allowed to develop his school on his own lines with as little interference as possible. If he is a good man, if he is a man of character and experience, he knows a great deal more about how a school should be conducted than any inspector, and it seems, consequently, that to ask an inspector to spend several days in the year inspecting and examining such a school shows a want of confidence in the teacher, and is, as a rule, a mere waste of time. A teacher of that kind is able to examine his own school; he should be encouraged to do so, and, in fact, he is required to do so. The examination system for boys I thoroughly approve of when not carried to excess. Let the teacher examine the children as much as ever he likes in his own school. Stimulus is valuable to the children, and does not injuriously affect the teaching. There is no harm in the inspector's examining them once a year, provided he does not interfere with the teaching. But it is difficult to avoid doing so. Anybody who has experience of ordinary schools knows that if you ask the height of a mountain the children will get nothing but the heights of mountains for months afterwards. That is the kind of thing which usually happens. If we had a sufficient number of inspectors we might extend the sphere of examinations; but having only a limited number, and having, as you see from the Annual Reports, 80 per cent. of unsatisfactory schools, it seems from the point of view of the interests of the State more desirable to get the inspectors to concentrate their attention on the unsatisfactory schools, so as to try to make them satisfactory, than to turn them loose in these satisfactory schools, where the teacher does not require any such stimulus as examinations provide. The best schools ought to be very closely inspected once in every three years. I think that is quite sufficient.

11356. What class of schools?—The satisfactory schools. Such schools might in the interval be left very much in the hands of the teachers, but the inspector should visit them and see that everything was right; he should examine the note-books and copy-books, and everything of that kind, but he need not make a very close inspection.

11357. Your idea would be almost automatic increments?—I am in favour of making increments as automatic as the circumstances permit.

11358. Would that be subject to this condition, that no unsatisfactory report came about that teacher?—The 1911 circular, properly interpreted, provides that about 70 per cent. of teachers should get their increments automatically unless the inspector, after due warning, came to the conclusion that the school had fallen off permanently in its work.

11359. That they should get their increments if there had been no unsatisfactory report in the interval?—Yes, certainly.

11360. Mr. HENRY.—Does not that mean that they still must get the merit mark?—Yes; but we say in the 1911 circular that no lowering of the merit mark is to take place unless for a very good reason, and after warning; and that the inspector is not to lower it for any accidental matter, but only for a general fall in the school. I emphasize this point on account of what I have seen myself even recently in my visits to



28th May, 1913.]

Mr. W. J. M. STARRIE, M.A., LL.D., examined.

[Continued.]

schools. I sometimes go into a school and see it is "very good" one year and "good" the next, and I am unable to say why the standard varies from year to year under the same teacher. If I ask why the mark was changed, I may be told that the teacher's mental arithmetic was not satisfactory. But, from the point of view of the permanent value of the school, I don't care twopence whether it was or not.

11861. And you have come across cases like that?—Yes.

11862. Where a variation of the mark is made for an unimportant matter?—I often think so, but the Inspector might not consider it unimportant, and he might say: "I mark every subject I examine on, and the mark on the school is the product of the marks in all the subjects." The difficulty in dealing with some inspectors is that they have been baptised in the results system, and they have not yet got rid of the effects of their baptism.

11863. Those intentions which are proclaimed in the circular that we have all read are very imperfectly carried out as violated by many of the inspectors?—I believe that its spirit has not been grasped by some. I am not to be taken as implying that the Irish inspectors have a double dose of original sin. Their case is not peculiar. Sir John Strachan, to whom I mentioned some time ago how difficult I found it to get the inspectors trained in the old mechanical methods of marking ever to abandon them, told me that although the results system was abolished in Scotland 30 years ago, many of the inspectors who had been used to it never got out of it.

11864. Mr. HENRY.—That is my idea of the way schools ought to be worked?—The 1911 circular has also been extraordinarily misconstrued by the people in whose interests it was drawn up. To judge from their public utterances, they disapprove of it; and yet their representative, Mr. Ward, said at the National Board when it was passed: "That is the best document that has ever issued from the Education Office."

11865. The CHAIRMAN.—You know the charge against that circular is that it leaves too much to the discretion of an inspector?—I entirely disagree with that view. It is easier to ascertain the tone of a school than the knowledge of arithmetic, a great deal easier in my opinion.

11866. Mr. CORRY.—Yes, it is easy enough to form a judgment on the tone of a school, easy enough for an individual man to form a judgment on the tone of the school, but it is extremely difficult to get 66 men to form the same opinion?—It is just as difficult to get them to form a uniform judgment about reading. Some people I know of seem to think reading to be good which I think atrociously bad.

11867. The CHAIRMAN.—The variation among examiners of Latin is extraordinary; I have seen a Latin composition marked with three different letters?—Yes, uniformity is a will-o'-the-wisp; you will never get it.

11868. Mr. CORRY.—There are just two points. This friction between the inspectors and the teachers would be impossible with local control?—What I meant was this, that you could not get rid of the friction between the central department and the teachers, at any rate, so long as the inspectors interpret our intentions in the circular of 1911 as I think many of them do, without shifting the centre of gravity. In England (I am speaking under correction) His Majesty's Inspector appears to have a most delightful time; he is a man to be envied; he can go into a school and inspect it in the way I want it to be inspected, and he can have pleasant talks with the teacher and advise him, and then before going away he leaves some nice remarks for the teacher. On the other hand, the teacher does not look forward to the inspector's visit to the school with any apprehension, as the latter does not mark the school, and nothing particular depends on his report. In England the local authority pays the salaries, and the increments depend largely on the report, not as in Ireland of the central, but of the local inspectors. Furthermore, His Majesty's inspectors (again I speak under correction) do not pay very much attention to the individual members of the staff. At least I am given to understand so. When we ask the English department about the character of any individual teacher who has come over to us we find a difference

between their system and ours. Here we could easily give a long record of every teacher who has been in the Board's service; but in England it is not so easy to get out of the central authority much information about the individual members of the staff; they can only say that a man has served in such and such a school; they cannot give the minute information that is forthcoming in the case of Irish teachers.

11869. Mr. HARRISON.—You can get it from the individual inspectors of the district; but they keep no record in the central office?—But we in the central office have a minute record of every teacher's career. That is our system, of which I am not a great admirer. It is an awful thought that the recording angle of the Education Office possesses an exhaustive list of a man's shortcomings during a career of 40 years.

11870. Mr. CORRY.—Would you be favourable to the examination of all the pupils if you had a sufficient inspection staff?—I cannot give an unqualified answer to that question. What I said was that I should not disapprove of consideration if it did not affect the teaching. If you have an examination on which nothing is the way of increment or promotion depends, I do not think it does any harm, indeed I fancy it would often do some good; but if increments and promotion depend on the examination of the children, the teacher, being human, will inevitably reflect the questions set by the inspector and drill the children in them for the whole subsequent year. Under the results system arithmetic cards were sent all over the country. People went to the trouble of collecting all the questions of the inspectors and published them, so that the children were drilled all the year round in the questions likely to be set. I do not say this was the practice of the best schools.

11871. The CHAIRMAN.—Now, the next point?—The next point is the initial salaries. Those are far too small in the case of large schools. This was unavoidable after 1902, as the existing teachers had to be fitted into the grades without increasing the amount of the grant, as we were foolishly to do. In 1908 we endeavoured to secure this lack by providing bonuses for teachers of large and important schools (with 70 in average attendance and above), but this portion of our scheme was rejected by the Government in favour of increasing, as the teachers' organisation preferred, all salaries in the third grade by 21 per annum. The advantage of the Irish system is that it secures good teachers for country schools. Thus, some of the best schools are in out-of-the-way parts, such as the Dingle Promontory, the neighbourhood of Ballydoole, Castlebar, Seariff, etc. That is one great peculiarity of the schools in Ireland, that children in many of the out-of-the-way parts of the country get a better education than they can get, perhaps, in Belfast.

11872. But the teachers themselves based that they are the cream of the profession?—Yes. I next come to instruction and the number of schools. In 1887 there were 6,590 schools, with a population of 5,411,377; in 1901 there were 8,023 schools, with a population of 4,458,771. After 1902 immense additions were made to the number of Protestant schools (214 late E.C., 56 Presbyterian, 30 Methodist schools were added), also R.C. schools were divided into boys' and girls' departments, provided there were 20 in average attendance in each. This policy was largely due to the provision of the Act of 1892, which permitted the Board to give 2nd class salaries to schools attended by 20 children. The results of this policy apparently were not observed; Mr. Dale notices as its most disastrous consequence "the effect on the instruction of the boys from 3 to 7 years of age. . . . If there is any point of agreement among all interested in education it is that a man both by temperament and training is unfitted to teach infants, and that the charge of them should be entrusted to women. . . . The prevailing organisation in a large number of schools in Ireland exhibits absolute disregard of the elementary consideration, and the consequence I find to be that in nearly all the boys' schools that I visited the instruction of infants was unsuitable and ineffective. They were frequently neglected altogether while the master taught the older scholars; nor can it be reasonably expected that a man should possess the patience

or sympathy with very young children which are natural to even unskilled women teachers." All this multiplication of schools was due to the fact that the grants in Ireland are allocated, not by capitation, but as salaries; hence (as in the case of the schools in Salford, Co. Dublin) it was, and is, the interest of the managers to multiply principal teachers. To remedy this want of financial responsibility on the part of the managers Mr. Dale recommended the institution of County Associations of managers of the same denomination.

11373. Have you worked that out yourself?—No; I know the proposal to be impossible. Mr. Dale suggested that the present grants might be handed over to these associations, and that they might be allowed to make their own arrangements and to conduct their schools on the most economical principles. Associations of this kind were common in England under the Voluntary Schools Act of 1877. The objection to this scheme is that the local associations would require a large staff of clerks, and the Board would require accountants to check the local accounts; also, there would be great difficulty for many years in preserving the rights to increments and promotion of the existing teachers. Ultimately a capitation grant would have to be adopted, but this is impossible so long as each school is treated as a separate entity. If you had these associations of Protestant and Catholic managers I have no doubt that many of our administrative difficulties would be eliminated, but a great increase of expenditure would be entailed.

11374. Would they raise a voluntary rate?—I don't know anything about that. You must not mention the word "rate," it is dangerous.

11375. But I mean would they provide moneys of their own?—We should be very glad if they did, but I do not know whether they would or not. If a fixed capitation grant were handed over to the associations it would not be their interest to multiply schools and teachers, but rather to cut down the salaries as much as possible. From our point of view, such a scheme would have the great merit of shifting the centre of gravity from the Central Department to the locality. On the other hand, to be successful it would require much energy and ability among the local Boards of Managers, who would have to be assisted by numerous staffs of clerks.

11376. Would it involve in the first instance Parliamentary action?—Yes.

11377. They would be handling an amount of Imperial money, and it would have to be done under the authority of Parliament?—Certainly it would.

11378. Mr. HENLY.—Have you not experienced that where capitation payments are made to an authority employing teachers; in some cases those teachers have not got a living wage?—That is exactly what I was saying. The local authorities would cut down the salaries in England. Where the grants are paid by capitation there is a tendency to get the teachers as cheaply as possible.

11379. Have you not had experience under your own system of teachers being employed in schools at less than a living wage?—Well, I suppose we have experience of that kind in the case of junior assistant mistresses. In the case of schools paid by capitation (Convent schools) we had to make a rule that the recognized lay teachers must get £40 or £44 a year. If capitation grants were universal there would have to be a rule fixing the minimum salaries.

11380. The CHAIRMAN.—Have you worked out the problem?—Yes, I have, but there are many difficulties in the way of introducing such a scheme. First of all, you would have to set up two offices in each county with staffs of clerks. The next difficulty would be the safeguarding of vested rights, inasmuch as the teachers receive salaries which vary according to the length of service, but not greatly according to the size of the school. For example, the teacher of one school of 70 might get £260 a year, while in another school of 70 might get £200. In my opinion, if Associations of County Managers were set up, the payments from the State should take the form of a capitation grant of, say, £5 a head of the average attendance of children. It would then be calculated how many Catholic children

there were, and the central authority would hand over £5 a head for every child in average attendance at the schools under Catholic management, and if that was done the principals of schools similar in size would in time be paid similar salaries; but for many years the rights of present teachers would have to be safeguarded. Then the teacher of a school of 70, now in receipt of £70 a year, would insist on his rights to rise, in time, to £200.

11381. And that problem would last for years?—Yes, for possibly 40 years. It is a difficult problem. Any alteration of the present unfortunate system of salaries is a most difficult job. It nearly broke our hearts in 1900-4 to change from the results system to the new system, and anybody who has been through that ordeal is not likely to welcome any new system of payment. It was a most awful job. We had 3,000 applications for special treatment, and every one of these cases involved enormous calculations.

11382. And then you have always to bear in mind that the Treasury will not make any change in the grant?—Yes.

11383. You have only a limited sum to deal with?—Yes.

11384. But released from the Rule of the Central Authority, do you not think that in the County Associations you might not have Donnybrook Fair repeated?—Personally, I would not mind that, as we should no longer have the Donnybrook Fair at headquarters.

11385. But as the Official Head of the National Board of Education I think you would be bound to meet it after all?—I agree with you that there would be tremendous difficulties at first.

11386. But you shunt the trouble and odium from His Majesty's Inspector on to the Inspector of the Local Authority?—I should be very glad to do so.

11387. Would education gain very much?—I do not think education ever gains much by serious administrative changes.

11388. And there is an assumption that three or four Protestant schools could get on in perfect harmony?—That is a risky assumption so far as the North of Ireland is concerned.

11389. I think they are just as likely to fight among one another?—But the multiplicity of sects does not affect three-fourths of Ireland; take, for instance, the County Cork.

11390. The BISHOP OF ROSA.—We have Methodists and Church people?—But the former are very few.

11391. The CHAIRMAN.—Now, will you continue?—I come next to the efficiency of Irish schools. In 1903, according to Mr. Dale the efficiency was decidedly inferior to that of similarly situated English schools. This he attributed (a) to the unfavourable conditions under which the teachers worked; (b) to the effect of the results' system, which still affected the methods of instruction; (c) to the faulty instruction of infants—before 1900 their instruction was confined to the elements of reading, writing and arithmetic—young children had to spell correctly two or more individual words which were written on the blackboard and repeated together; they were rarely encouraged to talk on any subject. In no respect have the Irish schools so much improved in recent years as in the instruction of infants, which has been revolutionized by the institution of organizers of kindergarten and junior assistant mistresses. Kindergarten methods are now universal.

11392. Now, about those junior assistant mistresses, it is alleged that their education is very imperfect?—Viewed absolutely, I am afraid the education of everybody is very imperfect; but I do consider the training of the junior assistant mistresses, as teachers of babies, to be unsatisfactory. They have to pass in a very extensive programme, including kindergarten methods and the training of young children; they are trained to treat the babies as human beings, and to encourage them to talk and to sing, and that kind of thing. Their work does not require much book learning.

11393. Your point is, that they know quite enough for their work?—In my opinion, the introduction of junior assistant mistresses is the greatest improvement we have made in education.

28th May, 1913.]

Mr. W. J. M. STAMMERS, M.A., Litt.D., LL.D., examined.

[Continued.]

11884. They are appointed in schools with a certain number of children?—Yes, 35, but they are kept till the attendance comes down to 30. They may also be employed in small mixed schools under a male teacher. They now cost £60,000 a year.

11895. And you had to wring that grant from the Treasury?—That is a grant of which we are extremely proud, because we got it in exchange for a grant of £10,000 a year which was stopped. I mean the grant for Irish. That was in Mr. Long's time. Immediately afterwards there was a change of Government, and the first thing done by Mr. Burrell was to restore the grant, in exchange for which we got the junior assistant mistresses. So we gained a clear £50,000 a year, and the restored grant for Irish in addition.

11896. No, about the methods of organisation?—The method of organisation universal in 1903 was what is called the draft system, which was continued from the days of Bell and Lancaster; but it led to great defects (defects that we are not yet rid of), that is, indistinct, monotonous reading, which was universal some years ago and has not yet been eliminated. I still find, even in the new schools providing seats for every child, the children grouped round the teacher. The drafts were generally entrusted to the tender mercies of older children, euphemistically called "unpaid modifiers." The draft system was destructive of discipline, as under it every room was a ballroom of discordant voices. That was one of the reasons why there was tremendous difficulty in teaching a school with a single teacher. In the case of a school under a single teacher, the teacher usually acted as a supervisor rather than a teacher, the school being divided up amongst the more promising children who did the teaching.

11897. Mr. COOPER.—Did you ever find in any school the teacher merely supervising?—Perhaps not merely supervising; he used to take a section of the children himself, and to exercise a personal supervision over the rest.

11898. Mr. HENLY.—I never saw it?—I saw many such schools ten years ago. Mr. Dale and I often found in schools of 50 three or four drafts taken by children.

11899. Were they not always grouped in large classes for particular lessons?—I never saw them grouped in those days. Grouping was not introduced widely until 1908. It was recommended in the programme of 1900, but it was adapted only to small schools of 50 or 60; but in those days a second teacher was not appointed until the average attendance reached 60. Such schools were often attended, for some months of the year, by 80 or 90 children, and I consider that an impossible job for any teacher. What was he to do? Possibly there was no better way than to give the younger children to another child of nine or ten. How could you group 80 children properly under one teacher?

11900. But the original number for an assistant in a National School was 50?—When was that?

11901. The change was made in the time when Mr. Louth was the Chief Inspector?—The original number for a second teacher was 70.

11902. No, it was raised from 50 to 70 by Mr. Louth?—I think you are right. At one time it was 70, and that would mean, in many parts of the country where the children do not attend regularly, 100 children, and, perhaps, more at some seasons. I came next to the methods of teaching. Down to 1930 the teaching aimed at mechanical accuracy; in reading no idea of a piece as a whole was ever conveyed, no questions on the general sense of a passage were not allowed.

11903. I doubt that?—Do you question that, Mr. Henly?

Mr. HENLY.—I do.

11904.5. The BISHOP or BROS.—The teacher would object?—That is what I mean. I always understood that the inspector was not allowed to ask a question on the general sense of a passage.

11906. Well, he might do it or he might not?—As my rule, failure to answer such questions did not disqualify a child for a pass mark in the subject. The normal drill was to go over a paragraph

again and again until every word in it was known by heart. A good description of the teaching of the reading in 1903 before 1908 is given in the following letter of the Archbishop of Dublin, 8th January, 1909.—"In my National School that I have chosen to drop into in country places reading was simply ballrooming. A child gives out word after word mechanically enough, but it is no more reading than the mere spelling of a word would be pronunciation. Under the results' system I suppose it would get a No. 2 Pass (quite as good from the money point of view as a No. 1 Pass). Dealing with the individual pupils, the Inspector could hardly refuse this pass. But where he has to answer the question, 'Is reading really taught in this school?' it will be a different matter." English composition was not practised until the fifth class; the usual exercises in writing English were long lists of difficult words, transcription and dictation; and composition was not even attempted. Composition, in oral form, is now practised even by infants. No subject has shown more development than this during the last ten years. Before 1900, Mental Arithmetic was rarely practised, as a course in Arithmetic could be given without it; cards were produced by teachers containing all the questions ever asked by inspectors, and the children were drilled in these throughout the year. In 1909 the Board furnished a teacher for preparing a complete set of the inspectors' cards and offering them for sale. The inspectors were not permitted to ask questions as to the method employed. According to Mr. Dale, the inferiority of the Irish schools was due to the "long continuance in a system under which examination in a narrow and rigid syllabus (called by Mr. Balfour 'an educational monocotyledon') has been made the sole end in education." It was necessary at first, as in 1873 the schools were very bad, but nothing is eternal in the world—not even the examination system; "its continuance far beyond the time when it had done its work has tended to create not real intelligence and interest, and to confine the efforts of the teachers within an unduly narrow channel." In 1903 the chief hindrance to reform was, according to Mr. Dale, the necessity of holding the annual examinations, which left little time for incidental visits. These have since been abolished, except in the case of unsatisfactory schools—see the circulars of 1903 and June, 1911. I came next to the programme of studies. No change is more frequently brought against the Irish system than that the programme is overcrowded. During 10 years' inspection I have rarely seen a case where a teacher was encouraged to take up more than his strength could bear. The programme imposed a maximum, which is attainable only in favourably situated schools. Most rural schools take up little beyond the "the 3 R's," except drawing, singing, and drill, and in girls schools, cookery, laundry and needlework. Some of these subjects are absolutely necessary in a practical world; others are beautiful as varying the monotony of the drill in the absolute sense of an elementary education. As Mr. Dale well put it: "no peccation in the theory of education can be considered more certain than that a limitation of the primary school course to such a narrow range of subjects as was usual in Ireland before the revised system defeats its own aim." The general requirements of Irish education were summed up as follows by Mr. Balfour in 1899:—"More teachers, all fully qualified, well paid and well pensioned; a raising of the school age; no half-time; better attendance; better buildings; provision for transference to higher education." So far as the Board is concerned, provision has been made for all these; that much has not been done is due to the apathy of the Executive, and the opposition of the Treasury, not to the negligence of the Board. I take this opportunity of briefly summarising the improvements in the system which the Board has introduced, or attempted to introduce, since 1905. (1) In 1900 there were only 31 evening schools; in 1908, 1,500. Since then there has been a decline, but this has been largely due to the fact that the inspectors who desired to supply the defects of their elementary education have been gradually provided for. (2) New plans for school-houses were drawn up by a government com-

militer which sat in 1902, but were at first suppressed and then delayed, through Treasury and Castle mismanagement, for six years. Even non-vested schools, which before 1902 were erected anyhow, have to satisfy our requirements. Poor localities, which previously were unable to improve their buildings, are now specially favoured, so that in four or five years no really unsatisfactory buildings will remain.

11407. That was a suggestion of Mr. Dale?—As a matter of fact, we made it previously in the report of the Committee I have just mentioned. Emergent attempts have been made to prevail on trustees and managers to keep vested schools in order: see the circular of May, 1908, quoted above. We proposed at one time to devote some of the Development Grant to this purpose. We have proposed to organise corporations of managers to provide for school-houses from common funds, but they have not taken it up. That is a very different proposal, of course, from Mr. Dale's, as it has nothing to do with salaries. There are not nearly the same difficulties in the way of its adoption. Formerly there was no way of dealing with impoverished parts of the country. Some districts are better off than others, but there was no common fund out of which weaker communities might have been assisted. We now build schools in four districts without any cost to the locality. (8) We have proposed to establish scholarships for children from primary schools to continue their education in suitable secondary schools. These were actually put on the estimates last year, but, as you know, they have been blocked by the County Councils.

11408. By secondary schools, you include technical institutes, such as Mr. Forth's in Belfast?—No; Mr. Birrell would not include these. We wanted to, but Mr. Birrell did not see eye to eye with us. As you remember, he restricted the scholarships to children attending intermediate schools.

11409. Mr. KAVANAGH.—Has that Birrell scheme been definitely dropped?—I think so. (4) We have procured a grant to provide half the cost of the heating and cleaning of schools.

11410. The CHAIRMAN.—What does the grant amount to?—£23,000, the half of £46,000 a year.

11411. How is it given to the school?—It is a grant largely based on the average attendance. We have fixed a sum for each school according to its size. For instance, if a school under 30 expends £8 10s., it will receive back £1 15s.

11412. The BARNER or ROSS.—The school has to send in its account and show that it has spent so much?—Yes.

11413. And they can get back a certain amount, provided they can show that they spent twice as much?—Yes.

11414. Mr. NEWELL.—The grant we got for a school in Rathmahon last year with a junior assistant mistress was 35s. 7d.—That would represent an expenditure of £8 10s.

11415. The CHAIRMAN.—Now, as to improvement in the teachers' salaries?—(5) We have improved the salaries and positions of teachers by means of a greater security of incomes. Then there is uniformity of payments quarterly (this was the original policy which was spoiled by the introduction of a capitation grant, the Birrell Grant, and extra fees). Next, there are higher average salaries; the present average salaries are very much higher than in 1900.

11416. Can you have made out for us the rise in salaries of the various grades in the last 15 years?—Yes.

11417. And will you do that?—Yes. You can see the grants have increased by half a million. You mean the average salaries of principal teachers and assistants.

11418. Yes; we want a comparison?—We can furnish you with that very easily, because the figures are in the annual report. I think the average salaries for principal teachers have increased about £19 a year, but I can give you the exact figures.

11419. You know that instead of quarterly payments there is a great demand for monthly payments?—Yes.

11420. And the great objection is the enormous increase in clerical work?—Yes, it involves £5,000 a year.

11421. Additional?—Yes.

11422. For clerks?—Yes.

11423. The BARNER or ROSS.—In the first instance there would be an increase in the estimates, because you have to pay for three months of another year?—They do not like the prospect of putting on an additional £200,000. Other advantages of the new system are the higher average salaries; there are also triennial increments; immensely increased salaries in small schools (the salaries in small schools have been more than doubled), then there is the freedom from anxiety as to the answering of individual pupils. In the 25 years before 1908 the salaries of teachers had been doubled; these were further increased in 1908 by the awarding of 4,000 increments, which cost £20,000, and 750 promotions, which cost £6,000, and by similar sums in 1900, 1906, 1912. A further addition of between £7 and £10 was made in 1908 by the "Birrell Grant," which amounts to £114,000 annually. (6) We have reduced the average for an assistant from 60 to 50; we have provided junior assistant mistresses for an average attendance of 25. We have introduced the so-called principle of the "swing," whereby assistants are retained until there has been a fall of more than 10 units in the average attendance for at least two quarters. (7) We have re-cast the managerial system, and instituted a new class of pupil-teachers. We have raised the age for both and increased their salaries. We have reformed the programme for monitors and improved their practical training by means of criticism lessons, which they have to give in the presence of the staff. (8) We have proposed a scheme of higher grade schools. The principle of these was approved by the Treasury 10 years ago, but in spite of repeated appeals nothing has been done.

11424. Have you calculated what those schools would cost?—A little under £5,000 at first, but afterwards possibly £25,000 a year.

11425. You would need a large grant in the first year?—I think not. The institution of such schools as separate departments would not be expensive, at least in respect of building grants, as a number of the intermediate schools, if the conditions were satisfactory, would prefer to separate themselves from the Intermediate Board, in order to do the higher grade work, which would be much more suited to their needs. Nobody knows better than you do that under the Intermediate Board we are turning out multitudes of clerks and budding Bachelors of Arts, with no productive occupations in prospect. (9) We have appointed six organisers of Irish, fourteen organisers of Domestic Economy, and six organisers of Kindergarten. (10) We have improved the curriculum in the following respects:—In English, under the results' system, reading was taught to children, grouped round the teacher, and in small schools, by "unpaid monitors," viz., senior children, according to the Bell and Lancaster system. The reading of a book at sight was not required until 6th class. The matter of the reading-lessons was confined to a few pages in the 2nd year. Sight-reading is now expected from 2nd standard. Three "readers" are obligatory. Works of literary and historical interest are presented. Then as to composition, under the results' system this subject was not required until 5th class. Oral composition is now prescribed for infants; and inspectors are directed to consider composition the most important subject of the programme. Under the results' system history was practically unknown. It is now a distinct subject in the programme, and is taught in 8,093 schools. Under the results' system drawing was rarely taught, and only on mechanical lines. Object drawing is now almost the rule, and drawing of some kind is taught in 8,373 schools. Drill was introduced in 1900, and is now almost universal. The Swedish system has been tried in the last three years. There is collective teaching of needlework; Saturday conferences have been attended by 4,500 teachers; there has been an increase of 600 in schools teaching this subject. There are teachers' classes for singing, attended by 6,400 teachers; an increase of 4,300 in the number of schools taking

singing; an increase in the number of King's scholars taking singing from 260 to 3,600. Singing has now become practically universal.

11425. The CHAIRMAN.—There is a great difficulty about singing?—There is no doubt that some of the singing is exorbitant, but it is also true that there is a great deal of singing heard now in country villages which were perfectly silent before. We have done much to make Ireland a musical country. Then, cookery has increased. The number of schools taking this subject increased from 268 to 727 in 1904, and now to about 2,700, and in a year or so laundry will be taught in most girls' schools, because they must take up laundry after two years of cookery. Hygiene and temperance lessons have been introduced, and are now universal. Domestic economy, as a separate subject, was introduced a few years ago. In manual instruction our advance has not been very great, but it is universal now in the lower classes, if you count paper-folding and stick-labeling, which is really an extension of kindergarten occupations.

11427. I understood that the higher standards are not doing any manual work?—They are not, and in most cases they never can. If I had known more about the schools in 1900 I should have seen the impossibility of doing much in that line. The schools in Ireland are not large enough to allow of much woodwork being done in them. It would be too expensive to rig up a carpenter's shop, or even a table, and to supply tools. The teachers, too, have to teach many other subjects; they cannot be expected to teach everything.

11428. You would want skilled men?—In a small school it is impossible to do much beyond the elements. Woodwork is all very well, but I do not consider it a sine qua non. I do not think the road to Heaven is paved with woodwork; it is not "the key to all the mythologies." Woodwork is a subject in which boys take a great interest, but I think it ought to be taught in the technical schools. Cookery is occasionally taught to our children in technical schools; and there is no reason why they should not be drafted into such schools for woodwork also.

11429. That was part of your plan for higher grade schools?—Yes, certainly, but we could not get the Treasury to accept our proposals.

11430. Mr. HESTER.—But in the majority of schools would not the pupils be too young for woodwork?—Certainly; most of the children in Irish primary schools, as you know, do not go beyond the Fourth Standard, and what is the good of teaching them woodwork?—Of course, in the country schools they ought to be taught horticulture, and we are trying to do that.

11431. The BISHOP OF ROSK.—Some of your National School children are taught woodwork without any expense at all. Father O'Hara does it in his part of the country, and the County Inspector teaches in the National Schools. He does not teach in the National School itself, but the children are drafted out of the National School at 2 o'clock in the day?—We allow that.

11432. And they are taught for an hour and a half twice a week. They get on very well, and the only difficulty is that some of the teachers of the National Schools rather dislike the fact of the children being taken away from them for a couple of hours?—That is so.

11433. But the managers do not listen to that, although some of the managers, no doubt, are inclined to listen to it. Of course, the Inspector is paid by the County Committee?—The proposal of the Manual Instruction Commission was that woodwork should be taught by the ordinary teacher in the majority of the schools, but I think that is quite impracticable. Not to return to my subject. Elementary Science is very successful in about 1,600 schools; it has led to training in science and accuracy in all schools; the Science note-books are very educational, and are well kept. Nature lessons are almost universal, and are very valuable in rural districts, where a satisfactory programme in practical subjects is provided. These should lead up to a detailed instruction, both theoretical and practical,

in school-gardening. Science is taught in about 2,300 schools, most of which are doing fairly good work. I have examined hundreds of the note-books, which show that science is an excellent training, at any rate, in cosmology.

11434. Mr. HESTER.—You are discouraging it in the Training Colleges?—We think that the copying out of notes taken in the laboratory takes too much time. It is not that we disapprove of careful notes, but the pupils in the Training Colleges are worked a great deal too hard, and are anxious to lighten their labours.

11435. Is it that they have too many subjects?—I think so. I must say that I prefer specialisation in subjects that are to a man's taste. This was the old idea of education; but now everybody is expected to know a little about everything.

11436. The CHAIRMAN.—Now, as to school gardening?—School gardening is likely to be successful as a fee is not provided, for which more had certificated teachers will be eligible. The Department provides for their training in summer courses.

11437. Mr. HESTER.—How many school gardens are there?—This is only the first year, so that they are not numerous, not more than about 100. They are mostly concentrated in two or three counties.

11438. There were school gardens previous to 1907?—Yes, there were about 116 of them.

11439. The CHAIRMAN.—Would they grow both flowers and vegetables?—Yes; there were farms also, which were abolished in 1900, in accordance with the recommendation of the Manual Instruction Commission. School gardens were not recommended, but it was pointed out that the teaching of horticulture was impracticable, as it was mostly done out of Mr. Curran's back. I have been told that, under the results system, the best marks in horticulture were got in Sandy Row. If best knowledge had been combined with practical teaching in the gardens I do not suppose anybody would have said anything against it, but the learning of such a subject out of a book has no value if not supplemented by practical teaching.

11440. Have you anything to say about Irish?—Irish was taught in 1900 in only 130 schools, and it is now taught in 2,576.

11441. How do you inspect Irish?—We have inspectors who know Irish.

11442. What is the proportion of the entire number?—About one-third of the staff now know Irish.

11443. So that it must be a condition for a certain number of appointments? Every alternate appointment, so that in time at least half the staff (Catholic and Protestant) will know Irish. We have introduced bilingualism into 200 schools. Eleven colleges for the cultivation of Irish studies among teachers receive grants from the Board; 150 prizes are given to trained teachers who, after leaving the Training Colleges, teach Irish successfully. Prizes are also given for the teaching of Irish in Evening schools. A knowledge of Irish is required from teachers appointed to schools in Irish-speaking districts. (11) We have introduced two new standards (7th and 8th) which are allowed to take up Intermediate courses, as we have not been allowed to establish higher grade departments.

11444. What proportion of the children are in those standards now?—You will get that in the Annual Report; there are something like 211,000, I think.

11445. The 8th would not be much above the old 6th?—Far above, I fancy, as two languages must be taught in it, if it takes up the Intermediate programme.

11446. For pupil teachers?—Certainly. The pupil teachers must have taken courses in the Intermediate; that is the qualification. And monitors are appointed if they get passes in the Intermediate.

11447. And what would be the initial salary of the pupil teachers?—In the first year it is £18; in the third year £20.

11448. Mr. HESTER.—But then you made a regulation that Intermediate pupils are to get a sort of preference in entering the Training Colleges?—Yes, certainly. Do you act on that in Kildare Street.

11449. We do. Now, have you any knowledge that you have turned out more successful teachers?—No; the teachers tell me generally that they would prefer pupils who have been monitors.

11450. The CHAIRMAN.—I suppose there is hardly time to judge of the effect of it yet?—No, it is a new thing.

11451. Mr. HENRY.—We are getting in some of those that never have been in a National School, and the task of preparing them for the Inspector is very heavy?—Personally, I would prefer that candidate teachers should have been monitors in a good school. I think that in England the same preference is universal. They say that many of the teachers they get now from the Training College, who have had a University education, have never been in a National school till they go there to teach.

11452. The CHAIRMAN.—About the training of inspectors, it has been urged again and again that every inspector should have spent some time teaching in a National School, every candidate inspector. What do you think of that?—A regulation of that kind would exclude many eligible candidates.

11453. Some, of course, would be National School teachers, others would be from Universities; but before you appoint your University men he should have spent some time in getting experience of a National School. But that means nothing more than that he should be trained?—If he is trained he would have to teach in a National School. I think it would be rather a good thing if we trained every inspector.

11454. Mr. HANNAH.—When a man becomes a candidate for the position of inspector now in England he is required to have some practical knowledge of education, and, if possible, of elementary as well as secondary education, and, therefore, as a rule, he takes a situation as assistant master in some elementary school, and works as assistant master for from four to six months?—That is very interesting. Would a graduate of Cambridge or Oxford, who wanted to become a junior inspector in England, have to submit to that?

11455. Yes, a great many of them have done so, and it has, I believe, enhanced their chances of getting appointments, and in some cases they have done so after an appointment has been previously promised?—Well, you may take it from me that I thoroughly approve of that suggestion if we could get the managers in Ireland to take these people in.

11456. That would be a difficulty?—We could not insist on it, as we do not appoint the teachers. Of course, we could make use of the Model Schools.

11457. There is practically no difficulty in England. A man offers himself as supernumerary in a London County Council School, and he can generally make sufficient interest to be taken in?—That is very interesting.

11458. Mr. HENRY.—I think there would be no difficulty here?—We could train them in the Model Schools, where we can appoint any staff we like.

11459. Mr. HANNAH.—The idea is that he should gain his experience after he has got his appointment?—That would be much easier. (13) We have facilitated the amalgamation of small schools by giving privileges to the principals of the schools which are discontinued, and by giving the whole of the building grant when a central school is required. (14) We have reduced the number of small and unnecessary schools, which until 1904 had been increasing at the rate of 40 or 50 per centum. The annual reduction since 1904 has amounted to 80 or 70, largely by means of Rules 196-7. In 1904, 5,260 schools had only one teacher; in 1913, only about 2,500. That is, perhaps, the greatest improvement we have made. We have reduced the number of one-teacher schools by 8,000. (15) We have improved the training of infants by means of 12th improved, the training of infants by means of 12th improved by the introduction of junior assistant mistresses who are qualified in Kindergarten; and by the institution of organizers of Kindergarten. Kindergarten methods are now adopted in every school where infants are enrolled. (16) We have drawn up office rules, with a view to securing the rapid promotion of teachers in large and efficient schools. The effect of

these has, unfortunately, been arrested by the Treasury as regards men in the higher grades. We give special promotion very largely; thus it is possible for a woman to get into the second grade after three years' service, instead of nine; and into the first of first grade in twelve years.

11460. Now?—Yes; but, as I have said, this is no longer open to men, since there is a block in the promotion; we cannot now give promotion to anybody over the heads of men who ought to have got it according to normal conditions. Over a hundred men are still waiting for promotion.

11461. The CHAIRMAN.—What is the shortest time in which a man will reach the first division of first?—Without special promotion, twelve years in the third grade, and nine in the second, and six in second of first grade.

11462. Mr. HENRY.—It is 36 years altogether?—Yes, 36 to make the maximum of first of first grade.

11463. The CHAIRMAN.—36 years till he gets to the top?—Yes.

11464. Mr. HENRY.—And then only if there is a vacancy when he reaches the time for getting promotion?—Quite so; but the period can be reduced to 27 years, if the teacher gets special promotion in the third or second grade.

11465. The CHAIRMAN.—Did you make a proposal to the Treasury?—Our proposal to the Treasury was that the number of places in first of first and second of first grade should be specially increased, and the grid pro quo we offered was that the number in the second grade should be diminished. By means of this compensation the increase in expenditure for the first couple of years was not to be more than £2,000 a year or so. Our Accountant went into the figures and said the ultimate increase would be £18,000, and I think that frightened the Treasury. (17) We have proposed bonuses for teachers in large and important schools, bonuses costing £11,000 a year. I proposed that four years ago. I made it possible for a teacher of a large school to get £50 a year extra as a sort of bonus, because his school was large. One of the great objections to the present system is that a young man goes into a big school, in which his predecessor may have been earning over £200 a year, and he may have only £70. Now, if a man lives in a town where living is expensive, he finds it almost impossible to live on £70 a year; we were excessive, therefore, that men in those big schools should get a bonus. It would be a good thing to encourage men in big schools. The salary that is sufficient in a small rural school is not sufficient in a big town school.

11466. What would be the highest salary of a man in a town school at present?—Without bonus about £260 a year.

11467. A teacher in Belfast told me that he had the highest salary in Ireland?—He must have got that under the old system. There are very few such old teachers remaining. I once met in Belfast a man who had over £300 a year; but he would not get as much as that now.

11468. You mention a course of training?—Yes. (18) We require two years' training in the case of the principals of all schools and in the case of all male assistants. We have increased since 1905 the proportion of trained teachers by 20 per cent. (19) We have provided for a third year's course of training for teachers who propose to attend lectures in University Colleges. We have established a higher certificate, to be awarded to such teachers, as also to others, who being unable to attend College lectures, successfully pass an approved examination in subjects of a professional or general character.

11469. With regard to inspectors, a question has been asked here more than once why inspectors have not a course of lectures on method before they are finally confirmed in their office?—They have to pass an examination in method.

11470. We did not know that?—After six months they have to pass an examination in method.

11471. But they are not put under any regular training?—They are put under practical training; they have to go about with inspectors for a fortnight each.

11472. Mr. HEALEY.—We were given to understand that the examination is a very trifling matter that they have to pass?—After six months?

11473. Yes?—Well, if I am convinced of that, I will make it easier. Our men are not recognised as inspectors till they get a certificate that their probation is satisfactory.

11474. Mr. CONWAY.—Did I understand you to say that male assistants should be trained, but that it was not compulsory on female assistants. Why is that?—The reason is that we turn out more male teachers than are required, and we have not a sufficient amount of trained women to fill the vacancies. There is a shortage of trained women. Of course, we should like to make training compulsory in both cases. (20) We have procured fees for school gardens. (21) Splendid new training colleges have been opened, under our auspices, at Caryfort, Limerick, Belfast, and Glasnevin. We have procured grants from the Treasury to defray the cost of these buildings.

11475-6. The CHAIRMAN.—How many female candidate teachers would be turned out each year by Caryfort or St. Mary's Training College?—There are 100 students in Caryfort. In Limerick and Belfast there are 100, and then there are those in Kilbane Place.

Mr. HEALEY.—We have provision for 50 men, but we generally have less.

11477. The HONOR. MR. BOSS.—And then in Marlborough Street?—In Marlborough Street we have 154 women.

11478. Mr. CONWAY.—And men?—136 is the normal number in Marlborough Street; in Kildare Place, I suppose 60; in De la Salle, Waterford, 200, and, I think, there are 168 at Drumcondra.

11479. The number of females turned out appears to be greater than the number of men?—Much greater; there is a much larger number of women, but there is also a much larger number of places for women. To return to my subject. Much has been said teaching these reforms in the Annual Reports since 1902, and in my occasional addresses. On this occasion it may be more proper to quote an independent witness, Rev. B. M. Gwynn, F.F.C.D., in his admirable article, "Education and Citizenship" (*Ireland's Hope, A Call to Service*, p. 191), "and now, before I close, a word of hope: do not solve your consciences by casting the blame upon any Irish Board or even English Treasury. Especially the Board of National Education needs and deserves our support." Since 1900 it has wrought a veritable revolution, and had it the power as it has the will, to carry out its policy, many of the puzzles I have set before you would have been solved. Besides the reforms I have already mentioned, it has abolished the system of individual examination and payment by results. The percentage of attendance has increased in 12 years from 62 to 73. It has fought for bursaries and continuation schools. By introducing a wider range of subjects it has sought to encourage teachers to adapt their schools to local needs. For example, it has secured grants for the gardens attached to rural schools, where most of the pupils are likely to follow the pursuits of agriculture. I wish my space permitted me to enlarge upon this reform, and the consequences it may bring; why should not an Irish cottage be as beautiful as an English one? It has introduced the teaching of the science of health and cleanliness, and it has largely reformed the actual practice of the school itself in these matters. For the infants between 3 and 5 who, although not compelled to come, are brought to our schools in great numbers, it has substituted kindergarten methods for the old mechanical style of teaching everywhere prevalent in 1902, which was totally unsuited to children of tender age, and it has introduced measures to do the teaching. It has raised the average State-derived income of principal teachers, men and women, from £82 and £45 in 1877 to £112 and £90 in 1910, with corresponding increases in the payments of assistant teachers. It has secured the expert training of more than half (really 68.5 per cent.) our teachers, a better percentage than England can show." I myself said at Belfast in 1911: "The scheme of reform which we devised in 1900, and which is still a *terro*, was as perfect in its conception as that which Sir John Strickland has been allowed to construct in Scotland." For another testimony I may refer to

Mr. Graham Balfour (*Administrative Systems*, 2nd ed., p. xcv.): "In the last four years much has been changed. The curriculum of the National schools has been brought up to date. . . . If a sound educational system could be made by three strokes of the pen, this would be the time for unbridled congratulations and rejoicings. But to those who realise that the root of education, if it is to be of any avail, must be much deeper down, in the very heart of the people, it is plain that only a small beginning has been made. All has apparently been done for the immediate present that can be done from above." "The new system seems well devised, but the difficulty lies in seeing that it shall be adequately carried out by teachers and inspectors." The warring note of the last words is very significant, in view of the attitude of the chief inspectors, especially during the early critical years after 1860.

11480. The CHAIRMAN.—Now, with regard to your visits to schools?—My visits to schools are quite informal, and no special action has ever been taken against a teacher on my own private judgment of his capacity. These visits, originally undertaken at the suggestion of Lord MacDonnell, began during the governmental inquiry held by Mr. Dale in April-June, 1890, and have been continued annually ever since. During this time, I have travelled 30,000 miles and visited about 2,800 schools in Ireland, Scotland, England, and Wales. For some years I used a bicycle, or horse and car; in 1907 the Treasury permitted the use of a motor car, to the limit of £200 per annum, which is very satisfactory. The condition was that I should show that it was not more expensive than a horse and car, and consequently I had to register my movements over the country. It involved my travelling 100 miles a day to make it as cheap as a horse and car, and for that reason I could spend only a comparatively short time in each school. Lately I have not been asked for returns of my movements, so that I do not now travel so much in the day, and I am able to spend a much longer time in each school, as I do not find it necessary to visit so many in the day. I am usually accompanied by a chief or senior inspector, or one of the secretaries. The aim of these visits is as follows:—First, to gain a personal knowledge of the schools and the teachers, with, of which, in my opinion, sound and sympathetic administration is impossible. This was all the more obligatory on me, in consequence of the absolute inexperience of the chief inspectors as advisers of the Board. Second, to ascertain by personal investigation the grievances and difficulties of the teachers; third, to ascertain whether the policy of the Board is being faithfully carried out by the staff, and to study on the spot in what directions advance may be made; fourth, to compare the standard of education in the various parts of the country, and to take such measures as from time to time seem desirable to secure uniformity of marking in the standards; fifth, to secure the rapid adoption of certain subjects which the Board may be anxious to encourage. Thus, my visits have been instrumental in introducing, during the last five years, cookery and laundry into 2,500 schools. At present I am encouraging horticulture. I have always taken great trouble to improve the proficiency in certain subjects in which the Irish standard was very low, such as reading, composition, mental arithmetic, and drawing; sixth, to remedy the most flagrant defects in Irish schools, such as dirty out-offices and school-rooms, bad school-houses, untidy and unsightly school grounds; the improvement in the appearance of the schools is largely due to my efforts; seventh, above all to cultivate, by means of personal example, a kindly feeling between the administration and the teachers. I have been careful to note down, for promotion to inspectorships, etc., the names of the best teachers. I have carefully retained, beyond the age for compulsory retirement, teachers whose work I thought highly of. The aim of my visits was clearly explained in an official letter to the Treasury of 28th November, 1909:—"The use of a motor car is the first satisfactory method by which the Commissioners have been enabled to bring themselves personally in touch with the schools and teachers. This is particularly desirable in Ireland, where the increases in salary granted to teachers and their promotions, or, on the other hand, their depressions in grade and dismissal for unsatisfactory conduct, have in the main to be de-

terminated by the Commissioners and not by the managers of the schools. Supervision of the standards adopted by the inspectors in the course of their visits to the schools and in the award of the mark as to the grade of proficiency in each standard is also more perfectly secured, and it is of the utmost importance that the superior authorities be in the best position to appreciate the necessarily varying standards which individual inspectors may be prone habitually to adopt. The visitations of schools by the Commissioners themselves have now been found by experience to be productive of most valuable effects. The intelligent interest of the teachers in their educational work has been stimulated, and it is now desirable to extend the usefulness of this process by improving the efficiency of the means. "I believe the committee has heard some evidence that my visits have been instrumental in securing a large measure of uniformity in the marking of the schools, and the chief inspectors wrote, in their report on the petition of the Belfast teachers, that they have had a tendency to induce the inspector to exercise greater discrimination in their awards. Now, I have never regarded the securing of uniformity as one of my duties, nor has it been my desire to induce the inspectors to be severe in their judgment of the teachers' merits, but rather to concentrate their attention on such aspects of the school as had hitherto, in my opinion, been to some extent neglected. The maintenance of uniformity is one of the most serious responsibilities of the chief inspectors, which I regret to say, has been largely disregarded by them from 1860 almost to the present time. But as neither Mr. Downing nor Mr. Pomeroy, who indeed admits the fact, took any serious steps that I could discover to carry out their instructions in this respect (see "Duties of chief inspectors." 1. Each chief inspector "is immediately responsible for the due performance of all work connected with the inspection and examination of National schools,") and as it was obvious to me that they were trying to make the new system break down, and as it was impossible to allow the senior inspectors, who were directly responsible for the marking in their circuits, to remain without guidance, I thought it desirable to keep notes on the merits and defects of all the schools I visited, and occasionally I have had conversations with the chief inspectors on the subject of the marking in certain circuits if it seemed to me open to criticism. Thus in 1906 the standard in a few schools in Co. Down seemed to me, and also to Mr. Hynes, who accompanied me, unduly low; in 1907, I impressed on Mr. Farver, who was travelling with me, the want of uniformity in some portions of Co. Kerry and Clare; in 1913 I drew the attention of Mr. McNeill to the extraordinary number of "very goods" in the Limerick circuit. Mr. Farver seems to imply that he did not consider it his duty to see that uniformity was maintained. This is inconsistent with his letter to me of 6th August, 1909, in which he says: "I conferred with Mr. McNeill and Mr. O'Sullivan about the schools and the letter's low standard." I gather from my notes that, on a few occasions—not more than 8 or 10—I referred for a re-inspection to a chief inspector the marking on individual schools as being too high or too low. In most of these cases the chief inspectors agreed with the subordinate inspector's mark; even when he disagreed no change was made in the mark. While my aim has been to secure absolute uniformity, so far as it was possible, between the successive inspectors in a circuit, I have never aimed at more than comparative uniformity between the marking in different circuits. In the latter absolute uniformity is unattainable, and possibly not desirable. As I said to the deputation of the Belfast teachers (Report p. 20): "There is nothing more difficult than to secure absolute uniformity in anything, and inspection is not an exception. Indeed, it is doubtful whether absolute uniformity would be desirable. Under the old results' system the charge was that the teaching became mechanical on account of the very fact that such vigorous efforts were made to introduce uniformity. Different inspectors will, and must, vary in their ways of looking at things." The standard of education is not identical in the different parts of Ireland, and any attempt to equalise the standard of marking would cause immense friction, as the incre-

ments and promotions would largely flow to a few parts, such as Kerry, West Cork, Clare and Antrim. Mr. Fitzgerald, senior inspector, now in charge of West Cork, testifies that "fair" in West Cork is equivalent to "good" in Tipperary (before 1910). The social condition of the children, the efficiency of the teachers, vary so much that inspectors inevitably adapt their standards to the standard of the district, and they cannot be blamed for doing so; otherwise, very great dissatisfaction ensues, as in the recent cases of Tipperary, where an inspector, who had served among highly efficient teachers, imposed the standard to which he was accustomed upon teachers who were used to less searching requirements.

11481. The CHAIRMAN.—Where was Mr. Welpy before he went to that district?—In Co. Antrim.

11482. Mr. COFFEY.—How long was Mr. Fitzgerald in that Circuit circuit when he made that report that you quoted from?—I think he went there about the same time as Mr. Welpy; he went there at the end of 1910, I think. Mr. Fitzgerald was in North Kerry before he went to Clonmel.

11483. Mr. HYNES.—He had only six months in the circuit?—I think so.

11484. Mr. COFFEY.—He was not more than six months in the circuit, or so long, when he made that report, and after three months' interval the Clonmel circuit was taken by Mr. Little?—I think Mr. Little and Mr. Fitzgerald were employed there two years.

11485. The CHAIRMAN.—Mr. Welpy took charge of the circuit in July, 1906?—I did not think it was so long ago as that. I have recently gone through my notes with a view to ascertain what kind of official action has been taken on my visits. It has invariably been of the following kind: the inspector in charge has been asked to furnish a report with regard to the possible remedying of defective matters which came under my notice if no official action had already been taken, or if the matter was such as could be dealt with in the office; for example, questions relating to increments and promotions, etc., to have the case expedited in the office as much as possible. The notes are generally of the following type:—Dunross N.S.—the teacher wants promotion to 1st grade; Carrigrohane N.S.—do.; Rathcoole N.S.—"good" in 1906; no increment yet awarded; Cok N.S.—ask the inspector whether he considered its position when he gave "fair" to this school; Carrigrohane N.S.—the teacher has lost promotion through getting only "good" last time; ask the inspector how this was; Shanrum N.S.—the teacher wants promotion; this is a good school; Carrigrohane N.S.—both schools marked "fair," but girls' deserves "good"; Ballymoghler N.S.—the girls' school seems undermarked; Glanmire Girls' N.S.—"fair" by Cole after "very good" from Lyngan; inquire the reason of such a decline; Carrigrohane N.S.—lost "good" spoils chance of promotion.

Convent N.S.—"excellent" seems an overmark. The most common defects noted are structural; or the absence from the programme of certain subjects such as cookery. From a careful revision of the marking of the schools I have visited during the last ten years I can confidently make two assertions: (1) that the standard of the inspectors has been, and still continues to be, very lenient, and (2) that, in respect of uniformity, it is much more satisfactory than is generally represented. As to (1), the marks of real importance to the teachers in the great majority of the schools are "good," on which promotions to 2nd grade and increments depend, and "middling" and "bad" which lead to dismissal. In my opinion, the most noticeable feature has been the enormous percentage of the Irish schools visited by me which have been marked at least "good"; thus, in the City of Cork (1904), 85 per cent.; in Waterford, Cork (1909), 84 per cent.; about Kilkenny (1909), 90 per cent.; in Leitrim (1910), 85 per cent.; in Kerry (1913), 80 per cent.; in Cork (1913), 95 per cent. were at least "good." These marks have steadily increased during the last six years in some districts I have visited by at least 30 per cent. No doubt, there are circuits where the marking is much lower: thus in Down and Donegal (1909), 58 per cent.; in Co. Dublin, 65 per cent.; in Galway, Mayo (1908), 58 per cent.; in Sligo (1910), 58 per cent. are "good," but it is well known that the



28th May, 1913.]

Mr. W. J. M. SPARKS, M.A., LL.D., LL.D., examined.

[Continued.]

standard of education is very low in these districts. In the Clonmel circuit, during 1908-9, 81.7 per cent. of the schools reached "good"; this was reduced to 61.9 per cent. in 1909-10, and rose to 64.2 per cent. in 1912. There is no doubt that the mark in 1908-9 was much too high. I visited 70 schools in this circuit in 1911, and I am convinced that the standard of education in Co. Tipperary was, at that time, rather below than above the standard of the rest of Ireland, in which 69.2 per cent. of the schools ranked as "good." But, if I may be asked, whether the standard in 1908-9 was high or low, does not the decline in 1909-10 show that there was no proper uniformity of marking between the successive senior inspectors? This is true, but the blame rests not so much with the senior inspectors, Messrs. Brown and Welfly, as with the chief inspector, Mr. Purser, who was responsible for the proper inspection of the schools, and was informed by Mr. Welfly that he was reducing the marks, and was asked to inspect some of the schools himself. This statement should be remembered in connexion with the assurance of Mr. Purser that he had no knowledge of the marking being reduced. If Mr. Brown's standard was too low, Mr. Purser should have ascertained the fact and rectified it. If Mr. Welfly's standard was too high, he should have noted the fact, and taken measures, as he did not do, to convince Mr. Welfly of the fact, at the annual conference with the inspectors or in some other way.

11486. In the examination of Mr. Wyse, it seemed to some of us that in the office of the examiners there might be an arrangement made to call the attention of the higher authorities to any great variation of standard?—I think that would be a very good thing.

11487. I asked that question myself?—Yes, it would be a very good thing, at any rate for my information.

11488. If that arrangement had existed, Mr. Purser's attention would have been called to that state of affairs?—Mr. Purser ought not to have required that. I have been shown a part of Mr. Dilworth's evidence on that point, and I think it is such as he ought not to have given; he really ought not to have answered a question outside his own province. He was asked whether provision had been made for the maintenance of uniformity, and he said "No." Now, I distinctly disagree with that. Ample provision was made. The chief inspector had abundant means of knowing the marking through his conferences and from the circuit register, where every mark given to the schools is put down. He could have inspected these at any time. The chief inspectors have only to look at the Circuit Register in any district to see whether the marks are falling or rising.

11489. Then your point is that this raising of the standard in Clonmel should have come under the notice of the chief inspector in a very short time?—Yes, decidedly. And Mr. Welfly drew his attention to it, indeed Mr. Purser admits that he knew that there was likely to be a fall in the marking on account of his knowledge of Mr. Brown and Mr. Welfly. Besides, there is the register containing every mark, which was open to his inspection.

11490. Mr. Cowser.—Where is that kept?—The senior inspector has it.

11491. In his private house?—Yes, or in the Model School if he has one under him.

11492. He has no office?—No, except in a Model School. The senior inspector has a room in the Model School. But, in addition to that, all the reports are sent in to the chief inspector's room after final action has been taken.

11493. Mr. Purser said he asked that the reports of the senior inspectors should be submitted to the chief and that that was refused?—The reports have been in the chief inspector's room for many years. Mr. Purser himself asked for them and got them.

11494. The CHAIRMAN.—They are sent to him regularly?—They are sent into the chief inspector's room when action has been taken on them. His denying this is amazing; but he has made many extraordinary statements on similar matters, indeed I actually led to take notice of the way he hinted these reports. He used to examine the reports and to make notes, as in the old days when he was chief of inspection. I told him that our observations he had to make on the reports should not be made on the file, but com-

municated privately to me, because if action had been taken by the Board it would never do for the chief inspector to write anything implying he disagreed with the action taken by the Board, when it was completed. The chief inspector asked in 1905 that the reports should be sent to them, in order that they might have a conspectus of the whole country. I was glad to accede to their request.

11495. Mr. HARRISON.—Would a whole batch of reports go, or only some?—The whole lot.

11496. But could any man really go through them?—Of course, they would not attempt to do so. If I had the job myself, I would look merely at specimens. They might take up a different circuit every quarter, and they might go through that thoroughly. They should also be on the watch if there was a change of inspectors. Mr. Purser, for example, was known, as is admitted, that Mr. Welfly was known in his work, and anxious to secure a general standard. Hence he should have said to himself: "I must warn Mr. Welfly to be cautious, as he is more exacting than his predecessor, and a sudden change of standard is undesirable." Such a course was particularly incumbent in this case as the new master was a senior inspector who is supposed to set the standard of marking in his circuit.

11497. Mr. HARRISON.—In this case Mr. Welfly was senior inspector?—Yes.

11498. Mr. HENNA.—You referred to the action taken by the Board. Now, what are we to understand exactly by the Board?—All action is taken by the Board. The Board is not in itself responsible for everything.

11499. But what does the "The Board" exactly mean there?—It depends on the class of business; for instance, in the case of reports, if there is anything important to take action on, "The Board" may mean the Secretaries or myself or the whole Board.

11500. The CHAIRMAN.—Just as in the case of the Lords of the Treasury?—Yes; there is delegation in every department.

11501. Mr. HENNA.—We have got it in evidence from Mr. Purser that there are some matters in the way of reports that he deals with himself finally?—I entirely disagree with that.

11502. The CHAIRMAN.—He certainly said that he sends out reprimands himself?—I entirely disagree. That is a most ridiculous statement for a man in his position to make. No doubt, he might write an important notice, but that is a different matter. A clerk in the Treasury may write a most important letter, but if he said: "I am solely responsible for that letter," I would write him down as soon. I know very important letters from the Treasury are written by me only 35 years of age, but they have no responsibility in the matter, except to their immediate superior. I hold the secretaries, and not the examiners, responsible for any reprimand.

11503. That letter would go to a secretary?—Yes.

11504. Mr. HENNA.—Only for his signature?—Not necessarily only for signature; no doubt the secretary does not always look carefully into matters of small importance. In every department the same thing occurs. It largely depends on the head of a department in an office what sort of scrutiny he exercises over the work of his subordinates; but his superior will hold him solely responsible for everything under his control. I hold Mr. Lonsdale and Mr. Dilworth solely responsible for everything they initial.

11505. The CHAIRMAN.—Any reprimand that went out in Mr. Dilworth's or Mr. Lonsdale's handwriting, Mr. Dilworth or Mr. Lonsdale would be responsible for?—Yes; they are responsible to me and I am responsible to the Board.

11506. Would the secretary read a letter of that kind conveying a reprimand?—Most certainly they ought to read it, and to scrutinise it; I have always believed that they did so, and it has to be proved to me yet that they do not.

11507. Mr. HENNA.—Did Mr. Purser put initials on these letters or documents after the reprimand had been actually signed by the secretary or below?—The way these things are done is as follows. When the examiners get the reports they read through them, and if they find, for instance, that a teacher has been guilty of, say, falsification, they look back into his record, and supposing he has been guilty of a similar offence before,

they know what the practice of the Commissioners is in the case of repeated falsification, and they draft an order suited to the case. This recommendation is brought to the secretaries, and after they have considered it it is brought to me, and I read it carefully; finally it goes before the Board. The original recommendation may have been written by Mr. Purcell, yet he is not responsible for it. It is I who am responsible to the Board. I am held responsible. That is what happens in important cases. But take another case. Supposing it is reported that the teacher's teaching of arithmetic or something of that kind has been extremely defective, that the inspector points out certain defects, and that his mark on the schools is, we will say, "middling." Mr. Purcell, from looking back on the record of the teacher and from his own knowledge of what is usually done when a man gets "middling," may draft a reprimand, but that reprimand is entirely based on a recommendation of the inspector, either

positive or implied. The inspector does not always recommend; he often points out certain defects and gives a low mark to the school, but the reprimand does not involve any judicial action on Mr. Purcell's part. It is implied in the inspector's report; Mr. Purcell may draft it, but he is not responsible for it. It goes to the secretaries, and you have got evidence at any rate from Mr. Lennane that he carefully scrutinises such orders. Whether he does so or not I hold him responsible, and not Mr. Purcell.

11508. But you stated that Mr. Purser put notes on these documents after they reached the office, and I asked were these notes made before they reached the secretaries, and were signed by them or were not?—I thought you were asking me about Mr. Purcell. Mr. Purser's notes on these documents were made, as well as I remember, when action had been completed, after the letters had gone out, sometimes a month after.

## TWENTY-FIFTH DAY—THURSDAY, MAY 29TH, 1913.

At 23, Kildare-street, Dublin.

Present:—**SIR SAMUEL DILL, M.A., LL.D., LL.D. (Chairman);** The Most Rev. **DENIS KELLY, D.D., Bishop of Ross;** **SIR HYAM SHAW WILKINSON, LL.D.;** **MR. JOHN COFFEY;** **MR. HENRAGE E. B. HARRISON, B.A.;** **MR. JEREMIAH HENLY;** **MR. WALTER MCMURROUGH KAVANAGH, D.L.;** **MR. THOMAS MICHAEL KEENE, B.L.;** and

**MR. ARTHUR J. DONNELLY, M.A., B.Sc., Secretary.**

Dr. SPARKS, Resident Commissioner of National Education, further examined.

11509. The CHAIRMAN.—We stopped yesterday at the conclusions you had reached from your visits to schools?—I had reached the case of the Glomac circuit, which is very important. In the Glomac circuit during 1908-9, 81.7 per cent. of the schools reached "good"; this was reduced to 61.9 per cent. in 1909-10, and rose to 64.3 per cent. in 1912. There is no doubt in my mind that the marks in 1908-9 were much too high. I visited 70 schools in this circuit in 1911, and I am convinced that the standard of education in Co. Tipperary was at that time rather below than above the standard of the rest of Ireland, in which 69.2 per cent. of the schools were as high as "good."

11510. That is the average of "good" marks all over Ireland?—All over Ireland. But it may be asked whether the standard in 1908-9 was high or low, does not the decline in 1909-10 show that there was no proper uniformity of marking between the successive senior inspectors? This is true, but the blame rests not so much with the senior inspectors, Meems, Brown and Welpy, as with the chief inspector, Mr. Purser, who was responsible for the proper inspection of the schools, and was informed by Mr. Welpy that he was reducing the mark, and was asked to inspect some of the schools himself as chief inspector, in order to test them.

11511. Mr. Welpy referred to his chief?—Yes. I have a statement of Mr. Welpy's, which I will come to later on, in which he states that he referred the question to his chief. He told me in conversation, and he wrote it down as well, that he appealed to his chief as follows: "I cannot maintain the marks that Mr. Brown has been giving in this circuit for the last four or five years"; and he went on: "As my reductions are likely to be heavy, I am very anxious that you yourself, as chief inspector, should examine some of the schools."

11512. Did he come down?—No.

11513. He did not?—Not as far as I know. I think he has admitted this in his evidence. He says that he was not aware that the marks were being reduced, though he anticipated that they would be.

11514. Mr. HENLY.—What was the date of that?—I am afraid I cannot give you the date. I do not think

Mr. Welpy mentioned the date, but I will get it from him.

11515. The CHAIRMAN.—Mr. Welpy took charge of circuit 18, that is the Glomac circuit, in July, 1908?—Yes.

11516. That was the time he began his inspection?—He must have been in a considerable number of the schools before he told Mr. Purser that he could not possibly maintain the marks. That statement is an important one, as Mr. Purser said here, in reply to some questions that he was not aware that Mr. Welpy was reducing the marks, but that, knowing the character of Mr. Brown and Mr. Welpy, he thought it probable that a reduction would take place.

11517. And therefore Mr. Purser appears to have taken no notice of the possible change of the standard?—According to Mr. Welpy.

11518. Mr. COFFEY.—But he did not know anything of the change. It is quite consistent with the tenor of the statement of Mr. Purser that he was not aware of the lowering of the marks?—I do not think so. In my opinion there is a direct contradiction.

11519. The CHAIRMAN.—The point made by Mr. Coffey is that Mr. Welpy said that he would pull down the marks?—Well, for practical work that warning should have been sufficient. My point is that Mr. Purser got full notice that the thing was going to be done, and that he was guilty of a dereliction of duty in not accepting Mr. Welpy's suggestion to examine some of the schools himself, so as to test the standards of these two inspectors.

11520. Mr. HARRISON.—Would it be possible to get the date of that?—Yes. It is quite easy. Mr. Welpy is in Dublin; I saw him yesterday, and I can easily ascertain that.

11521. The CHAIRMAN.—It would be well to get this in connected and regular order?—If Mr. Brown's standard was too low, Mr. Purser should have ascertained that and rectified it. If Mr. Welpy's standard was too high, he should have noted the fact, and taken measures, as he did not do, to convince Mr. Welpy of the fact at the annual conference with the inspectors

29th May, 1913.]

Mr. W. J. M. STARRIS, M.A., LL.D., examined.

[Continued.]

or in some other way. I did not visit this district to any extent myself till the trouble had arisen. I think I was in three or four schools near Kildare. My prolonged visit to this district took place after the trouble had arisen, and previously to that there had been only a single appeal from Mr. Welply's marking.

11322. Mr. CORREY.—Was that Gortagowna or Mardyk?—I could not tell you that.

11323. I gathered from the statement of the teachers, as set forth in the memorandum which you kindly furnished, that there were appeals in the case of the Gortagowna school and the Mardyk school?—The information that I give you here I got from the secretary, but I should like to look up this later on. I give you the information furnished by the secretary.

11324. I am not quite sure from reading this memorandum furnished by the teachers of these 14 specified cases, that there were not appeals in the case of Gortagowna and Mardyk?—It is just the difference between one and two. From my own inspection of the circuit, I agree with Mr. Hynes's conclusion that "there has been a great deal of indiscriminating praise on the part of inspectors. This easy-going style of inspection extended to the checking of accounts," and with Mr. Welply's statement that "awards were given for work which in hardly any other part of Ireland would earn those awards. I could not continue those awards. To do so would be altogether my own judgment." When such a condition of things arises as Mr. Pusey allowed to develop in the Tipperary circuit, the result is very unpleasant, both for the administration and the teachers. Personally, I have the greatest possible sympathy for the teachers in the matter. The Board cannot allow the standard of education in any district to continue too low, and the teachers to be lulled into a "Fool's Paradise" by the laxity of its staff; on the other hand, the teachers reasonably complain if they fail to get increments and promotions to which they are accustomed, and to which they believe themselves to be entitled. If a man's school is marked "very good," and if he has not seen any other school, he thinks he deserves his marks, however bad his school may be. I am perfectly certain most of us would feel like that. A teacher who has been getting "very good" for many years, and suddenly, as occurred in some of these cases, finds it reduced without notice, receives my cordial sympathy.

11325. The CHAIRMAN.—That sudden change must have affected a great number in the matter of increments?—No doubt.

11326. And very seriously?—Yes. I am perfectly ready to admit that the Clonmel teachers had a grievance. The Belfast case was not nearly so serious. There was there a difference of 4 per cent. in the "goods" one way or the other (that is the amended figure), but, of course, it is serious when the "goods" are reduced 20 per cent.

11327. Mr. HENLEY.—I think it was more, because 137 "excellent" and "very goods," given by Mr. Brown, fell to 70?—I took the figure here from official returns, and I am treating only of "goods," because it is on the "goods" that increments, as a rule, are given. I have got a typed return<sup>1</sup> here dealing with all the marks, which I can hand in; but I am dealing only with the "goods"; it would occupy too much time to go into all the marks. The important mark for the National teacher in Ireland, where the schools are mostly small, is "good," since he will get his grade and increments on that, and that is the reason I selected "good." The fall in the Clonmel circuit in the "goods" was from 84 to 61 (it has since risen to 64). Well, that is very serious.

11328. Did it rise to 64?—Under Mr. Welply. It has gone up in the last year.

11329. Is he still in that circuit?—Yes. Not being philosophers, the teachers are not inclined to take the rough with the smooth. If they were philosophers—possibly I am rash in implying that all philosophers reason with finely balanced minds—but supposing they were philosophers of the highest type, they might say: "We have had seven last years under Mr. Brown; these have to be balanced by an equal number of last years under Mr. Welply." Not being philosophers, how-

ever, they are inclined to consider the usual high mark to be their due, and to accuse the inspectors of harshness if they are deprived of it. Probably Mr. Welply would have shown more discretion by tempering justice with leniency for some years; he might have warned the teachers that their present marks could not be continued unless patent defects were remedied. My own opinion is that the mark of a school should not be altered, or at any rate lowered (I do not suppose that a teacher would require to get a year's notice before his mark was raised) until he has received timely notice a year before (as is now done in every case since the 1911 Circular), that unless certain defects are remedied the mark of the school cannot be continued. I think that is perfectly fair. It gives a man a year to think it over. Possibly Mr. Welply's reductions were too sweeping, especially where the teachers were reduced by two steps in a year. The Committee has doubtless heard that I visited in person, in company with Mr. Dilworth, a large number of schools in the Tipperary circuit.

11330. Seventy schools?—Yes, seventy. I wish to explain why on this occasion I, as it were, stepped down from the judgment seat and took upon myself the functions of chief inspector. I did so unwillingly, and not on my own motion. As may be gathered from the Board's letter to the Belfast teachers, it was not quite satisfied with the state of things in the Belfast circuit, nor did it approve of the tone of the chief inspectors' report, which the Belfast teachers had represented—and I am inclined to agree, with them—as breathing a narrow, bitter, partisan spirit in every line. It was represented to me by some of my colleagues that it would be a great advantage if I made a preliminary report upon the condition of education in the Tipperary schools, so that there might be some possibility of checking the verdict of the chief inspector upon the senior inspector's marking, such as was not available in the case of Belfast.

11331. The CHAIRMAN.—That was anticipating the visit of the chief inspector?—With regard to the Belfast schools, the Board directed the two chief inspectors to report upon them, but, as you know, they found it impossible to induce these gentlemen to write a well-balanced and impartial report, such as suited the circumstances of the case. And yet, as I told you yesterday, I implored them when going down to Belfast to bear in mind that their report ought to be as calm, as judicious, and as free from emotional excitement as a proposition in Euclid generally is; but the result was a report such as you have read.

11332. You went down as a preliminary to sending down the chief inspector?—I am talking of Belfast now. Some of my colleagues who know the chief inspectors implored me to send somebody else in their place, Mr. O'Connor, for instance. I pointed out that I could not possibly send down to Belfast a comparatively junior inspector to report on the circuit of a man so senior as Mr. Deane, and they said: "What the Clonmel case was before the Board some of my colleagues said to me: 'Is there no way of obviating what occurred in the Belfast case?' We know the sort of report the chief inspectors will write. We wish you would go down yourself and give us a general report on what you believe to be the state of education in that particular circuit." I acceded to his request, and proposed to select a member of schools, to be re-inspected by a chief inspector, such as I thought most favourable to the teachers. I am afraid I was doing an injustice to Mr. Welply, as those would be schools most unfavourable to him; but that is what I did.

11333. Mr. CORREY.—Was there a minute of the Board for that?—No, I think not. I do not believe there was.

11334. Because we had it from one of the Commissioners here that he knew nothing of the Board making any such suggestion?—I stated "some of my colleagues"; I did not say there was a Board's Order, but I mentioned my proposal at the Board. Dr. Clarke was one of the first persons who suggested it.

11335. The BRISQOR OF ROSS.—He gave us that fact in evidence?—Yes; he was one of them. I am not certain whether Mr. Ward did.

11536. Did Mr. Taylor speak to you?—I do not remember.

11537. Mr. HENRY.—Mr. Ward said the Board made no Order?—I never said that.

11538. Yes, but you mentioned it to the Board?—I mentioned it to the Board. They knew perfectly well what I was doing. I agreed to the suggestion of some of my colleagues and told the Board that I would visit, with Mr. Dilworth, as many as possible of the schools whose marks had been reduced by Mr. Welby, or his adherents, and select a certain number which I considered most favourable to the teachers for re-inspection by a chief inspector. In October, 1911, Mr. Dilworth and I visited about 70 schools, and I took careful notes upon what I saw and heard. If any member of the Committee would like to know what my notes were on any particular school, I am perfectly willing to read them.

11539. The CHAIRMAN.—There was one particular school among those 18 selected as being favourable to the teacher where that description did not seem to apply?—Later on I will say something about that. I paid particular attention to the modulus and cleanliness of the buildings, to the order, discipline and good habits of the children; I tested the senior classes in reading and mental arithmetic; I examined their written exercises and drawing. I noted the bearing of the teacher. As some of the teachers in their position had accused Mr. Welby of rudeness and unbecoming manner, I closely questioned every teacher on this subject. In two cases alone did I find any serious objection to his attitude; those were Mohober N.S. and Shirewardagh. Mr. Mahony, the teacher of Mohober, had kept a record, filling 18 pages of a copy-book, of Mr. Welby's movements from the moment he entered the school; in this teacher's opinion he was "over-hasty, excitable, rude, cruel and unsympathetic," "such an uncalculated, and ungovernable display of bad temper I have never seen except in street scenes."

11540. Mr. COFFEY.—Is that a quotation from Mahony's notes?—Yes. As I was told by Mr. Mahony that the notes were prepared for a speech he had made in Tipperary, I confess I was not much impressed by them. Mrs. Barry, of Shirewardagh N.S., thought Mr. Welby "damned the teachers before the children." In eight or nine other cases he was thought "stiff," "averse," or "unsympathetic," but in the remaining 52 or 60 absolutely no fault was found with his manner or attitude. Thus I had reason to conclude that the charges of rudeness against Mr. Welby emanated from a very small minority of the teachers of the circuit. As to the standard of marking, I saw fair reasons for agreeing with Mr. Welby in about 50 cases.

11541. The CHAIRMAN.—In any other circuit where Mr. Welby was stationed, were complaints made of his manner to the teachers?—I never heard of any complaints of Mr. Welby in the Belfast circuit until he had left.

11542. He was in Belfast before Clonard?—Yes; I did not hear of any complaints. He was very popular, as far as I know, in Kerry, where he was stationed for very many years. There was one case of a row with a teacher who was suspected of writing an anonymous letter, threatening to shoot him. But that was a quarrel about the appointment of a teacher. Mr. Welby recommended a certain appointment to the manager of a neighbouring school and the teacher of the other school did not like it.

11543. Is he a man of irritable temper?—No, I do not think so; on the contrary, he is very cold and business-like.

11544. Mr. HENRY.—In the case of Mohober School, was there not a conflict of testimony between the inspector and the teacher as to what took place there?—I do not think I could stand cross-examination as to the details of all these cases. I really do not know.

11545. The CHAIRMAN.—Will you kindly continue from your notes?—In 10 or 11 cases I thought Mr. Welby's remark somewhat severe; in 10 cases I was inclined to think that his opinion of a school was too favourable. As I undertook to do, I referred the former cases to Mr. Hynde to be re-inspected. They

were:—Kilteely B. G., Cullen B., Monard B., Noon, Carrig G., Nardylke, Mullinsheg G., Mohober, Shirewardagh G., Clonard. To these I added Loughmore B., which I thought over-marked, and Roscrea B., which I thought rightly marked, but where the teacher was very dissatisfied. In five of these cases the chief inspector's judgment was slightly more favourable than the senior inspector's—in one (Loughmore B.) it was less favourable. In my informal report to the Board on the condition of education in this circuit, I stated that, while in my opinion, Mr. Welby was probably the most efficient and energetic of the inspectors, it was possible, as often happens, that he suffered a little from the defects of his qualities. I had travelled much in his company, and never had reason to find fault with his attitude to the teachers; he was strenuous and business-like; it was possible that sensitive persons might think him somewhat brusque and wanting in softness. Being unsparing of himself he could not tolerate want of energy in other, and possibly he had adopted too rapid measures to remedy the glaring defects which had grown up unchecked in his circuit. I certainly did not agree with his action in reducing a school by more than one step in a year, as he had done in five or six cases. He had been accustomed to work in districts such as Kerry or Belfast, where the standard of work was high, and possibly had not made sufficient allowance for teachers working in less favoured localities. The general feeling of the Board on hearing my report, and the subsequent report of Mr. Hynde, was that no injustice had been done to any teachers, but that it would have been more judicious if less strenuous methods had been adopted of raising their efficiency. It was hoped, however, that the circular of July, 1911, would prevent a repetition of what must be admitted to be a case where, mainly through the deliberate neglect of Mr. Pascoe, uniformity of marking between successive senior inspectors had seriously broken down. That is what I have to say about the Clonard subject.

11546. Then I see you take up the question of marks?—Yes; I have made some notes on the marks. It is a very important subject. The schools are at present classified by the inspectors under one of six heads, "excellent," "very good," "good," "fair," "middling," or "bad." In practice, however, the vast majority of the schools are classified under one of the three heads, "very good," "good," or "fair"; thus, in the year 1910, 92 per cent. of the schools were placed under one or another of these three heads, and in 1911 even a larger percentage. The three great categories, therefore, in which nearly all the schools are placed correspond to the three divisions:—(1) highly efficient, (2) efficient, and (3) inefficient. These three divisions account for 24, 45, and 31 per cent. of the schools, respectively. The percentage of the teachers in these classes is, however, somewhat different, and roughly corresponds to 30, 50, and 20 per cent. These divisions form a ready means by which the Board can distribute their awards of increments and promotions to the teachers. The 30 per cent. who are highly efficient, are eligible for the highest class salaries obtainable under the Board's regulations, and to the teachers in this class is given the exceptional reward known as "special promotion." The second class of efficient teachers are eligible for increments and promotion to the maximum of the second grade. If you abolished these mark marks, as many witnesses, I believe, have recommended, it would be necessary for the Board when awarding promotions to endeavour to assess the inspector's reports under some such similar heads, otherwise a want of uniformity in the distribution of rewards would grow up, as the officials dealing with this work would find it almost impossible to attach the correct value to the reports if expressed in a merely narrative form. It is a most difficult thing to assess the value of a report expressed in general language except for the person who has actually done the inspection. It is obviously much easier for the inspector to grade the school than for an official in Dublin, by studying the inspector's report, to endeavour to gauge in what grade the inspector would be likely to have placed it had he been called upon to do so. A number of persons to whom I have spoken object to the word

20th May, 1913.]

Mr. W. J. M. STARKIE, M.A., Litt.D., LL.D., examined.

[Continued.]

"excellent." This mark is given to a very small number of schools, perhaps three or four per cent., and from my knowledge of the managers and the teachers, I think they would be disappointed if they did not get this Blue Ribbon. I find that even the cur-dressers I come across know when a school has been marked "excellent."

11547. But it does not affect the classification?—Not a bit; but the teacher becomes a marked man in the district, and he walks about with his head in the air if his school is marked "excellent." Everybody knows it. It excites a fierce interest even in the placid minds of Nones; when they hear that a neighbouring convent has been marked "excellent," when they have got only "very good," there is a deal of emulation over it, and they work very hard in order to overtake their rivals in the race. Furthermore, the existence of this mark is a positive help to the teachers. In giving promotion, if I find that a teacher has got "excellent" along with "good," I inevitably allow the "excellent" to compensate for the "good." For special promotion, one has to get three "very goods," and it often happens that a teacher drops one "very good" in the middle; but if he has got an "excellent," I take no notice of the drop.

11548. Mr. CORRY.—You say that this falls in under three heads generally?—02 per cent. of them.

11549. I see that Mr. Purser and Mr. Hynes, in trying to fix the marks in Belfast had to introduce the new marks, "strong fair," "weak good," and "moderate excellent"?—Yes; it crosses me when I hear some of the inspectors saying there are too many merit marks and increasing the number.

11550. The CHAIRMAN.—I came across a "weak good"?—Yes, and a "strong middling."

11551. Mr. HARRISON.—That is the same as saying "fairly good"?—I daresay you have heard that originally we had only four marks: "excellent," "good," "fair," and "bad," and it was the inspectors themselves (Mr. Purser in among the number) who induced us to increase them by adding "middling," which is "a vile phrase," and "very good." I think middling was introduced in order to spare the feelings of the inspectors. They did not like to assign an unmitigated, unvarnished "bad" to the school; they preferred to give the pill for the teacher. After all it is only a question of appearance for "middling" as if it were "bad." But a very small proportion of schools, I am glad to say, are classified as "middling." As I said, it was at first thought sufficient to have four merit marks ("excellent," "good," "fair," "bad"), but it was urged upon the Board by many inspectors that these categories were insufficient, and should be increased by the addition of "very good" and "middling."

11552. The CHAIRMAN.—Who proposed that?—The inspectors. It was done at a conference of the senior inspectors in Dublin.

11553. These merit marks spring from a conference of inspectors?—Yes, and even now a good many of the inspectors are not satisfied with the number, but add "very fair," and so Mr. Coffey said, "strong fair," "weak good," and "moderate excellent."

11554. Mr. HENLY.—When was that conference?—In 1903.

11555-6. But, then, was not the question submitted to them to give a definition of those terms, "excellent," and so on?

The CHAIRMAN.—I think we have that document?—Have you that document?

11557. Yes?—Yes; but the terms of reference were drawn up during the meeting of the inspectors. They came to me and said they could not get on with the four terms, "excellent," "good," "fair," and "bad."

11558. Then they attempted to analyse?—Yes. As I was touring with Mr. Dale at the time, the agenda paper was not drawn up before the senior inspectors arrived; but the items for discussion were submitted to them every day while the conference lasted.

11559. And did you suggest to them to analyse those merit marks or did they take that upon themselves?—It is very hard for me to remember exactly; but I

suppose I asked them to give definitions of the terms used in the schools. I fancy that the terms "middling" and "very good" did not appear until the second conference of the senior inspectors which was held at the end of 1903.

11560. Mr. HENLY.—The question was submitted on the form we have, at all events, that with a view to securing uniformity of inspection an agreement should be arrived at as to the meaning of "excellent," "very good," "good," "fair," "middling," and "bad"?—What is the date of that—is it June, 1907?

11561. June, 1903. And then the answer is given in parallel columns?—I see you are right. I am, however, perfectly certain of this, that the addition to the marks was pressed on the Board by the inspectors. There is no doubt about that.

11562. The BISHOP or BLOKE.—And then, perhaps, in consequence of that, you asked them to define these various terms?—I am perfectly certain that it was pressed on us by the inspectors. One of their arguments was that some teachers suffered through there being no mark between "excellent" and "good," as a lot of teachers got "good" who would have got "excellent" who would have got only "very good." It is clear that if you have only two classes instead of three, a number of people who would have been in the intermediate class are put either above or below. However, whatever the marks were, the inspectors have been very generous in awarding them. Mr. Purser anticipated that the number below "good" would be 60 per cent. In a memorandum dated the 13th of October, 1903, he divided the schools into "excellent," 6 per cent.; "very good," 12 per cent.; "good," 22 per cent.; "fair," 30 per cent.; "middling," 30 per cent.; "bad," 10 per cent. As a matter of fact, the number below "good" is only 30 per cent.; so that at that time, at any rate, Mr. Purser judged that the merit of the schools was not nearly so high as it turned out to be.

11563. The CHAIRMAN.—That was purely guess work, I suppose?—Not purely guess work, as his opinion was based on his own knowledge of the schools.

11564. I suppose it was a rough estimate?—Very rough, indeed; but my aim is to show that the estimation of the inspectors as to how these marks would be awarded did not come within 100 per cent. of the truth; that is to say, the number of "goods" was double what was expected.

11565. Will you put in that memorandum of Mr. Purser's?—Yes.

11566. Now are you going on to the administration?—Yes, the administration and the services by teachers to the Board. In order to understand the methods whereby the Board of National Education transacts its business and the extent to which it controls, through the Resident Commissioner, as head of the administration, the administrative details, it is necessary to have a comprehensive view of the amount of work that is involved in the administration of the National system. It is to be remembered that the Commissioners administer a system of a highly centralized character, that every detail of the work of over 8,000 schools and the individual payments to the teaching staff (consisting of over 17,000 individuals) have to be seen to by the officers of the Commissioners.

11567. Are they over 17,000 now?—Yes, including junior assistant submasters. It is obvious that the amount of material calling for consideration is so great that it would be quite impossible that the Board should deal itself with the multitude of individual cases and documents that demand attention. Every year the secretaries receive from managers and others over 25,000 letters and communications on school subjects, inspectors furnish about 15,000 reports on the schools, in addition to an equal number of letters and other memoranda. There is, in addition, a large correspondence with the Board of Public Works, with the Pensions Office, the training colleges, etc., amounting on the average to about 10,000 communications yearly, and there are besides a large number of returns, forms and circulars demanding official attention. A Board of Commissioners (with one exception, unpaid), consisting of eminent men, nearly all

of whom have important public or private occupations of other kinds, could not attempt to deal with the thousands of individual cases which form the subject-matter of the enormous mass of documents actually received in the office, and it is accordingly necessary that the daily management of this business should be delegated to officials and clerks to be dealt with in strict conformity to the Board's instructions, and in accordance with its intentions and policy. But this does not mean that the decisions in these numerous individual cases are given without the Board's cognisance or authority, nor that the control of the Commissioners over the details of their administration is really in the slightest degree impaired. Nor does our procedure differ essentially from the practice in all Government Departments—even those which are entirely directed by paid officials. In all Departments administrative work is necessarily delegated to the staff, and for all decisions the heads of the department are held collectively responsible. Although there is little question as to the general principles on which the business of a great department such as that of the National Board should be conducted, occasions arise when the application of the general principle gives rise to difficulties. Thus, before 1909, there was much discussion at the National Board as to the way in which individual cases were occasionally dealt with.

11568. Was that during Mr. Redington's administration?—Yes. Although the Board met weekly, and the meetings were often prolonged after 6 p.m. in order to deal with the 80 or 90 cases usually placed among the agenda, a considerable number of important questions were postponed from meeting to meeting.

11569. Can you give us an idea of the attendance in the days when they were weekly?—It was not nearly as good as at present—6 or 7 very often.

11570. The same men attending?—There were certain men who always attended.

11571. Just as at the Intermediate Board now?—Yes. Dr. Wilson, the Archbishop of Dublin, and Mr. Molloy, always attended. In Sir Patrick Keenan's time there was, from his point of view, an excellent arrangement. As he professed to work the Board by means of the members living in Dublin, he prevented Commissioners living in the country from having their travelling expenses or maintenance allowances. It is a well-known fact that these were never given until he died.

11572. Mr. CORRY.—You said the meetings were prolonged sometimes till six. What is the time of meeting of the Board?—From half-past-three. Before I became Resident Commissioner a rule was passed that the meetings should not be prolonged beyond six, as they often had been previously.

11573. From half-past three till six?—Yes, and nothing controversial can be brought forward after half-past five. We tried to put the hour earlier, but many members objected.

11574. Mr. HENRY.—Is not that a very short time to transact an immense amount of business?—Those who attend the meetings do not think so. There are very great advantages in having an unpaid Board, but there are disadvantages also. Business men, such as the Lord Chief Baron, are not able to attend if the work is too heavy. Besides, you must remember that there are many committee meetings also. For instance, last Tuesday, the Commissioners were occupied from half-past eleven in the morning for most of the day.

11575. The CHAIRMAN.—Have you a rule that a member vacates his seat by prolonged non-attendance?—There is no such rule. In some Boards it is provided that a man shall vacate his position if he has not attended for a year, but I have never known a case of that at the National Board.

11576. We have that on the Intermediate Board now?—As there are every year 26 ordinary meetings, and possibly 10 meetings of committees besides, a man is certain to turn up at one of them.

11577. Mr. KAYNOR.—Have you ever failed to get a quorum?—No.

11578. What is a quorum?—Three.

11579. The CHAIRMAN.—Were weekly meetings prolonged to late in the day?—Yes, to deal with some 85 cases. A considerable number of important questions were postponed from meeting to meeting. As the meetings were so frequent, the Commissioners were not properly informed (by means of printed memoranda as at present) as to the details which the shortness of time made it impossible to discuss. When the meetings became fortnightly it was possible to give very full information to the members. First, a detailed record of the proceedings is circulated. This is a very important document, requiring a very long time to print in extenso, as it often extends to 30 pages. The secretary attending the Board, whose duty it is to write out the minutes, has to spend his whole time on this, to the exclusion of most other business. Again, the amount of printing to be done for every meeting is very large, as, in the case of important cases, we print the whole of the Inspector's report, and any other information we think it desirable the Board should have before it.

11580. Does that go on the agenda?—Yes; and it takes a long time to print. When the meetings were weekly decisions were constantly made, and reversed at subsequent meetings; there was no continuity or consistency in action. Through the meetings were so frequent the members of the Board complained that important cases involving the dismissal or firing of teachers were decided by the office-committee, of which they mostly knew nothing, as they were placed upon the table, in the register of office-committee orders, which was open to inspection, but was rarely inspected.

11581. What was the office-committee?—I am going into that later on. The register was open to inspection, but was rarely inspected. Before Mr. Redington's death the Archbishop of Dublin had tabled the following motion, which remained on the agenda for a couple of months until I was able to deal with it:—"To call attention to the fact that business of a very important character, including the imposition of fines on teachers and the withdrawal of the Commissioners' recognition of teachers in particular schools, is transacted in the form of orders of the office-committee, which after being laid on the Board-room table, are issued in the name of the Commissioners in the form of Board's Orders; and to move that in future the name of the Commissioners be used in official correspondence only in reference to matters which have been considered and decided at a meeting of the Board." At the second meeting at which I was present I proposed that a committee should be appointed to consider whether any improvement could be effected in the then method of transacting the business of the Board. The result of the discussions at this Committee was that all letters continued to be issued in the name of the Commissioners, but the recommendations of the office-committee were classified (somewhat as "provisional orders" at present), and were circulated in a printed form. I am told that Mr. Dowling stated that, in consequence of the Archbishop's proposal, letters were no longer issued in the name of the Commissioners. This is not true, as the Archbishop withdrew his resolution. At the same time, the Board ordered that the penalties for falsification and inefficiency should be revised, it being the general opinion that the recommendations of the office of inspection on those matters were inadequate. It was pointed out by several members that teachers of admitted inefficiency and dishonesty were retained in their schools for many years (in some cases 15 years) to the injury of the children. The following penalties were laid down as a disincite to the office-committee:—For falsification—A minimum of £3 for the first offence; depression in classification for the second offence (or three times the first fine if teacher was in the third class); dismissal for the third offence. For inefficiency—1st year, the teacher to be reprimanded and warned; 2nd year—if no improvement, temporary depression in class for one or more quarters; 3rd year, permanent depression in class and retention on trial for a year; 4th year—dismissal. In order to obviate a charge which has often been made, I wish to say that, as I was then new to my post, I had nothing to do with the suggestion of these penalties. I once saw in some Teacher's Journal that the last act of my

20th May, 1913.]

Mr. W. J. M. SPANAN, M.A., LL.D., *examined.*

[Continued.]

official career was to impose these penalties. There is no truth in this statement. In order to give the officials time to prepare the cases in a thorough manner, and to print requisite information for the Board, there was a unanimous opinion on 30th May, 1899, in favour of holding the meetings fortnightly.

11882. With you put in that Order on the books about penalties?—Certainly.

11883. What is the date of the Order?—The revised penalties for infraction were fixed by the Board I think in March, 1899. Those for inefficiency were fixed later in the same year. I know the first Order was in March; but I will put in the Order.

11884. Mr. COVAT.—What were the penalties?—In the first year the teacher was to be reprimanded and warned; in the second year, if there was no improvement, he was to be depressed in class for one or more quarters; in the third year there was to be a permanent depression in class, with retention on trial for a year; in the fourth year it was dismissal. There was an unanimous opinion on the 30th of May, 1899, in favour of holding the meetings fortnightly; but the final decision was deferred, as it was felt that the meeting was not sufficiently attended. I think there were only seven members present. When the Archbishop of Dublin resigned in June, 1901, there was much public discussion as to the extent to which the Board was kept informed as to the details of business, and much complaint as to the small attendance of the Commissioners at their weekly meetings. An eminent colleague wrote to me on the subject, on July 2nd, 1901: "The work of National Education in Ireland is being carried on under impossible conditions. There were 143 meetings since the beginning of 1898, and the Commissioner who stands 12th on the list in point of attendance was present at 82 out of the 143. ———, who has of late become so energetic, not to say noisy, attended only 84. Let each Commissioner's vote be multiplied when a division is taken, by the number of his average yearly attendances for the preceding three years, and things may go better." (If that were done the Secretary would have to be a great an arithmetician as Mr. Dilworth is.) On the other hand, the urgent necessity of regularizing the position of the Resident Commissioner was shown by a certain Commissioner's defiance of my authority when I refused to read him the confidential reports of inspectors upon a certain school, in order to be used in a Press controversy with a colleague whom he had publicly accused of invertebracy. I appealed to Mr. Wyndham for assistance in the letter case, and he wrote as follows in reply (July 25th, 1904): "I have read your letter of July 24th, and enclosures, with interest and regret. It is clear to me that, as I feared, your position on the National Board involves difficulties only less great than the services which you have rendered, and are rendering, to the cause of education in Ireland. I am also convinced that the 'constitutional' relations between the Board and the Resident Commissioner, based as they are on relics of antiquated provisions now strangled by disuse, demand the close and prompt attention of the Irish Government. . . . I would ask you to allow me to defer, not consideration in so far as I am able to give it, but to defer definite suggestions as to what should be, until I can, in Dublin, have the advantage of conferring with you and other members of the Board." The result of these conferences was that on November 5th, 1904, a resolution was passed at the Board, "That a committee be appointed to consider what questions should be brought before the Board at their ordinary meetings; and what matters should be decided on the responsibility of the Resident Commissioner; also what changes, if any, are required in regard to the procedure at the Board's meetings; the Committee also to report on the relations existing between the Resident Commissioner and the Departmental staff (indoor and outdoor) in regard to promotions, superannuations, etc.; whether these relations should be modified, and, if so, in what respects." The members appointed were the following:—The Lord Chief Baron, Sir R. Bismarck, Judge Shaw, Bishop of Kildare, Dr. Traill, Resident Commissioner (ex-officio). On 7th January, 1905, the Board received the report of the committee, and resolved as follows:—

(1) "That all questions of principle and the classes

to which they should be applicable be decided by the Board; that, subject to the right of any Commissioner to bring before the Board the application to a particular case of any principle, whether already laid down, or hereafter to be laid down by the Board, such application shall be determined, in the first instance, by the Resident Commissioner, and shall be brought before the Board in the same manner as the reports of the Office and Finance Committees now are." (2) "That, subject to an appeal to the Board by the official officer, the Resident Commissioner should have the power to superannuate any officer over the age of 65, when he should be of opinion he ought, in the interest of the public service, to cease to hold office." (3) Divided into two parts:—(a) "That all written orders and directions given by the secretaries to any official, either of the indoor or of the outdoor department staff or the other officers of the Board, shall be assumed by the officers to whom they shall have been given, to have been made by the authority, general or special, of the Board, or of the Resident Commissioner; but this rule shall not enlarge the authority of the secretaries as between them and the Resident Commissioner, and the Board." (There is a flourish of the Chief Baron about this, I think.) (b) "That, subject to the preceding rule, the Financial Assistant Secretary and the Chiefs of Inspection shall be independent of each other, but under the direct authority of the Board or the Resident Commissioner." (4) "That the Board meet once a fortnight during the year, the Resident Commissioner to retain the power of summoning a special meeting of the Commissioners whenever necessary."

11885. Mr. COVAT.—May I trouble you to read Clause 2 or Section 2, referring to matters of principle? "That, subject to the right of any Commissioner to bring before the Board the application to a particular case of any principle, whether already laid down, or hereafter to be laid down by the Board, such application shall be determined, in the first instance, by the Resident Commissioner, and shall be brought before the Board in the same manner as the reports of the Office and Finance Committees now are." In accordance with these orders the following system of administration was adopted. In the first place the Code of Regulations settles the principles on which individual cases are to be dealt with, and, secondly, in the case of matters not directly coming under the Rules, such further orders as the Board deem to be necessary are adopted from time to time after discussion, which settle the principles to be applied to these new cases. In the next place, higher officials are appointed by the Board for the examination of individual cases, and to draw up the necessary orders in strict accordance with the rule or previous decision of the Board applicable to each case; inspectors' reports and letters from managers are referred, in the first place, to the officials known as "examiners," and if the matter is one presenting no special difficulty the appropriate order is made by the examiner, and he is held responsible to the Commissioners for its accuracy. But when the decision involves action of a more important character, such as the granting or withholding of money payments, the infliction of penalties on teachers, or the diminishing in any way of salary or emoluments, the order, after being recommended by the examiner or other executive officer within whose province it falls, must be counter-signed by one of the secretaries, submitted to, approved, and also signed by the Resident Commissioner, and, in addition, set forth in the agenda paper with such details as are necessary, and laid before the Board at a full meeting. In very serious cases, such as those involving the dismissal of a teacher, a full statement of the grounds of the action recommended is sent out with the agenda to each Commissioner some days before the meeting. When the Board meets it is open to any Commissioner to raise a discussion upon any of these decisions, and, if necessary, to have it deferred for fuller discussion at a subsequent meeting. In addition to this, every Commissioner can, at any time, call for information regarding the action taken by the officials in any particular case or demand to see the official documents relating thereto, and he can further, if dissatisfied with such action, or for any other reason, give notice of motion to raise a discussion on the subject at a Board meeting. Further, when important cases of a special or unusual character

29th May, 1913.]

Mr. W. J. M. SKEWER, M.A., Litt.D., LL.D., examined.

[Continued.]

come under official notice they are discussed specially by the Commissioners, all the documents and other papers relating to the matter being submitted to the meeting. Of course, all proposals involving changes of rules or alterations in the principles of the administration are fully considered by the Board, due notice being given. Important questions of principle are frequently referred for special discussion and consideration to sub-committees of the Board. In pursuance of the system of administration just described a report from an Inspector (whether a chief inspector or one of lower rank) is, in the first instance, considered by the examiner, and such action is then taken on it as may be in accordance with the rule or principle laid down by the Board that is applicable to the case. If the application of such rule or principle presents any difficulty the matter is referred to the secretary and by him to the Resident Commissioner, who determines what action is suitable to the case. If the circumstances require any decision of a serious nature it is brought before the next meeting of the Board as a provisional order for confirmation. Suppose now the case of an appeal from a teacher against the report of an inspector. This appeal, which is forwarded by the manager, is first carefully read by the examiner, and is then referred by him to the inspector concerned for such observations in explanation or fuller details, as may seem to the latter to be necessary to explain his actions. When the inspector's reply is received, the teacher's statement and this reply are carefully considered by the examiner and by one of the secretaries and submitted to me. If a prima facie case in favour of the teacher's statement appears to be made out, an inspector of higher rank is deputed to visit the school. But if the inspector's explanation appears to dispose satisfactorily of the teacher's objections, the appeal is not granted. The substance of the inspector's reply is, however, sent to the manager for the teacher's information, and it is, of course, open to him to put forward objections or further additional facts if he thinks fit. It cannot, however, be amended, nor was it ever contemplated, that the most effect of an appeal against an inspector should necessarily require an inspection by an officer of higher rank.

11586. Do you think it would be reasonable (and this is a point that was raised by Sir Hiram Wilkinson) that when the inspector's further report came in it should be sent to the teacher before the case was closed?—I cannot say that that ever occurred to me.

11587. The CHAIRMAN.—That, coming up two or three times?—But you must consider that when a person has a grievance it is very likely that a discussion of it might go indefinitely, and what would be gained by it? Extracts from the report of the inspector are sent to the teacher who may send up a rejoinder. This is sent to the inspector for a further report. If that must be sent to the teacher, and if the latter may make a rejoinder, where would be the end?

11588. You get fuller information or more detailed information in this supplemental report, as I may call it, from the inspector, and I think it really looks only reasonable that the teacher, who was complained of in the first instance, should be furnished with a copy?—I have no objection to do that.

11589. But it has not been done?—Not before the case is decided.

11590. Mr. HENRY.—Of course, you are aware that the Belfast teachers felt greatly aggrieved by the fact that when the inspectors sent in that statement in reply to their deputations, they had not an opportunity of seeing the reply of the inspectors?—Yes.

11591. The CHAIRMAN.—They wrote to ask for that report?—The refusal was the action of the Board, not mine; of course, I know that that does not make any difference.

11592. Mr. HENRY.—But still they felt a grievance in the matter?—But as a fact, they got the inspectors' replies.

11593. The CHAIRMAN.—They got them in the end?—In the beginning; I think.

11594. Mr. HENRY.—They did not get the inspectors' reply to the deputations?—Indeed, they did.

11595. They got it surreptitiously, I think?—Very much so; they got the substance of it from a Commissioner who has been here.

11596. Sir HERMAN WILKINSON.—I might just make a remark with regard to that point, as my name has been mentioned. You are quite familiar, I have no doubt, with the changes introduced into the procedure of the Law Courts with regard to the documents that are put in by plaintiff and defendant. In former times it went on so far that there might be eight or nine of these statements and replies, ending with what was known as a sur-rejoinder, as well as I remember. Under the new system they abolished that. In some systems it is now simply a case of statement and answer; in some others, statement, answer and reply. Of course, where they are cut down in that way, it is contemplated that the matter will be thrashed out in public; but there is no opportunity given to the teacher here in this particular case of thrashing it out before an inspector, as it were, so that the suggestion I made here to some of the witnesses whom we have had before us, was whether it would not be desirable to allow the teacher to have the reply of the inspector, the whole charge against him (for it amounts practically under the system which is now in force to a charge of inefficiency against the teacher), and that he should have all the remarks of the inspector against him, so that he might reply to them before the final decision. In this case, what occurs is that the teacher complains of the report sent to him (and he does not receive the whole of the report) and his complaint is then sent to the inspector, and the inspector says something, the whole of which, is not, I understand, sent to the teacher at any time, and the teacher's case is decided upon statements made behind his back (I do not use the word offensively), his case may be determined on statements which he has not before him, with the result that he is fined for an offence upon evidence the whole of which he has not heard. It becomes a fine for an offence in practice, because it is a refusal to give him that instrument which he considers he has earned, and which you have stated that in many of these cases he might consider himself fairly entitled to earn. As my name has been mentioned, I want to put that point of view forward. Perhaps you will think it over, and see whether a claim might not be made?—Reasonably, I should be very anxious to go very far in that way, because I am always most anxious that the teacher should get full information of everything he is charged with; but it would involve (and I do not say that this would necessarily be an insurmountable difficulty) a complete change of attitude on the part of the Board with regard to the reports of their inspectors. Up to the present, for the last 80 years, the reports of the inspectors have been treated as of such a confidential nature that in no circumstance would the Board consent to publish them. Even on an Order of the High Court, they won't surrender the reports, as you know, but they send down some official to read whatever parts of the reports the judge may think necessary; but the official never lets the reports out of his hand. You have had experience of that yourselves here in the Clondalk case, this report which Mr. Lemass refused to surrender. If the Board approves your suggestion, the inspectors will have to be informed that they must write their reports with full knowledge that they are no longer confidential documents.

11597. Of course, we are all aware in public services that confidential reports are in existence for the information of the heads of departments; but in this particular case, here is an action covering irremediably affecting the teacher, and the teacher is not informed fully of the basis upon which the conclusion is arrived at, and the point is that the teacher might be able to explain something in the further report of the inspector which would alter the decision of the Board with regard to the granting or not granting of that increment?—Certainly.

11598. The CHAIRMAN.—In the case of the report of the second inspector, might not an extract be sent to the teacher on some new matter arising?—But it is sent; no doubt, after the case has been decided.

11599. After the case has been decided?—A decision at a Board like ours does not resemble a law of the Medes and Persians; it is not like a decision in the Law Courts.

11600. The BANNER OR BOSS.—If the manager sends up new information could the case be re-opened?—



Certainly, that is constantly done, I am most careful myself when dealing with these cases to act in this way. Whenever I happen to get any new information, either in letters from a manager or at an interview—and very often they come to see me and tell me things about the teacher which I did not know from the official document—I make it a point to bring the case again before the Board, so that it may reconsider it.

11606. Mr. HIRSH WILKINSON.—Might not that be avoided by some regulation such as I suggested?

Mr. STARKIE.—Would not the teacher be more impressed with the fairness of the proceeding if he got the supplemental statement before the decision was taken?—I do not think there is any insuperable difficulty in doing what you suggest.

11607. Mr. HIRSH WILKINSON.—I wish to say before you, Dr. Starkie, that I think that the question of the confidential nature of the report hardly comes in. If the report is finally sent to the teacher the question of the confidential nature of that report really is immaterial, because it is as confidential on the one side as it is on the other?—But, as you know, we do not send the whole report.

11608. Mr. HARRISON.—Is the general report confidential?—Every report is confidential.

11609. But, as a matter of fact, you always send out that?—Only an extract.

11610. And do you decide how much will be sent out or does the inspector decide?—In the general report, as you can see from the form of the report in the Code, there is a minute at the end which is always sent, but the rest is confidential. The inspector is directed to draft up the minute at the end for the information of the teacher and manager.

11611. And that always goes?—Yes.

11612. The CHAIRMAN.—And we understand that he writes that, knowing that it is intended to be sent?—Certainly.

11613. Now, I think we may continue your evidence?—The Commissioners have ample knowledge of the character and efficiency of each individual inspector, and unless there is some serious reason for doubting their judgment or their bona fides when reporting upon a school, they do not consider it necessary or advisable in the public interest to subject their inspectors to indiscriminate revision at the mere request of the teacher. But if any reasonable doubt exists in the matter, steps are always taken to get the information of a more experienced official than the one complained of. Cases such as these, which are largely matters of expert knowledge, are not and never have been as a rule laid before the Board unless there is a question of principle involved, or unless I am of opinion that some special difficulty arises in the case. It may be remarked that in such matters no inspector or other official has any right to demand that the Resident Commissioner of the Board shall take his view of the matter. Under Rule 72 of the Code, no inspector, whether a chief or other inspector, has any authority to decide upon any question affecting a National school. These are matters solely for me, as representing the Board, and in accordance with the authority delegated to me, and in the last resort for the Board's approval. But, as already mentioned, it is open to any Commissioner to make inquiry into cases of this or any other character, and to demand to have them specially considered by the Board.

11614. Mr. GOSSET.—The delegation you referred to is the delegation of 1902?—But there always has been delegation. The delegation of 1902 did not greatly extend my powers, but only consolidated and recognised what was rather doubtful before; for example, whether I had the power as head of the administration to retire a man of 60 years of age. They delegated that to me, subject to an appeal to the Board, on the principle that the Board cannot rid itself of its power as the final authority. Hence there is always an appeal to the Board. Thus, when I retired Mr. Downing, he appealed against my action. Individual Commissioners make a free use of their power to enquire into the details of administration, and one might almost say that it is impossible that any legitimate grievance on the part of anyone under the Board's authority could possibly be

kept from their knowledge. The question of appeals by teachers to the Board was carefully discussed by the Board in 1905, on the request of Mr. BIRALL. It was decided that it was impossible for them to be heard personally by the Board, for reasons which are well given in the following letter to me from the late Recorder of Belfast (November 18th, 1907):—"I am entirely opposed to giving the teachers any right of personal appeal to the Commissioners, or any of them. It would destroy the discipline of the service. If we cannot trust our inspectors, are we to inspect the schools ourselves?" It may be added that when a group of teachers—as in Belfast and in Tipperary—recently presented joint memoranda to the Board regarding their alleged grievances against the inspectors, these matters were fully considered by the Commissioners themselves, and it is important to point out that in demanding the present inquiry it is the charges made by the teachers were against matters which had been fully adjudicated upon by the Board itself and not merely against decisions taken on my sole responsibility. It has never been my policy to encourage individual appeals against the marking of inspectors, but rather to take measures (as in the circular of July, 1911) to obviate the necessity of appeals. That is, in my opinion the only way of dealing with this question. In 1902, when Mr. Dale, the present chief inspector of the English Board, was holding a governmental inquiry into the Irish national system, he was approached by a large number of the Irish inspectors, who represented to him that the habit of referring appeals, in many cases frivolous, of teachers for revision by inspectors of higher rank was fatal to their influence in a district, and destructive of their independence: a frequent allegation in the rank of an inspector, especially a senior inspector, diminished the confidence of the manager and teacher in his judgment. A chief inspector was not necessarily a better judge of a school than his subordinate; indeed, it was probable that, as he knew less of the teacher than the inspector of the district, his judgment was less likely to be influenced by the permanent aspects of a school than that of a man who had a long experience of the teacher's character and efficiency. Mr. Dale agreed with the inspectors, and he told me that, in England, appeals were rarely granted, as it was not thought necessary or desirable in the public interest to subject inspectors to indiscriminate revision at the mere request of the teacher. Independence of judgment and self-respect were likely to suffer if the inspector's judgment were liable to constant revision. As a result of this conversation I ordered that no investigation into the marking of an inspector should be undertaken by a chief inspector without my express order. There was nothing new in this, as it was really covered by the Rules for Chief Inspectors, viz., that no investigation can be held only on the Order of the Commissioners. I may quote here, as throwing light upon some of the objections to receiving appeals from individual teachers, a letter addressed to a senior inspector in June, 1904, who had complained at the action of Mr. Purser in respect of a school which he had inspected:—"The case you write about did come before me some months ago. The manager appealed against your examination, and called at the office, but did not see me. On looking over the papers I found that three years ago there was a similar appeal, which was referred to Mr. Purser. He differed from you in his judgment, and in the following year another inspector also took a higher view of the proficiency than you did. I may say that for some time past I have set my face against re-inspections of schools, which, I consider, are unfair to the first inspectors, and likely to lead to friction between the members of the staff. Consequently I refused to allow your results to be checked by Mr. Purser. On the other hand, as your report of three years ago had been referred to Mr. Purser, with the result I mentioned, I was compelled to take some action. I directed Mr. Purser to visit the school, and to examine it independently, but not to criticise the reliability of your examination. On the receipt of his report, I directed that the manager should be informed that no action would be taken until after the next annual visit, which should take the form of a full examination of the school. As I view the matter, there is no reflection on your efficiency at

29th May, 1933.]

Mr. W. J. M. SKEAR, M.A., Litt.D., LL.D., examined.

[Continued.]

an inspector. I carefully avoided all possibility of this by ordering an independent inspection, without reference to your report; and I have refused to draw your 'mark' on the school, although Mr. Furness's is higher than it. P.S.—I have seen your official letter since writing the above, and I regret that you should think the action of the Commissioner reflects on your work: nothing was further from our intention. We directed you to hold the examination next year individually, in order to bring home to the manager, in a way that cannot be questioned, the shortcomings of the school. This is the object of the individual examination." It may be added that appeals from teachers are not solely upon the subject of the marking of their schools; nor are those the most important: I myself receive personally 900 appeals in each year, most of which might as reasonably be placed before the Board as those touching inspection. There are hundreds of complaints on the subject of the conduct of managers, parents, other teachers, salaries, increments, fines, etc. The Board would not deal with these, even if it sat daily.

11610. THE CHAIRMAN.—Now, with regard to the means of access?—For some years past the formal resolutions of Teachers' Associations on matters touching their interests have been printed among the agenda and laid before the Board for their information at regular intervals. I also have frequently received deputations representative of the teachers for a discussion of various subjects of this kind. Deputations to me from the Teachers' Organisation ceased in 1909, their Committees having resolved to ask for no further interviews with me, in consequence of my having refused to receive any member of a previous deputation, which had broken confidence with me in the circumstances related in the following letter addressed to Miss Catherine Mahon, 5th December, 1910:—"Madam—I am desired by the Resident Commissioner to say, in reply to your letter which he received on the 21st ultimo, that he has no desire to enter into further discussion concerning the deputation of February, 1909. He wishes, however, to remind the Central Committee of the Teachers' Organisation that in Mr. Phelan's letter (July 14th, 1906) to their Secretary he laid down, in the following terms, the conditions on which he was willing to receive deputations:—'Before Dr. Sturges consents to receive that deputation, he will require to have an assurance that the proceedings at the interview will be regarded as confidential, as experience shows him that observations made in the course of past interviews have been disclosed, and that even anonymous accounts of what took place have been published. The Resident Commissioner further wishes to remind you that on the occasion of the deputation of February 6th, 1909, he spent a considerable time in explaining what he meant by 'confidential,' and his reasons for requiring that interviews with him should be treated as such. He pointed out that the untempered interchange of ideas was the chief value of interviews between the teachers and the head of the administration, and that this would become impossible if, as on many recent occasions, isolated expressions of his were published, possibly in a garbled form, and certainly without the careful qualifications which, though out of place in conversation, are indispensable in a statement intended for publication. The Resident Commissioner was asked by a member of the deputation, who, to the best of his belief, was yourself, whether he objected to a report of the proceedings for the purposes of the Organisation, and he replied that anything of the nature of a detailed confidential report was out of the question, as experience had shown that, in the absence of shorthand writers, verbal accuracy was unobtainable, and that its confidential nature could not possibly be preserved if communicated to some thousands of teachers; but that he would consent to a general report of the proceedings being circulated. Though the Resident Commissioner thought that in this preamble, and in his earlier correspondence with Dr. Clarke, he had made his position quite clear, he furthermore throughout the interview repeatedly and earnestly impressed on the deputations the confidential character of many of the remarks which were subsequently published in a garbled form by the Organisation. In view of these circumstances, the Resi-

dent Commissioner cannot but feel that 'the good name,' if not of the Central Committee, at any rate, of the deputations, is gravely affected by their having sanctioned the preparation of a 'verbatim report' of the interview, which he had expressly forbidden, and by having circulated it broadcast, without taking any precautions that its confidential character should be preserved. The Resident Commissioner regrets the decision which has been forced upon him by this violation of a definite understanding. He has always welcomed opportunities of discussing, with the representatives of the teachers, the defects of Primary Education; but he is convinced that such discussions lose their chief value when not conducted with the perfect freedom and candour which are the natural outcome of mutual confidence and good faith." Last summer the Commissioners themselves received a deputation from the Teachers' Association on the maternity question and gave a full hearing to their views. Short-hand reports have in recent years been taken of the proceedings at the teachers' interviews with me, and these have been afterwards circulated to the Board and fully considered. On two occasions last year the Board invited representatives of the teachers to confer with them on proposed modifications in the system of education. One of these conferences had reference to the institution of higher grade schools and advanced departments, and the other to Mr. Burrell's proposed scheme of scholarships for pupils of primary schools.

11611. Have you had any conference with teachers as to proposed new rules or changes to be made in your rules and regulations?—We have had conferences with regard to proposed new rules, for example, with regard to higher grade schools.

11612. That would go into your new rules?—They would, of course, if they were sanctioned.

11613. A question was discussed with two or three witnesses here as to whether some notice, say three months' notice, should be given of the publication of new rules, so as to allow time for representations to come up to you, or to give time for a meeting or conference with the teachers, such as we have had at the Intermediate Board?—Yes.

11614. Would that not get rid of some of the trouble?—At the Intermediate Board, as you know, there are certain conventions which are very carefully observed, that is to say, the confidential nature of the proceedings is pretty well recognised and observed; but even there, as we know, the information which the schools get as to a prospective rule very often leads to Parliamentary opposition. You know that very well.

11615. One or two cases?—Certainly; that is a very great difficulty. I think there would not be so much danger if we put questions before the teachers merely in general terms; but if we made known the actual rules before they are published, the Board would be abdicating its function altogether.

11616. But you do not object to the general principle?—I think it would be possible to do what I have suggested; but we could not inform the teachers beforehand that a rule was necessary, in order that they should start an agitation in the country. We could not carry on the administration at all if we were to do that.

11617. So that the proposal to give three months' notice, say, of the publication of rules would lead, you think, to an agitation that might compel you to withdraw them?—Certainly.

11618. Mr. COFFIN.—Are not the rules of the English Board laid before Parliament?—If we get Home Rule next year, I have no doubt that the rules of the Board (it won't be called the National Board) will be laid before Parliament.

11619. THE CHAIRMAN.—The Irish Parliament?—Yes.

11620. Mr. COFFIN.—Why not the rules of the National Board when those of the English Board are published?—I will give you the reason. The English Board has a Parliamentary representative, who is responsible for the policy of the Board, and loyally defends it; but our Parliamentary representative does not control our policy, and would not lift his finger to save us from perdition.

11621. Mr. KERRIN.—Does not the Chief Secretary answer for the rule of the National Board?—He certainly confirms them.

11622. Mr. HENRY.—But if an undesirable rule were sprung on the country would it not be better that there should be a discussion?

11623. Sir HERMAN WILKINSON.—You are aware of the rule with regard to statutory bodies, that they are compelled now to give 40 days notice of any rule which under the Act of Parliament they are enabled to issue. Parliament came to the conclusion that a body having the power to make rules should not make rules without giving notice to all concerned. You are familiar with the Act and I have it here. The requirement is that before the rule can come into operation at least 40 days notice must be given that there is such a rule drafted, and that a copy of the rule can be obtained at such and such a place, and that any body concerned (meaning a Corporation or similar body) can apply for a copy of the rule, and can make their representations to the rule-making authority, and the rule-making authority shall consider such representations when they are making their rule. It does not say that they are to act on the suggestions, but they are to consider the suggestions; and then Parliament in its wisdom has considered that every statutory body in the United Kingdom, Ireland included, should be laid under that obligation: does it not seem that there ought to be no great difficulty in applying it to the National Board?—Well, you see, Sir Herman Wilkinson, the National Board is unlike anything else in the universe; there is nothing else like it; we are under nobody. If you ask me under whose authority I am, I must say with the *Cynopole* of old that I owe allegiance to no man; or with the "reined man" in Aristotle that I am a law to myself. It is a very anomalous position, which, though not devoid of charm, is extremely uncomfortable. I am not an official but a member of the National Board. Mr. Birrell cannot give orders to me any more than he can to the National Board. Under our Charter my colleagues and myself are independent of Castle control.

11624. I am not suggesting for a moment that you are under an obligation or that the Board is under an obligation. What I am suggesting is that if Parliament in its wisdom considered it necessary that all those bodies to which it had given power to make rules should make the rules under this restriction, the adoption of such a restriction by the Board would scarcely be out of the ordinary course. I do not think I need press the matter—I quite understand your point of view, but it would require changes, as you know, since under Mr. Sealey's letter constituting us we are given power to make rules and to alter them in any way we like, irrespective of anybody.

11625. The CHAIRMAN.—And you act under that?—Certainly; the only rules about which we have to consult the Lord Lieutenant are what are called the fundamental rules, dealing with religion in the schools.

11626. I raised this question which Sir Herman has asked you about merely as a matter of policy, not of obligation?—I know that, but I cannot answer a question of this kind without asking my colleagues. I remember that on the last occasion it was mentioned one of my colleagues said exactly what I said a moment ago: "We will do that when we have got an Irish Parliament with a proper Parliamentary representative; but at present who is going to represent our point of view? We have nobody."

11627. Will you now proceed with your note on the subject of administration?—Yes. Since the storied change, made eleven years ago, there has not been a single complaint by any member that the Board has not had due control of the administration. I interpret the regulations in a very liberal spirit. In addition to bringing questions of principle before the Board, I invariably arrange that it shall decide directly upon all cases of the applications of principles which is likely to cause controversy. Thus, it is a rule in the Code that, in certain stated circumstances, unnecessary schools shall be discontinued; the carrying out of this rule in individual cases lies within my jurisdiction, but as this question is most controversial, I submit all cases in which the discontinuance of a school is at issue to a Committee of the Board, once in every quarter.

11628. A Committee of the Board?—Yes, and I report to the Board.

11629. Mr. CONYER.—How would it come within your jurisdiction?—In this way. According to the regulations of 1902, special cases of the application of a general rule would come to me. The Board laid down the principle that when a school is unnecessary in a district it should be discontinued. They also lay down that in considering whether a school is necessary or unnecessary one must take into account differences of religion between Catholics and Protestants; that is to say, we must not consider whether the Catholic children could find accommodation in a Protestant school, or vice versa, but whether the particular school is unnecessary to the particular denomination, Catholic or Protestant, as the case may be. That is a detail on which, as I say, I do not want to make a decision, because if I strike off such a school as being unnecessary, it is perfectly certain that some Commissioner interested in the school would raise the question at the Board. Thus, first of all, I should have the difficulty of coming to a decision myself, and then my decision would be questioned by some of my colleagues, and then a long controversy would ensue. Although rehearsed with the details of administration I do not always insist on my authority, as I am extremely anxious to avoid responsibility wherever I can.

11630. The CHAIRMAN.—You refer that to a Committee of the whole Board?—Certainly; to a Committee of the whole Board, which is practically equivalent to the Board, as anybody can attend. These are generally well attended; for example, 14 members were present at such a Committee last Tuesday. Again, it is a rule that books containing anything objectionable, politically or religiously, shall not be sanctioned. The carrying out of this principle in individual cases is fairly within my jurisdiction, but I do not treat it as so. All books specially produced for Irish National schools are sent round for the examination of each member of the Committee, and are then submitted to the Committee for sanction. Again, it was long the practice for the Resident Commissioner to nominate to the Board candidates for appointment to junior or senior inspectorships and other important offices; about seven years ago I altered this practice, so that at present they are interviewed by a Committee of the whole Board, who make the nomination to the Board. In a word, the Board is now kept in touch with the details of the administration to a greater extent than at any time in its past history. All answers to Parliamentary questions are submitted, in print, at each meeting; all resolutions from managers' and teachers' associations; full details are printed in respect of any important case, and circulated; every member is at liberty to raise any detail of mine if he is not satisfied with it. As some of the Commissioners receive in the course of the year hundreds of letters from teachers who fancy they have grievances, it is improbable that any doubtful decision of mine should remain long unquestioned. The usual practice of the members of the Board who is dissatisfied with any action taken by me under the rules is to discuss the case privately with me, and if, after discussion, his dissatisfaction is not removed, he is at liberty to bring the matter under the notice of the Board. Thus, in the much discussed Clonsilla case, Mr. Ward was opponent of my action from the beginning, but, although constantly urged by Mr. Power, he refused to raise it at the Board, as he expressed himself perfectly satisfied with the action which I proposed to take. As the character of the Office Committee has been misrepresented before this Committee, it is necessary to append a short explanation of its history and function. The Office Committee (then called Sub-Committee) was appointed in 1892 to supervise the details of administration. After the appointment of the first Resident Commissioner (Rev. Mr. Curle) on February 7th, 1893, the Committee became the Resident Commissioner.

11631. Mr. CONYER.—Had he the title of Resident Commissioner?—As far as I know he had. He was given rooms in Marlborough-street, and a horse and car, and £800 a year, and I think he was called Resident Commissioner. At any rate, I see in the report of the Power Commission he is spoken of as the

first Resident Commissioner. The other Commissioners had the right to be present at the meetings of the Sub-Committee, but they practically never availed themselves of it. The functions of the Committee are explained in the Report of the evidence given before the Powis Commission, e.g., Q. 2853:—"The Sub-Committee is the Resident Commissioner, and any member of the Board, but no member attends. The Committee deals with applications for aid to schools; all important cases arising out of reports forwarded by inspectors; suspensions, fines, severe admonitions. Less severe admonitions are not referred to it. The Reports of the Committee are merely laid on the table of the Boardroom, and are 'mere matters of form' so far as any significance of them by the Board is concerned." Q. 2937:—"The members of the Board know nothing of what takes place before the Sub-Committee." Q. 2947:—"The Resident Commissioner (Sir A. MacDonnell) stated:—'I conceive that if we were to present a great number of these routine matters, it would be impossible to get the Commissioners to go into them. Their whole time would be consumed in deciding upon matters that I think everyone will admit the chiefs of inspection and the secretaries, assisted by myself, would be able to settle much more satisfactorily than if there was a Board of twenty persons to examine into all these details with which they were very little acquainted.' Personally, I do not approve of Sir A. MacDonnell's statement that he assisted the secretaries, which inverts the proper relationship between the Resident Commissioner and his subordinates. In 1903 the Board abolished the term 'Office Committee' on the ground that it was not a Committee, but the Resident Commissioner, sitting permanently in his office; and, furthermore, that the phrase 'attended by the Secretaries, Financial Assistant Secretaries, and Chief Inspectors,' was misleading, as possibly conveying the idea that these officers were members of the Committee, and not officials who consulted the Resident Commissioner, not in Committee, but at all times of the day, whenever any questions of doubt arose. The relations of the secretaries, etc., to the Resident Commissioner were, in practice, not in the slightest degree altered by the resolutions of January, 1903. At present the secretaries, Accountant, and chief inspectors have access to me at all times, as in the days of the Office Committee. Touching the Board, the change in 1903 gave it full cognisance of the more important details of administration embodied in 'provisional orders,' both special and ordinary, which are printed among the agenda. Those, to be valid, must be passed at each meeting. Before 1900, everything in these Committees was done in such a way that any of the other nineteen Commissioners might know what was going on if he wished, but he rarely did wish. That is question 2852 of the Report of the Powis Commission.

11630. Now what is the next subject?—The Board's circulars. To shorten matters, I am perfectly willing to put that into the Appendix.

11634. You went very fully into these circulars yesterday?—Yes, but what I have to say here is this. The chief ideas of our new methods of inspection were developed in the circulars, and there are some passages which I think I ought to give you. Freedom of organisation and of teaching has been from the beginning the watch-word of the new system. Many of the circulars developed that, but I think I may save time by not reading these if you will be good enough to put them in the Appendix.\*

11635. Sir HENRY WATKINSON.—I think that will do, because you really went into a great deal of this yesterday, and we reviewed a number of the circulars?—Yesterday?

11636. Yes, the circular of 1911?—Not so much. 11637. You certainly spoke yesterday at very great length about tone in relation to inspection?—I remember saying that I thought tone was more easily ascertainable than the standard of reading, but I did not go fully into it.

11638. THE CHAIRMAN.—I think it would be better to go through the circulars?—Well, freedom of organisation and teaching has been from the beginning the watch-word of the new system. Thus, as early as March, 1900, the Board stated that "programmes should

be arranged with a view to the special circumstances of the localities"; in July, 1902 ("Revised Instructions to Inspectors"), it was ordered that class examination should take the place of individual examination; the pupils in the sixth standard should be allowed during a part of the day to study for themselves on special lines according to the occupations they had in view; the permanent aspects of the school should be chiefly noted; thus, "no undue weight should be laid upon some weakness in a particular subject; the reports should be well balanced so as to leave upon the teacher's mind a correct impression of the efficiency of the schools"; attention should be concentrated rather on the methods of the teacher than on the answering of the children: "you should carefully observe the manner of the teacher in directing the movements of his pupils, his power of command, his watchfulness as to the pupils' attitudes, his power of maintaining attention, his distinctness of examination, facility and clearness of expression, and his brightness and animation are such as should be the characteristic of the well-trained teacher; whether his schoolroom is orderly and tastefully kept and whether he is decent and tidy in his own person and dress, and tries to make his pupils imitate him in this respect" (Dec., 1904). "Tone" is the character of the school as impressed upon it by a teacher with those qualifications: "increments should be awarded when the work done in a school shows merit, and the general condition of the school is satisfactory" (May, 1906). The general and permanent rather than the accidental aspects of a school are also emphasised in the circular of March, 1906: "inspectors should recommend (for promotion) deserving principal teachers, whose efficiency, judged by the work done in their schools, by the general condition of the schools and out-offices as regards sanitation and hygienic arrangements, by the cleanliness and brightness of the schoolrooms, by their own neatness and that of their pupils, but the general discipline, etc., is satisfactory. Uniformity should be secured by attention to such general aspects of a school, as agreed upon at conferences; the senior inspector should aim to establish a fair and uniform standard of examination as regards schools inspected by himself and his colleagues. A rigid programme should not be exacted, but teachers should be encouraged to devote additional time and attention to the parts of the programme of which he had a good grasp (Jan., 1907). The spirit of the new system was well expressed to me in a letter from the Archbishop of Dublin, dated 10th Jan., 1900: "I think this also useful, viz., if we can keep clear of the results element. Suppose that this grant were made in some way dependent on points in school-keeping which were utterly ignored in the old system—such as order, neatness, general appearance of the children. The results system was shockingly unequal in its working, where real education was in question." It would be difficult to find a clearer exposition of what we mean by "tone" than in this passage. As a result of the deputation of Belfast teachers, it was felt by the Board that, although their main charges against the inspectors had broken down, there might be something in their allegation that the methods of the results system were still followed by some of the inspectors. Hence the warning (June, 1911) against paying too much attention to minor matters, and to take broader views. It was pointed out that the most important factors in determining opinion were not the proficiency of the pupils in a limited amount of book-knowledge, but what is universally admitted to be the aim of all school education, viz., the formation of character, the training in good habits, and the development of the pupils' intelligence. The acquisition of information is of itself of value only as it leads to these. Emphasis is laid on tone, which is that condition of a school whereby it is indicated that it is performing its proper function. It was pointed out that the tone of a school depends on the character of the teacher, which impresses itself upon the habits and character of the children. Though, like most other good things, such as "knowledge" and "truth," not easily defined, it is ascertainable from its fruits, such as good discipline, *esprit de corps*, neatness and good order in work, good address, adaptability, shrewdness, and capacity for independent effort on the part of the pupils,

satisfactory appearance of the school-room and surroundings, etc. As there is no absolute standard of tone, careful attention should be given to the social conditions of the pupils and the character of the surroundings. Thus, a higher tone should be expected in a convent than in an ordinary school. As everything depends on the character of the teacher, a teacher, of whose high character the inspector is well assured, should be largely independent. As the character of a teacher is not likely to alter from year to year, the mark on a school, which has continued unchanged for some years, should not be lowered on account of an accidental or temporary decline in the proficiency in any particular standard or subject of instruction. As to the proper attitude of the inspector to the teacher, all the circulars strike the same note: thus (28th Nov., 1900) "all the Commissions report is that the teachers should do their best according to the facilities they have at present, and in the spirit and within the scope of the new programme"; (30th October, 1906) "you should be very moderate in your requirements in view of the heavy difficulties to be overcome"; (July, 1906) "cultivate friendly relations with both managers and teachers by a kindly and sympathetic manner"; (26th June, 1906) "incidental reports should rather deal with the good points of the school, and any striking merits noticed, than with defects"; (Jan., 1907) "inspectors and other officers of the Board are not justified in dictating to teachers or reproving them. Advice or warning should be given in a kindly manner"; (June, 1911) "to a conscientious teacher a word of commendation, when merited, is more effective than the directing of his attention to a great number of faults"—the inspector should endeavour to increase the teacher's feelings of self-respect—"the success or failure of a school to do its proper work depends almost wholly upon the teacher, and it is essential that he should have the respect of the children, whose destinies are largely in his hands." As there has been much discussion as to the meaning of "tone" in the circular of June, 1911, I wish to add the following note:—"The 'tone' of a school may be defined as that quality in the school work which is shown by (a) the production and development of high moral character in the pupils, and (b) their training in good habits. Thus, if a school produced successful results in these respects, its tone would be described as 'good,' and vice versa. There is nothing unusual or inappropriate in the use of the word 'tone' to express a quality of this kind in the work of a school. It is frequently so used by educational writers. Thus, in a memorandum put in by Sir John Strickland in 1897 before the Commission of Manual and Practical Instruction, he ascribes the use of the word 'tone' in a similar way to Matthew Arnold. The following is the passage referred to:—"In the very first years of the operation of the revised code (introduced in 1882 in England), its defects were more than hinted at by men whose opinion was entitled to respect. Matthew Arnold, e.g., said that it might have other advantages, but undoubtedly and of necessity it would substitute a more mechanical system of inspection for the old scheme of obtaining a measure of the general intellectual life and tone of the school. (Appendix to report of Manual Commission, page 137). I cannot verify this statement in Arnold's works, but it must have been written in one of his General Reports on the state of education in England in the early years of the revised system in that country. It is noteworthy that in these reports of Mr. Arnold be continually adverts to the ill effects of the system of individual examination of pupils on the 'intellectual life' of the school. Such statements are found passing in his reports for the Blue Book from 1888 onwards. Some critics of the Board seem to think that in the circular of June, 1911, there is an opposition unduly pressed between tone and book-knowledge. This opposition is more apparent than real, because it is evident that, as most of the formal training of a school is required by the pupils through the medium of book-work, it is necessary that the book-work should be well done if good habits are to be inculcated in the pupils. For example, such habits as those of application to work, diligence, perseverance, and accuracy must be impressed on the pupils by regular and careful work in the preparation and study of literary tasks, and will

vary in intensity with the care and attention bestowed on these tasks. It is practically impossible, therefore, that in a school which neglects careful book-work the pupils may yet appear to have acquired such good habits as those mentioned. The object of the stress laid on tone in the circular is to ensure that the aims of school work shall be kept fully in view by the teachers and inspectors and not be overlooked or neglected in the daily fulfilment of the usual round of lessons and exercises. It was ever a general complaint under the results system that the teacher concentrated his attention solely on preparing the pupils to answer questions at examinations, and that everything relating to training the characters and habits of the pupils received only incidental, if any, attention. Ever since 1900 I have attempted to impress on teachers and inspectors the main ideas underlying the policy of the Board. From the first my aim has been to encourage independence among the children, the teachers, and the inspectors: "the results system has made half a million of children in each year the drudges of the teachers, the teachers the drudges of the inspectors, and the inspectors the drudges of the office" (Feb. 1906); "under this system the subjects of the programme were prescribed from outside, and the iron limitations imposed by the Board allowed little play for the individual bent of the teacher or for the varied tastes of the pupils. The excellence produced by the spur of examination was but fleeting, and the rigidity of the programme inevitably resulted in that uniformity and monotony of training which has paralysed the intellects of a whole generation" (ib.); "a school is a living thing, and must be judged as such" (ib.); "the teacher should be absolutely unfettered in the choice of methods of instruction" (ib.); "Freedom and elasticity are vital to good teaching, and it is worth while sacrificing a good deal of the economy exacted by an examination test in exchange for the advantages of intellect, the spirit of initiative and independence, the slow but continuous development which a less rigid training fosters" (ib.); "By restoring freedom to the inspectors and teachers alike we wish to remove the source of friction between them" (ib.). "The aim of education, according to Locke, is not to fill the mind with information, but to 'open and dispose the minds of our scholars as may best make them capable of any trade or profession when they apply themselves to it'" (Oct., 1907). "Under the new system inspectors will be raised to a higher plane and to a purer air. The inspector will view the work done in each school according to its possibilities and not according to the demands of a rigid programme. He will look upon himself as the adviser and helper, and not as the task-master of the teacher. His aim will be, not so much to inflict penalties for shortcomings directed in examinations, as to point out the causes of the defects in the instruction and management, and what is more important, to suggest suitable remedies. At subsequent visits he will direct attention to what he noted at former visits, and, in conference with teachers and managers, will suggest measures to secure the desired improvements" (ib.); "The results examination reduced all knowledge to the absolute minimum that would ensure the full payment of fees" (Sept., 1909). The abolition of individual examination will not, as it is alleged, encourage laziness; rather under the new system of inspection "we hope to eliminate the worldliness; we shall endeavour to maintain a much stricter supervision over the individual members of the staff than has hitherto been thought necessary" (ib.); "so far as it goes being true that the lazy and inefficient will be better off than before, if I fail to see what place there will be for them, if the inspectors do their duty"; "all hardness must, however, be avoided; we intend, at least at first, to deal tenderly and sympathetically with the teachers" (ib.). Mere book-knowledge is not the aim of the new system, but "the formation of character, the cultivation of taste, the disinterested love of learning" (ib.), all these are summed up in the word "tone." Literary, rather than practical excellence, has hitherto been, to too great an extent, the aim of our schools: "our first masters in philosophy are our feet, our hands, our eyes; and these require a training which they do not get" (Aug., 1911). Everything depends on the character of the teacher; "an inspiring

personally may work miracles on the training of unformed minds" (ib.), "while in the hands of an ordinary teacher primary education is an elaborate method of turning out automata, possessed of only the rudiments of knowledge, who are abandoned to their own devices at the very age when the work of genuine education should begin" (ib.). Mere "lured-studies," however, are not enough, as the aim of the State is not merely "to live," but "to live well," and of educating to teach not only rightly to engage in business, but to spend one's leisure nobly (ib.). Thus "judgment" not "information" is the goal of true education; as Montaigne says: "unless his judgment is sounder I would rather say scholar had employed his time in tennis" (ib.). In fact, the scholar's mind is not a white sheet of paper to be inscribed with whatever education the teacher chooses; rather it is a living organism, which should be developed; thus self-realisation is the true aim of education. As Ruskin says: "It is not teaching people to know what they do not know; but to believe as they do not believe." The old system of treating the child as a putcher to be filled has been tried and found wanting; learning is a drug in the market, while capacity for action is priceless, as being rarely found. See the Report of the Poor Law Commission: "our expensive elementary education, which is costing £20,000,000 a year, is having no effect on poverty, it is not developing self-reliance or selfthought in the character of the children, and it is in fact persuading them to become clerks rather than artisans. It is not in the interest of the humanity to produce by our system of education a class of manual work and a taste for clerical or for intermittent work, when the vast majority of those so educated must maintain themselves by manual work." After all, the only searching examination is that of real life; and, if we fail in that, all anatomical dissections are mere vanity.

11639. We have had it in evidence that the counsel to the inspectors about not interfering with the methods of the teacher has not always been obeyed?—I suppose it is the experience of everybody that he rarely can get people to do exactly what he wants.

11640. Mr. HENRY.—One thing has struck me with reference to all those circulars, that you had to repeat substantially the same directions, admirable directions I would say; but does it not look as if you felt all the time that they were being disobeyed?—I have often felt that.

11641. The CHAIRMAN.—I asked that of Mr. Dilworth and he denied that he felt it;—I am not answerable for Mr. Dilworth; I have spent many years travelling round the schools and I am convinced that they are not fully carried out in many cases.

11642. Mr. HENRY.—What I think is that it is not a desirable thing to interfere with the initiative of a teacher when he is doing fairly good work?—You are appealing to one converted in my case.

11643. But I am appealing to the unconverted when I appeal to people outside?—Possibly. Inspectors are no wiser than anybody else. In dealing with people I find that though it may be logically sufficient to drive in a nail only once, if it is to hold in practice you have to drive it in once a month.

11644. The CHAIRMAN.—Another thing we heard from one set of managers was that their teachers complained that they were distracted by the recommendation of different methods by successive inspectors?—That I say is the result of personal visits. If I had not gone round the schools, I might not have discovered any of these things. Possibly some of the inspectors, like Mr. Hynes, do not like the supervision which I exercise, but in my opinion it is productive of enormous good. For example, from my examination of the observation books I came to the conclusion (a conclusion which I embodied in the 1911 circular) that the notes left by the inspectors should be much shorter than they were. I generally find in the case of conscientious inspectors (especially when they write a good hand) that they fill up the observation books with 16 up to 26 heads of suggestions. The teachers often are quite lost in the mass of advice, and that was the reason that in the 1911 circular we directed that the inspector should not draw attention to more than two or three shortcomings at a time, and then should assure

himself that these are carried out, instead of attempting to write a whole treatise on method at every visit.

11645. Mr. HENRY.—I was told by one teacher of experience that the inspector went into the school with a book of "Notes for Teachers" in his hand. The teacher taught a lesson in his presence and he then said: "You have taught an excellent lesson; but it is not in accordance with the method laid down here in this book of notes and therefore I must give you a bad mark"?—If what you say is true, I can only say the inspector was an ass. Such an inspector ought to have got a bad mark himself, since he had not read our instructions. In the preface to the Notes for Teachers we say that the methods suggested are not obligatory on anybody.

11646. I know that, but the difficulty is that I am afraid that throughout the country they are largely compulsory?—On the other hand, if I may ask a question—can you suggest how the Board could make people understand and follow instructions printed year after year in clear and categorical language?—What more can we do?

Mr. HENRY.—Well, I think there could be more done.

11647. The CHAIRMAN.—Do you ever issue a circular to teachers of the kind you issue to inspectors?—Circulars about what?

11648. About any of those things we are talking of?—The teachers are able to read quite as well as the inspectors. Why did not the teacher you speak of refer the inspector to the first page of the introduction to the Notes for Teachers?

11649. Mr. HENRY.—I am afraid it would not improve his position?—At any rate, he would have had the best of the argument.

11650. The CHAIRMAN.—You were going to say something about a uniform standard of inspection when we adjourned?—Yes. The importance of securing a uniform standard of inspection was present to the minds of the Commissioners from the very beginning of the new system in 1900, and the matter has frequently been made the subject of official instructions to the inspectors in the years that have since intervened. The earliest step taken was to secure that under the new system the inspectors should have more frequent opportunities of conferring together and with the chief inspectors, who were primarily responsible for the maintenance of uniformity with regard to their work. Under the results system there were sixty-six inspection districts in Ireland, each in charge of an inspector who very rarely met or consulted his colleagues and was, as a rule, brought into contact with his official superiors only on the somewhat infrequent occasions of the visits of the head inspectors, of whom there were six altogether. Under the new system the country was re-distributed into 22 circuits, each in charge of a senior inspector, who took the place of the old head inspector, and two district inspectors.

11651. Did the old head inspectors hold conferences?—I think so, but I really do not know much about them. Mr. Healy would know that.

Mr. HENRY.—Oh, yes; they did.

11652. The CHAIRMAN.—They were in charge of 11 districts?—Yes.

11653. Did they call their men together?—I should say so. It was in their instructions to do so; but I cannot speak of that as within my own knowledge.

11654. Mr. HENRY.—I think they called the clerks together, and they held check examinations?—At any rate, such conferences became much more regular, as far as the senior inspectors were concerned, in 1909. Under the new system, the country, as I have said, was re-distributed into 22 circuits, each in charge of a senior inspector, who took the place of the old head inspector, and two district inspectors. All the circuit inspectors resided at the same centre, and it was expected that this arrangement would secure frequent occasions for a comparison of methods and standards of inspection. Moreover, each of the three sub-divisions of the circuit was in charge of each inspector for one year only at a time, a change taking place in the area of work assigned to each official year by year. The chief inspectors were also directed to have conferences with all the inspectors at least once a year. In this way, it was thought that each school would in

three years have come under the judgment of three different inspectors, so that any possible misjudgment of the teacher's work on the part of one inspector would be corrected by the opinions of his two colleagues. In this way the Board sought to provide that the mark on the school should be the product of the mature judgment of at least two inspectors: thus the Archbishop of Dublin wrote to me, when this arrangement was being discussed in 1900:—"The fact that the head (viz., senior) inspectors will be much more free than formerly to visit the schools of their whole district, enabling us to have with care two judgments on such points, ought to secure the effective working of such a plan (viz., to secure uniformity)." This system, which had many merits, never secured a fair trial on account of the opposition of the chief and other inspectors. And, indeed, in practice it was soon found that it had several disadvantages. Insistence at one centre in each circuit necessitated lengthy journeys and long periods of absence from home on the part of the staff. An annual change of inspectors was moreover unpopular with the managers, who disliked the constant change of inspectors, and also with the officers concerned, who felt that they never became sufficiently closely acquainted with their schools to carry on their work with the best results.

11655. The CHAIRMAN.—It has been alleged that under your present system the circuit inspectors remained too short a time to get acquainted with the schools.—They remain as long a time in the circuits as is possible, consistently with their rights to promotion. That is the principle on which we work. We like to leave the inspectors unchanged as long as possible; but if a better district is vacant, and a man asks for it, or we think he has a right to it, we transfer him. For example, there is always a desire to move to such cities as Belfast and Dublin on account of the facilities for education which these centres afford.

11656. Do any of them remain as long as the old district inspectors did?—I think so; for instance, Mr. Weply was eight years to Kerry. I could mention many other similar cases.

11657. Mr. HENLY.—We had a case here of one school in Belfast inspected five or six successive years by five or six different inspectors.—That is quite possible. There are different ways of looking at these things. For example, Mr. Birrell wrote to me last year on the subject of inspectors. An attack had been made in Parliament on the inspection system. Mr. Birrell defended them on that occasion; but he wrote to me after the debate somewhat as follows:—"The persons for all this trouble is to move your inspectors about more rapidly, for if you have got a nasty inspector, the sooner you get rid of him the better." To continue. The centre-system gradually fell into disuse, one or two district inspectors being located as circumstances permitted in minor centres within the circuit, and the annual change of section was abolished. This state of things continued until 1906, when a modification of the circuit-system was brought into operation. The country was still divided into 22 circuits, but each circuit was now re-divided into two sections, each of which was to be in charge of one of the two district inspectors attached to the circuit. The senior inspector was required to undertake the inspection of one-fifth of the schools in each section in each year, so that in a period of five years he would have made a complete circuit of the schools under his control. In addition to this, he had special charge of the model schools, and was required to deal with special cases of an important character, besides exercising supervision over the work of his colleagues. This system with one or two developments (which I will explain later on) is in force at the present time. Meanwhile, the importance of periodical conferences was enjoined in several circulars to inspectors. Thus, in July, 1902, the inspectors of each circuit were instructed to confer every month, and one of these conferences in each year was to be held by the chief inspector. In July, 1903, and in April, 1904, all the senior inspectors were called together to a conference held at the office in Dublin. You said you got the report of the conference in July, 1903. I do not know whether you got the report of the more important conference in 1904.

11658. The CHAIRMAN.—No, we did not hear of it for a long time; it came out only the other day.—I have got it here. (Witness hands in report of Conference of 1904.)

11659. Does that deal with uniformity?—I may say in explanation of the fact that the question of uniformity was submitted to inspectors a second time; that I was not satisfied with the results of the conference in 1903. The inspectors misinterpreted to some extent the views of the Board, so that I found it desirable to draw up this agenda paper for their consideration at the meetings of April 1904 and following days. (Witness reads agenda.) In the previous year the inspectors took into account, or thought they ought to take into account, in assessing the value of a school, the state of the school buildings; but I strongly disapproved of that, and I told them so. We tried to make this clear afterwards in the annual report, but not so clearly as might have been done. I thought, and the Board thought too, that the faulty condition of the buildings ought to be reckoned in the teachers' favour and not against him.

11660. That is the famous Clause 11?—Yes; such things ought to be construed in his favour, not against him. Hence we never approved of the senior inspectors' recommendations with regard to the merit marks in 1903. We never acted on them. As you see, there is nothing in the report of 1904 about the buildings; but there is much about cleanliness and such things, for which the teachers are responsible.

11661. Mr. HENLY.—Mr. Dilworth told us that after the conference in 1903 each senior inspector assembled his colleagues and told them the conclusions arrived at. Now, how could they have acted on those conclusions of your subsequent conference?—I do not know what evidence Mr. Dilworth has for that statement; possibly they did in 1903. I really do not know. It is very hard ten years afterwards to recall the exact facts unless I have the documents. But it is clear from this document that I was dissatisfied with the recommendations of 1903, because I called the inspectors together again on exactly the same subjects, and on the second occasion I delivered an address to them, in which I explained my views. It is possible that in the early days there was some looseness about these questions. There was a prevalent feeling which I had long since until I recently got hold of a letter of one of my colleagues, that although it was unfair that the teacher should be marked on account of the unsatisfactory condition of the buildings, yet the most effective way to get the buildings put in proper repair was to let the teachers know that they would suffer in their salaries because of the neglect of somebody else. That was the view held by some, but I must say I was opposed to it.

11662. The CHAIRMAN.—It is a very unfair kind of punishment.—I agree with you. I won't read you the letter of my colleague, in which he argued the matter at full length.

11663. In favour of that?—Yes; but you will see from this report that even ten years ago I certainly held the opposite view, and I defy you to find a case during the last decade in which a teacher has suffered on account of the buildings. Some of the best teaching is done in some of the worst school buildings; for instance, at Kilmacneigh, near Gungaharra. It is one of the worst buildings in Ireland; yet the teacher is marked "very good." The children have peacefully no desks, and there are holes in the door and the roof, through which water comes in, yet the teacher got "very good."

Mr. HENLY.—Who was responsible for that?

The BISHOP OF ROSK.—That is on the border of Cork and Kerry and one of the most beautiful places in the three Kingdoms.

11664. The CHAIRMAN.—Were there any other conferences of senior inspectors held except those two?—One was held on the 10th of December, 1903. That was mainly for the purpose of drawing up the programmes which we issued in 1904. I had also two conferences with the Teachers' Organisation on that subject. The programmes of 1904 are partly the result of their wisdom.

11665. Conferences are again mentioned in a circular of March, 1906?—That is a conference between inspec-

tern. I did not bring them up to Dublin after 1904, as it is a very disturbing thing to take men away from their districts for a fortnight at a time.

11605. The CHAIRMAN.—Will you now continue?—Yes. During the conferences of 1903 and 1904, which extended over a fortnight, the question of a uniform standard of inspection was specially considered, and an agreement was arrived at regarding the value to be allotted to the different merit marks that might be assigned to the schools and teachers. On their return to their centres, the senior inspectors called their colleagues together and gave them instructions regarding the results arrived at in Dublin. In a circular to the senior inspectors, dated 8th of March, 1906, the following expressions are found:—"The senior inspector will be responsible for the punctual and efficient discharge of the inspection-work throughout the circuit, and it should be his aim to establish a fair and uniform standard of examinations as regards schools inspected by himself and by his colleagues. The conferences, of which there should be two in the year, and the frequent opportunities which he will have when going round the circuit of conferring separately with each of the inspectors associated with him will, it is hoped, enable him to secure such uniformity." The same matter was adverted to in a further circular to inspectors dated January, 1907, in which the following sentences occur:—"For the purpose of securing uniformity of standard and general principles of inspection the senior inspector and his colleagues should hold periodical conferences. Two, or at most three, such conferences in a year should be sufficient. . . . For the purpose of arranging a due standard of examination the senior inspector and his colleagues may occasionally visit and inspect the schools together." Notwithstanding these repeated injunctions to inspectors the question of a uniform standard still pre-occupied the minds of the Commissioners. Early in 1907 the question was under consideration of asking the Government to sanction the appointment of three or four inspectors, to be styled "provincial inspectors," who would have supervision of five or six circuits each, and would thus be able to correct any divergence from a fair standard of inspection. This proposal was not then further pursued, as it was hoped that the provision of a motor car for the use of the Resident Commissioner and the chief inspectors would enable frequent visits to be made every year to a large number of schools, so that any abuse that might grow up would be corrected. I should like to say with regard to that, that although the Treasury have refused the motor car for the use of the Department, I am allowed to employ one for 80 days in the year, in fact as far as £200 goes. With regard to the appointment of three or four provincial inspectors, I do not think our proposal was a good one; as usual, it was spoiled by our extreme desire for economy. We proposed that the divisional inspectors should cost only £200 a year, 250 each, in addition to their salaries; but I think it is clear enough that if we took one in each province out of the senior inspectors and told him to go round the circuits, in order to supervise the work of the inspectors, he would have to neglect the work that he is doing at present.

11607. His own circuit?—Yes. I think it is pretty clear that one man in each province would be wanted, as far as his own circuit was concerned. If anything is to be done, I would much prefer that we should be allowed to appoint two brand new men as assistant chief inspectors, or something of that kind. In this way there would be practically four chief inspectors in Ireland, two at headquarters, and two assistant chief inspectors, one in Belfast and one in Cork. These two men would have no work to do except supervision; the chief inspectors might, in addition, carry out the special duties that occupy a lot of their time, examining training colleges and that sort of thing. The present chief inspectors have not got nearly enough time to supervise satisfactorily the work of the senior inspectors.

11608. And the other chiefs would be free for all their?—My proposal would double the value of the chief inspectors.

11609. I understand that at first you proposed these four divisional inspectors as new and separate officials?—No. It rarely happens that we can prepare what we believe to be ideally best for education. As it was,

we did not get our divisional inspectors, although they would cost only £200 a year; so that it is not very likely that we should have got them if they were to cost £2,500 a year. As I said, to do any good they would have to be in addition to the present staff. On this understanding I think two would be enough, so that there would be two chief inspectors, with two assistant chief inspectors. The two assistants might get £750 a year, while the chief inspectors would get £800. But to return to the question of uniformity. In June, 1911, the Board had under special consideration the apparent absence of uniformity in the Belfast circuit, and it issued a special circular to the inspectors, repeating, and in some points amending the more important previous instructions. In this circular they laid special stress on the importance of not altering the merit mark of a school without grave reason. "The lowering of the merit mark of any school that has maintained a high standard for a considerable time should not be lightly determined upon, and such lowering, if necessary, should denote a deterioration in the tone of the school rather than an accidental or temporary decline in the proficiency in any particular standard or subject of instruction." As present, if a mark is lowered, after it has continued high for some years, we often ask for an explanation from the senior inspector. The examiners have been instructed to draw attention to cases of this kind.

11610. Calling your attention to it?—Calling the attention of the secretary, who consults me. I always insist that where the school has had a very good record, say "very good," for four or five years, and there is a sudden fall to "good," the senior inspector should be asked whether he has considered the fact that the mark has been "very good" for a long time, and whether the fall in the mark is due to a permanent decline in the school and not to an accidental drop in one particular subject, that could be remedied in a few months.

11611. Is it the duty of the examiner to call attention to an alteration of marks now?—Certainly; I have been drawing attention to that lately.

11612. Mr. HENRY.—That is since this Committee set?—Possibly.

11613. Mr. CONYER.—What exactly is meant by the consciousness of the senior inspector—is he bound to allow the mark to be lowered when he next visits the school?—The circular says that the senior inspector "may" visit the school. I think that is the word. It is difficult to say "must," because the senior inspector may know the school, and may not require to supplement his previous knowledge. If you will allow me, I should like to say that it was not since the sitting of this Committee that I began to ask the senior inspector whether he had visited the school himself. As I have told you already, I have the greatest possible objection to the lowering of the mark of a school which has maintained a good standard for a considerable time.

11614. Mr. HENRY.—Take the case of Dolphin's Barn?—I know that Dolphin's Barn case pretty well.

11615. Did the senior inspector visit there?—Yes, the senior inspector did; he certainly did. Mr. McSwenny said in his letter to the Press that the decline in the school was entirely due to the adoption of the educational methods suggested of the senior inspector.

11616. But when did Miss Burke give the final report that led to the dismissal of the teachers?—The senior inspector did not consider his report, as he had already expressed his own opinion on the teachers. But you remember that school never got more than "fair."

11617. Well, I have been told that it got "good"?—You must have gone back to a very ancient period. I had before me yesterday the reports as far back, I think, as 1906. As well as I remember the school got "fair" from 1906 to 1908, and then it began to get "middling," after Dr. Alexander took it in hand. Subsequently Miss Burke gave it "bad."

11618. What is the value of a conference, if the senior inspector does not go to the school—is not that, after all, only taking the word of a junior inspector?—I do not think so. His opinion is based on a scrutiny of the report that is sent in by the district inspector, and on his own knowledge of the school. It should be remembered that he has been in the school, and has



29th May, 1913.]

Mr. W. J. M. SPARKIN, M.A., Litt.D., LL.D., examined.

[Continued.]

examined it and inspected it himself. When he gets a report from the district inspector, giving the full details, he should visit the school himself if he is not satisfied.

11679. But that is assuming that the junior inspector's report of the school is infallible, and not to be questioned?—Mr. Henly, it all comes back to the old difficulty of the personal equation. Except for unanswerable reasons, I have a great objection to reducing the merit mark of a school. I make a practice of impressing on the inspectors that they ought not to reduce the mark, except for very strong reasons. If you could only persuade me that the senior inspectors are infallible, I would make a rule that in every case the senior inspector should inspect the school himself. But when a reduction of mark is recommended, what guarantee have I, or has anybody got, that the opinion of the senior inspector, simply because he is older, is better than that of a district inspector? I wish to goodness that our wisdom increased in proportion to our years.

11680. But what is the value of a conference where the senior inspector has not seen the actual condition of the school at the time when he is to confer?—But I say he has visited the school. You must remember the position of an administrator in all these things. He can very easily do the very best thing; he has to do the second best. If I had enough of money, I would certainly make a rule that in every case where there is a question of the lowering of marks, the senior inspector should visit the school. I quite agree with you that it is desirable. Possibly the best plan would be that the senior and district inspectors should visit the schools together. Would you be satisfied with that?

11681. Yes; but you see that it comes to taking away the teacher's head?—I think there is a great deal in what you say; but the staff is far from being so large as we should wish. A visit to a school might mean a two days' journey to a senior inspector. Take a place like Mayo, where you might have to drive forty miles. That is the difficulty. Again, a visit to a school, if it is to be of any value, has to be made very soon, if one is to see it as nearly as possible in the condition in which the district inspector saw it. If one postpones one's visit it is possible that there may be all sorts of changes. The school may have got worse or may have got better in the interval.

11682. But, of course, in Dublin's Boro, it would not take an inspector long—like reports on that school have been very unsatisfactory; every inspector who has been in it has given the same opinion.

11683. The Chairman.—Will you continue now?—We wished that the inspectors should judge the school rather from its permanent aspects than from any temporary or passing feature of its progress during the year. A very important change was also introduced at the same time. It was now required that no inspector below the rank of senior inspector should alter the merit mark previously given to the school until a conference had been held with the latter, and the alteration agreed upon as the joint mark of two inspectors. In cases of disagreement the matter was to be referred to the chief inspector for report to the Commissioners. This matter was further emphasised in another circular, dated August, 1912, in which it was stated:—"The merit mark of a school should not be altered as the result of a hasty inspection or of an inspection held in exceptional conditions, e.g., commenced too late in the day or held at an unsuitable time," and in the same circular, an instruction already conveyed to the inspectors six years previously was repeated, viz.:—"That the senior inspector should visit schools with his colleagues, three visits to be followed by a conference at which the details of the inspection and the appropriate merit mark to be awarded would be discussed at length. More recently still, the Commissioners have again considered the question of appointing four specially selected senior inspectors to visit the schools of five or six circuits, each with the same object in view, namely, that of securing greater uniformity. A special request has just been made to the Treasury to sanction such appointments, but it has been refused. As there has been much discussion as to the duties of the chief inspectors in regard to the maintenance of a uniform standard of marking, I wish

to make the following remarks. In the memorandum of "Duties of Chief Inspectors," dated 29th May, 1900, and issued to these officers by order of the Board, it is laid down in paragraph 8 that "the chief inspectors are to be responsible for the amount and character of the work done by the officers under their control." In paragraph 7 the officers are directed to see that to include senior inspectors and deputy inspectors (under which two categories all the inspectors (other than chief inspectors) at that time employed by the Board are included). It is further laid down in paragraph 13 of this memorandum that "it is an important part of the duty of the chief inspectors to make themselves personally acquainted with the merits of all the officers of the Board. . . . so as to be able to advise the Commissioners when questions of promotion, &c., arise." It is obvious that the deviation of this responsibility on the chief inspectors (under par. 8) for the character of the work done by the inspectors meant that it was their duty to see that the reports of the inspectors were an accurate representation of the work done in the schools, and that consequently the standard adopted by the inspectors in marking the schools was reasonable, just and uniform. The chief means by which the necessary degree of uniformity between one circuit and another was to be secured was by annual conferences between the chief inspector and the circuit inspectors, but it was also expected that each of the chief inspectors would visit schools over the group of eleven circuits which was assigned to him, make himself thoroughly acquainted with the standard of marking adopted by each of the inspectors under his charge, and at the conferences take the necessary steps by his advice, guidance and instruction (as the circumstances might require) to bring all the inspectors into line. It is apparent from the evidence of Mr. Downing and Mr. Purser before the committee that they were conscious of their duties in this respect in regard to the annual conferences. Thus, Mr. Downing states in evidence (Questions 4756-4767):—

"4756. Did you hold conferences?—I did.

"4757. With a view to uniformity of reports?—I did. I have held conferences.

"4758. Of whom did the conferences consist?—Of all the inspectors in my half, that is in the southern half of Ireland.

"4759. All the inspectors?—Senior and junior.

"4760. The juniors, too?—Yes.

"4761. How often did you hold these conferences, and were they held regularly?—They were held regularly; but that is now a long time ago.

"4762. We want to know to some extent what passed at these conferences. Were they held to a great extent with the object of securing a uniform standard of reports?—That was the object.

"4763. One great object, at any rate?—Yes.

"4764. And it was part of your duty to go and visit any schools that you chose?—Yes; that was in our directions.

"4765. That was amongst your instructions?—That was one of the instructions."

Mr. Purser is almost equally clear about the purpose of the conferences. He states:—

"4821. What means were taken to secure uniformity in the circuits?—It was laid down originally that there was to be a circuit conference every month. . . . By degrees it was dropped, and they were to have two conferences in the year. That was the arrangement up to the time I left, and at one of these conferences the chief inspector was to be present.

"4822. What steps were taken to secure uniformity as between circuits and circuits?—I think except that conference that the senior inspectors had in 1903, there was nothing beyond the circular issued from the office. I don't know of anything.

"4823. Was not the chief inspector supposed to confer with them once a year?—Yes; the chief inspectors conferred with them once a year.

"4824. Were these conferences regularly held, do you know?—They were by me."

It is evident from this that Mr. Purser understood that his annual conference was looked upon by the Board as one of the chief means of securing a uniform

standard of inspection, but yet we find him making the following statement:—

"4033. Suppose these conferences were regularly held, do you think they would be sufficient to secure uniformity?—No; they had very little to do with uniformity. We seldom discussed questions like that."

11664. We were surprised to be told by Mr. Purser that the question of uniformity was not discussed?—Your surprise was not equal to mine. So that although Mr. Purser now declares (see his answer to Q. 3997) that "there was no uniformity of marking," and although he knew that the annual conference was one of the chief means of securing the uniformity that he believed to be lacking, yet he seldom mentioned this matter at his conference. Must not, therefore, the blame be imputed to him of neglecting the means at his disposal to secure uniformity? For the selection of the topics of discussion at the conferences was entirely in his own hands. It is, moreover, clear that he recognised his responsibility in the matter, for in his reply to Q. 4039, he mentions a conference in the Galway circuit at Athlery, at which the inspectors in conference with him made a joint inspection of a school with a view to the determination of a common standard of marking. But in addition to this admission of Mr. Purser's that he neglected to use the conferences as a means of promoting uniformity, it is also evident from further evidence given by him that he entirely failed to use his power of visiting the schools for the same purpose. He was quite aware that the securing of uniformity was one of the chief objects of visits to schools on the part of the chief inspectors, for in his memorandum on the Clonliff case, prepared for the Committee, he states:—"I think it will be admitted that the above paragraphs (i.e., certain paragraphs in the 'Duties of Chief Inspectors') not only justify school visits, but require the chief inspectors to visit schools, for the purpose, among other things, of maintaining a fairly equable standard of inspection throughout their eleven circuits" (pp. 8, 4). In his reply to Q. 4044 he makes the following statement:—"I think the chief inspectors would be much better employed in dealing with the reports in the office than in going out on a few occasions. They are generally sent out or go out at more haphazard, as we very often did, to find nothing particular, but just put in our time. We had no definite object in going. We went out simply to see the schools. We might drop into a good school, or we might drop into a bad school." Such a complete misconception of his duties on the part of this highly-placed official is amazing. Mr. Purser considers that there is no uniformity between one inspector and another; he has the opportunity of personally visiting schools in the different circuits and divisions of circuits; these visits, if the schools were intelligently selected, would show him where the divergences (if any) from the correct standard were to be found; but in spite of all this, when he goes to visit schools, he drops into one or another haphazard, wandering aimlessly about "just putting in the time."

11685. Mr. SEARCE.—We had it in evidence that Mr. Purser did visit schools; but you say Mr. Purser failed to use his power of visiting for the purpose of securing uniformity?—I am proving my point out of his own lips. I am quoting from Mr. Purser's own evidence. The words "haphazard, wandering aimlessly about, just putting in the time," are his own words.

11690. I had an idea that it would be better, in order not to be breaking in more frequently with questions, just to ask you what was the evidence in support of a statement that you submitted to us in the précis that Mr. Purser failed to use his power of visiting the schools for the purpose of securing uniformity without having to answer it from the point?—Just as you like.

11687. But you are passing over a very important statement that he failed to use his power of visiting the schools?—What I have read, as I think, simply proves that he failed to use his powers; the statement that he failed to use his opportunities of visiting the schools is not inconsistent with the fact that he did visit some schools. You might visit some schools and still fail to use your power to secure uniformity by means of visiting schools. These two sentences are not inconsistent.

11688. But we want something more than the statement that he did not use his power to secure uniformity. How do you prove that he did not use it?—By his own words.

11689. Very well. Give me the words?—Certainly. In his reply to question 4044, he says: "I think the chief inspectors would be much better employed in dealing with the reports in the office than in going out on a few occasions. They are generally sent out or go out at more haphazard, as we very often did, to find nothing particular, but just put in our time. We had no definite object in going. We went out simply to see the schools. We might drop into a good school, or we might drop into a bad school." I maintain that these sentences simply prove what I said.

11690. The CHAIRMAN.—And he says even "without any definite object"?—Without any definite object, haphazard, without any plan. I have a return here which I can put in, of the actual visits to schools by Mr. Purser. I find that in the last year, for instance, (and the same statement largely applies to other years) the whole time he spent in visiting schools, including special investigations, which are pretty numerous, amounted to about 80 days.

11691. In one year?—Yes, in the year 1911. Certain parts of the country, for example, the Cork district, as I said before, he had hardly visited for eight or nine years.

11692. Mr. KERRIN.—But his statement was that he could best secure uniformity by remaining in the office?—Yes; but it is not his business to dictate to the Board how, in his opinion, this should be secured. The Board laid it down as his duty that he was to travel through the country.

11693. Mr. SEARCE.—But he had his time all the year filled up by work officially?—I can't say, as I did not look after him personally. I do not consider it is my business to look after every movement of a highly-paid officer like a chief inspector. The chief inspector is allowed a very great amount of independence. I do not look after him in the way in which, for instance, a junior inspector has to be looked after by a senior inspector. He was told from the very beginning that he was an outdoor officer, and his idea of being an outdoor officer was to go out for 80 days in the year. If he remained in the office, it was because he preferred working there like the old chiefs of inspection, at routine business, which the Board never considered half so important as the work in the schools. Mr. McNeill, who succeeded Mr. Purser, told me the other day that he considered the duty of visiting the schools to be by far the most important part of his work.

11694. The CHAIRMAN.—Mr. Purser speaks of his being better employed in the office?—And Mr. Kettle interprets that as looking over the reports in the office.

Mr. KERRIN.—Yes.

11695. The CHAIRMAN.—But I find that in 1900 that duty was taken away from the chiefs of inspection?—That is exactly my point. It was not for Mr. Purser to dictate to the Board, and say: "I prefer to remain in the office doing the work of the old chiefs of inspection to going about the country." That is not complying with the wishes of the Board.

11696. Mr. KERRIN.—I took Mr. Purser's attitude to be that he could best secure uniformity by spending a considerable time in the office studying reports?—But that was not his business. It was not his duty to spend his time examining the reports. Any intelligent clerk could do that.

11695. Mr. SEARCE.—But suppose he saw a divergence of standard, what power was left him to secure uniformity?—He had got full powers; he was allowed to get the reports, and if he found divergencies of standard he should have gone to the senior inspectors and pointed them out. That was his duty.

11696. Did he not do that in one case?—No, not that I know of.

11697. The Clonliff case?—In that case he did not discuss with the senior inspector his standard of marking, but he held an investigation and sent in a report to the office without authority, and in violation of official instructions. The duty of the chief inspector, according to the regulations, is to scrutinise the work of the senior inspectors and the other inspectors. If in going round the districts he finds that anything is

wrong, he can go to the senior or district inspector and draw his attention to it. I have a letter of his here which I will quote later on, and which shows that he had that conception of his work. I submitted to him some cases that struck me as peculiar when I was going round the schools in Clare, and he wrote to me then on the subject, saying that he had examined these schools, and that in certain cases he agreed with me, but that in other cases he agreed with the inspector. He then went on to say: "I have conferred with Mr. McNeill and Mr. — about their schools and the latter's low marking." That is what a chief inspector is supposed to do when he finds mistakes, or what he believes to be mistakes in standard; he should confer with the senior inspector. That is the natural thing to do. He certainly should not hold an investigation and write in a report to the Board without the authority of the Commissioners. That is in the instructions to the chief inspectors.

11706. Mr. CORRY.—Where could we see that?—It is stated in the instructions to the Chief Inspectors, which you have got, that they should not hold an investigation without the authority of the Board.

11707. Can we see that?—That is in the instructions.

11708. Mr. HARRISON.—I presume it is perfectly open to him if he goes into a district and finds that the standard is very high or very low, to report the fact to the Board?—Yes.

11709. Mr. HARRISON.—By clause 5 of his instructions it is stated that the chief inspector is to be at liberty to examine a school whenever he may deem it necessary?—Certainly; but that clause does not authorize him to hold an inquiry.

11710. Mr. CORRY.—What is the clause in the memorandum dealing with the duties of chief inspectors which precludes the chief inspector from making a report to the Board on the condition of any school?—He is not forbidden to make a report to the Board on the condition of a National school; but he is not to hold an investigation into the school. That is forbidden by Instruction No. 10.

11711. Mr. KETTLE.—Investigations when so directed?—When so directed.

11712. Mr. CORRY.—There is nothing in the rule precluding him from making a report on a particular school?—No, there is not. The chief inspector is not precluded from writing reports on the general condition of the schools in a district; but we expect him to deal with the question of uniformity, not by writing reports to the Board on particular schools, but by conferring with the officers whom he believed to be in fault. To return to my own visits to schools, as I said before, when I was dissatisfied with anything, the attention of the inspector was drawn to the fact when it was a case of structural defects, or the omission of a subject from the time-table. I do not know whether the Committee have seen any of my notes to the inspectors. I circulate them now, as an illustration of the way in which I have dealt with these things. I usually send round a private memorandum to the inspector. That was nearly always the case where an important subject had not been taken up. I have collected all the notes that are still in existence. I often called attention to some structural defects or to some subject or other which had not been taken up. When it was a question of want of uniformity I invariably asked the chief inspector to visit the school and to tell me his own opinion about it. I may say that I always considered that my visits to schools were too short to enable me to pass a final judgment. I never thought of altering the mark of a teacher on a visit of mine. Such a thing has never happened so far as I know. If I found fault with the mark on a school I referred it to the chief inspector. Even if he agreed with me, so far as I know the mark of the school has never been altered. I have a letter of the 6th of August 1909, written by Mr. Purser, that brings out pretty clearly the sort of action I expected to be taken: "When I was away last month I looked into some of the cases referred to me. — Convent school is certainly over-marked as 'excellent.' It is on the border-line between 'good' and 'very good,' and in view of the very inadequate accommodation, might be classed 'very good.' — girls, I would class as 'good,' considering all the

circumstances. The teacher is old and desperately nervous. When I paid the school a short visit a few years ago I got very unfavourable notes on her, and at first I thought little better of her on the last occasion; but after half an hour or so she began to get over her alarm. The girls are shy and nervous like herself, but also improve on further acquaintance. Their love answering and reading is the worst point in the school. I conferred with Mr. McNeill and Mr. — about their school, and the latter's low standard. — This school is doing good work, and is not, in my opinion, over-marked. Mr. — has a very good influence in the faculty. — girls. Dr. — has certainly over-marked this school, but probably he scattered his 'excellent's' very freely during the last years." If on visiting a school Mr. Purser came to the conclusion that it was of a low standard, what I expected him to do was to take immediate steps to remedy matters by conferring with the inspector, not by reporting it to the Board. Regarding he reported to the Board, what was to be done? His report would have to be referred back to him again to be brought under the notice of the inspector. What was to be gained by doing that, even if he had the right to write such reports to the Board?

11713. Mr. CORRY.—Of course, there is a question of the right way and the wrong way, and the right way would be, I think, to confer with the inspector?—Yes.

11714. But there is nothing improper in his making a report to the Board on a visit to a school?—No, I would not say that that was wrong. Certainly not.

11715. The CHAIRMAN.—Now, will you go on with regard to the duties of inspectors?—Mr. Downham's conception of his duty does not appear to have been very much higher than that of Mr. Purser. He informs the Committee, in reply to question 4758:—"I think I had very little useful work to do during those two years" (viz., 1900 to 1904, when he was chief inspector). The truth is that both these officers were so dispirited by the change of the system in 1900 that they made no attempt to discharge the responsible duties of their new position, and there is good reason for feeling that they would not have been displaced if, owing to their opposition or neglect, the new system of inspection were to have broken down altogether. Mr. Purser, in his evidence, tries further to disclaim all responsibility for our divergence in the standard of marking in the Clonmel circuit. He was asked with reference to the reduction of merit marks of the schools on Mr. Welply's appointment to this circuit:—"4000. And you were chief inspector while this fall of marks was taking place?—I was part of the time, certainly, but I do not know. I think Mr. Welply had not come to the district more than two years before he wrote that I left." And again:—"4002. You did not know that that great change of marking was taking place?—No; I did not know that there was any change. When I say I did not know, I had no official knowledge of it, but I could guess very well what Mr. Welply would give a smaller proportion of higher marks than when Mr. Brown was there, because Mr. Brown is certainly an easier marker than Mr. Welply." These statements are most misleading, if not worse. Mr. Welply was appointed to the Clonmel circuit on 1st July, 1909, and Mr. Purser did not retire from the office of chief inspector until 6th November, 1911. Consequently he was over 2 years and 4 months in charge of Mr. Welply's circuit, and had ample time to make himself acquainted with Mr. Welply's standard of marking. Moreover, he had no excuse for not doing so, for it appears that Mr. Welply called his attention to the state of the circuit on more than one occasion. Mr. Welply, whose attention has been called to Mr. Purser's statement as quoted above, has replied as follows:—"Purser's statement that he knew nothing of this reduction in marking that went on in Tipperary is quite inaccurate and misleading, because I told him on several occasions that the schools were overmarked, my object all along being to get him to look at the schools himself and to advise me if he thought I was wrong. This he consistently did not do. In one school in particular—Knocklong boys'—marked 'good,' he denounced the marking as being excessive, and very properly so. That was all." Mr. Purser tries to explain his omission to superintend the

marking of schools by the pretence that he did not see the inspectors' reports in the office (Q. 4151), and that no tabular statement of the marks assigned by the inspectors was furnished to him (Q. 4152). But he could have obtained such a tabular statement, if he considered it useful, and if he had asked for it, and the reports were always open to his inspection, and in 1905, at his own request, they were furnished to him in connection with the increment and promotion cases dealt with by Mr. Wyse, and this practice continued until his retirement in 1911. But an officer, who brought zeal, ability and resource to the discharge of his important duties, could easily have devised means for securing adequate uniformity by visiting schools in each circuit and by moving himself personally acquainted with the standard adopted by inspectors under his charge. That Mr. Purser neglected this means of carrying out his duties is not the fault of the system, but of Mr. Purser himself.

11708. Now you go to the Belfast teachers?—The grievances of the Belfast teachers was that, although the percentage of satisfactory reports through the whole of Ireland had increased by 4 per cent., it had decreased in Belfast by 4.5 per cent. But, even after the decrease, the reports show "Fair" are still 85 per cent. in circuit 7, 79 per cent. in circuit 8, which is 11 per cent. and 8 per cent., respectively, above the average for all Ireland. Again, the marks/scale represent comparatively few Belfast schools, viz., 111 out of 708; and the facts shown are consistent with the explanation given by the chief inspectors that the inspectors were "excessively lenient in the earlier days of the new system." Leniency of discrimination was reported to the Board by Mr. Hyne in 1906 in the case of some inspectors, who were removed to other circuits by the order of the Board.

11709. In what year were they removed?—1906. There were two of them.

11710. Sir HUGH WILLIAMS.—Are those inspectors still in the service?—One of them is dead, and the other, whose name I do not wish to mention, is still in the service. The present Belfast inspectors are, in the opinion of the chief inspectors, "among the most earnest and efficient of the Board's officers." No doubt they are stricter than their predecessors, but there were comparatively few appeals from their marking until reliable proofs of their severity were difficult or impossible to get. The late chief inspectors thought the present marking more correct than the earlier. The explanations of the inspectors in charge have been published by this committee. Mr. Dewar stated that his reports were never questioned in former districts, and if now regarded as severe, the fault lay with the teachers who felt aggrieved; in awarding marks, as he says, he looked for facts, and handed his judgment upon them, without regard to "any nice arrangement of 'fairs' and 'goods'." In Mr. Kelly's district 87 per cent. of the schools were not lower than "good," which is exceptionally high, the chief reductions "good," "very good" and "excellent." Mr. MacMillan was not impressed by the efficiency of the Belfast schools; he thought it not to be so high as in Mayo, which I do not regard with the view of excellence; he was not anxious to be severe, so that he often gave a mark which he could scarcely justify, so desirous was he to give the teachers the benefit of the doubt; "being only human" he was aware from stopping their increments. Mr. Mangin stated that, if his judgment erred, "it erred on the side of leniency." The Belfast teachers urged that the inspectors, to some extent, marked the teacher on the condition of the buildings; they were informed by me that if the inspectors did take into account the defects in buildings, etc., it was in order to make allowance for them in the teachers' favour. As to the alleged want of uniformity, the change is to some extent true, but of the decline in the marking in Belfast was not very serious, at least in the number of "goods," and there is no doubt that, as reported by Mr. Hyne in 1906, in the earlier years of the new system the inspectors took full advantage of the recommendation in a circular of the Board, to be easy during the time of transition. On the presentation to

the Board of the petition of the Belfast teachers, Mr. Purser and Mr. Hyne were directed to ascertain whether the present marks on the schools were such as they ought to be; the Board could do no more than this, as it was impossible to reproduce the condition of the schools as they were five years before. The chief inspectors reported that the present marking was, in their opinion, correct. The report of the department, the reports of the Belfast inspectors on the view-roads presented by the Belfast teachers, and the report of the chief inspectors, were carefully considered by the Board. It was unanimously held that the present marking of the schools must be upheld in view of the chief inspectors' report, but it was felt that further steps should be taken to secure greater uniformity in marking between successive inspectors in a circuit. I informed the Board that, in my opinion, possibly too much attention was still paid to the aspects of a school that varied from year to year, such as arithmetic, the habits, moral and intellectual, of the children, discipline, tidiness, were, perhaps, in some cases comparatively disregarded. There was possibly a tendency among inspectors to treat schools as if they were children in for a competitive examination; hence the anxiety to detect minute differences between schools, which were of importance in a competition, but of very slight value from the point of view of the State. The State should be satisfied if it was assured that it got reasonable value for its money; hence it was desirable, as equal attention could not be given to all schools, to concentrate attention on the less efficient, leaving the satisfactory schools largely to their own devices.

11711. Was Mr. McMillan an inspector under the old results' system?—He was. Like the rest, he suffered from the taint of that original sin.

11712. Mr. CORRY.—Have you anything to say about why Mr. Hyne failed to secure uniformity in Belfast?—Did you ask Mr. Hyne?

Mr. CORRY.—I did not.

11713. Mr. HENRY.—How is it that Mr. McMillan says the schools in Belfast were not quite equal to those in Mayo, when Mayo had only 10 per cent. "excellent" and "very good" and Belfast 26?—I can't say, as I am not my brother's keeper. But there are some excellent schools in Mayo.

11714. Mr. HARRISON.—Would he have been referring to the whole of Mayo?—If he had the schools along the coast-line he had as good schools, some of them, as there are in Ireland. Take Belmullet boys' school, for instance. If I were asked to make a list of the best schools in Ireland I would certainly put Belmullet among the first 20. A number of the bilingual schools on the coast of Mayo are certainly admirable; but then, on the other hand, as I have said already, I think the Antrim schools are extremely good. I have inspected at least 100 of them.

11715. Mr. HENRY.—There are good schools in both cases, and then how is it that there is a difference in the marks of 10.8 and 26?—What do you mean by 10.8?

11716. 10.8 is the percentage of "excellent" and "very good" given by Mr. Cussen?—In Mayo?

11717. Yes?—And is it 26 in Belfast?

Mr. HENRY.—Twenty-six in one of the Belfast districts. I think it is Mr. Kelly's.

11718. Mr. CORRY.—On that question of uniformity, you said a good deal or failure to secure uniformity, you said a good deal about Mr. Purser, but did not Mr. Hyne fail to secure uniformity in the Belfast marking?—I stated yesterday that I felt thoroughly dissatisfied with both the chief inspectors. Mr. Hyne failed, but not so badly as Mr. Purser.

11719. The CHAIRMAN.—And this was going on under his eyes in Belfast?—Certainly; but I do not think the failure in Belfast was anything like that in Tipperary. In Belfast the decline was 4 per cent. in the "goods," but in the other case there was a decline of 30 per cent.

11720. The 4 per cent. might have escaped the most lynx-eyed inspector?—I dare say it might; but he should have noticed the decline in "excellent" and "very good."

11721. Mr. COFFEY.—And where this laxity of discrimination occurred, was not Mr. Kelly the senior inspector in that part of the Co. Down at that time?—Yes, but it was Mr. Kelly's own reports that were found fault with.

11722. And how did he maintain uniformity with his two sectional inspectors?—I cannot answer that, but the charge is against Mr. Kelly and Mr. Dewar, themselves, and not against their subordinates.

11723. In this memorandum that you have furnished us with there is a statement about leniency in the Co. Down half of the Belfast circuit, and Mr. Kelly was senior inspector there at the time?—Before 1903?

11724. Yes, at least I understood so—I do not know how long Mr. Kelly has been in Belfast. It must, however, be remembered that the control of the senior inspector over his subordinates was not as strict seven years ago as it has been in the last five or six years, and it is quite possible that there was great leniency in the early years even under Mr. Kelly. It would have been quite possible in those days for the subordinate inspectors to be very lenient when the senior inspector had not so much control as he has been allowed to have recently. Previously the district inspectors had been practically independent, and one was rather cautious at first not to tighten the chain too suddenly. To return to my text. I impressed on the Board that teachers of known character and efficiency might be allowed perfect freedom and independence; codes and systems of inspection were drawn up in the interests of the inefficient. These views recommended themselves to the Board, which ordered that the senior inspectors should appear before it and bear an address from me on the methods of inspection which the Board wished to be followed. This was done at a subsequent meeting. Such was the origin of the circular of June, 1911, which was not intended to mark a new departure in policy, but only to sum up, to elucidate, and to expand, what had been contained in earlier circulars. This fact was emphasized in the letter to the Belfast teachers by the reference to my address in 1909. This was no new policy of ours; it was the policy we had been advocating from the beginning.

11725. The CHAIRMAN.—You told the inspectors in the first three years of the system that they were to be rather lenient in dealing especially with old teachers teaching new subjects?—Yes.

11726. And then where did you draw the line—was it about 1904?—We never gave any further instruction; we never gave directions that they were to be severe.

11727. Was there no understanding?—Never; certainly not. Such changes have been made at various times; but in Ireland every public man is accustomed to being accused of dishonourable conduct. It is no guarantee that because you are a gentleman you won't be suspected of foul dealing. Thus, I have been accused of giving secret instructions to inspectors. Of course, no member of the Committee believes it, but it is as well to have it on record, that until the Belfast teachers instigated it, I never heard that secret instructions had been given to inspectors. There have been no secret instructions. No instructions have gone from the office to the inspectors except those that went through the Secretaries.

11728. What I think was suggested was, that there might be a general understanding that strictness might be more gradually increased as the teachers became more competent?—No, I do not think that has been so; in fact, the marks have steadily gone up, and I maintain, from my own knowledge, though some people may not believe it, that the schools have immensely improved. The state of things I saw with my own eyes, when going round with Mr. Dale in 1908, no longer exists, and that improvement has been well represented in the marks of the inspectors, which in some districts, as I told you yesterday, are extraordinarily high; for instance, in West Cork, and some parts of Kerry, practically no school receives less than "good," and the great majority of them receive "very good." That is a most extraordinary record.

11729. Mr. COFFEY.—But didn't they always get those marks?—No. I have the marks going back to 1903, and they were quite different.

11730. In West Cork?—My return is not quite scientific, because I did not deliberately go into the same schools, but I was in West Cork in 1905; that was the first time I was there, and I have the marks that were given then. When I visited the same district last spring I found the marks were very much higher.

11731. Mr. HENRY.—But supposing Mr. Welyly had not gone to the Clonmel circuit, might it not be said in the same way that the schools in Clonmel circuit were high?—It would be difficult to show, Mr. Henry, that they had been improving. What I say about West Cork is not that the marking was high, but that it was considerably higher than it had been eight years ago.

11732. Did not the marks increase under Mr. Brown?—I cannot say; Mr. Brown was so long in the Clonmel circuit that I do not remember his ever being anywhere else; so that I cannot compare his marks with those of his predecessor.

11733. He was there for seven years?—Was he only seven years? At any rate, I do not remember Mr. Brown's having been anywhere else than in Waterford or Clonmel. I have no recollection.

11734. And may it not be possible that Mr. Welyly may not have visited that West Cork circuit?—They are very good schools no matter who visited them, and no matter what marks they got.

11735. The CHAIRMAN.—Have you anything to say about the dismissal of teachers?—It is often said that the dismissals after 1903 increased 300 per cent. This is true, but it proves nothing as to the absolute increase. If two teachers are dismissed one year, and four the next, there is an increase of 100 per cent, and still the absolute increase is not great. The important factor is that no one has been dismissed on account of his inability to adapt himself to the new arrangements; that, of 240 teachers dismissed before 1903, only two were good characters under the old system; and no one has been dismissed whose efficiency in English, Arithmetic, and Needlework was satisfactory. The increase of dismissals really dates not from the new system, but from the change made by the Board in March, 1899, whereby fines and punitive action were brought directly under its notice. It was at once felt that the action taken by the chiefs of inspection in the case of falsification of accounts and inefficiency was undeniably lax. In March, 1899, was drawn up the Code of penalties in the case of falsification; in May, of the same year the penalties for inefficiency, viz., fines, degradation in rank, and dismissal. Consequently upon these the dismissals increased, in 1899, from 18 to 34. During 1901-3 they were comparatively infrequent (only 21 per annum), compared with the succeeding years, on account of the desire of the Board to be lenient during the years of transition from the old to the new system. After that, partly on account of Mr. Dale's recommendations upon the extreme leniency of the Board, they rapidly rose, but never to more than 50 per annum, viz., four in every 1,000 teachers. Very great care is taken that every teacher shall have a warning before severe punitive action is taken, so as to have ample opportunities of remedying the defects. No one is dismissed on a single bad report, nor on the report of an inspector below the rank of senior or chief inspector. Every teacher is furnished with the grounds of dissatisfaction of the Board, and is allowed to present a statement in his own defence. In the case of teachers who have not earned a pension I proposed (25th February, 1909) that added years should be given if the dismissal was without moral fault. As this was refused by the Treasury, every effort is made to continue a teacher ineligible for pension until the pensionable age, unless his retention is clearly detrimental to the interests of the pupils. Thus the principal of a school in Adill Island, who was probably the worst teacher I have ever seen, was continued for five years in order that he might earn a pension, since I learned that he was a sober man and had a large number of children; indeed, I saw some of his benighted daughters myself in the school. By retaining him I was guilty of injustice to his pupils, but humanity prevailed over my sense of duty.

11736. Mr. COFFEY.—Do you reach a higher number in some years of what would be called dis-

dismissals or of withdrawals of salary?—Withdrawal of salary is equivalent to dismissal.

11737. You would call that dismissed?—Yes.

11738. And the highest number would be 60?—Yes; the fact is that that is the technical term. In the case of non-vested schools we do not dismiss teachers, we only withdraw the grants to the schools, if a teacher whom we object to is not removed. In the case of vested schools the technical phrase is that the salary is withdrawn from the teacher.

11739. The Chairman.—That is the phrase you used with regard to Mr. Mansfield, "The salary is withdrawn"?—I think so.

11740. Mr. HENRY.—Is that the phrase that is used when you dismiss a teacher from the service for misconduct?—I think so.

11741. Or that he be not recognised?—Yes, that he be not recognised; you are right in that. Dismissal is of two kinds; it may be a simple withdrawal of salary in a particular school, or we may determine that for some offense or other the teacher ought not to be in the service any longer. In the latter case we use the phrase, "That he be not recognised as a National Teacher." A distinction, however, is made between vested and non-vested schools.

11742. Mr. KAVANAGH.—Were there any dismissals by managers in addition to the figures you have given?—Yes, but we have no information about that.

11743. But you would have cognizance of it?—No; the manager would report that So-and-So was leaving on a certain day, and that he would appoint another. The man that was leaving might be leaving on account of illness, or because he wished to leave the profession, or to go elsewhere. Unless the teacher appeals to us against the manager we should not know that he was being dismissed.

11744. And then you have no figures to tell us how many were dismissed by managers in addition to your dismissals?—I do not think so.

11745. Mr. HENRY.—Do you say a teacher is not dismissed on the report of an inspector below senior?—Certainly.

11746. And what about Dolphin's Barn?—Yes, but we had a special report from the senior inspector on those teachers.

11747. Without visiting?—No, he specially visited the school. I cannot say off-hand whether the senior inspector visited it on the last occasion; but, under rule 90 (4), he must have examined the school himself before the teachers were dismissed.

11748. I hope you will reconsider that?—Yes.

11749. The Chairman.—You have finished the question of dismissal?—No, not quite. The present policy of the Board is to get rid of men when young, and without ties, by refusing them recognition as principal teachers unless they qualify for their diplomas within five years of completing their training. There is no more unpleasant duty imposed on anybody, I speak feelingly of this, as I personally have more to say to these dismissals than any other body in the service. They are brought before the Board and discussed, but the head administrator of the Board is the person who is held to be chiefly responsible for the action taken, and I say that there is no more anxious duty placed on any man than that of dismissing an unfortunate teacher. I feel the responsibility more keenly than others, inasmuch as in many cases I have seen the victims myself. If I were merely sitting in the office, without having gone round the country, I should regard dismissal as a very strong measure; but at the same time unavoidable, in the interest of the children. But if one goes about the country, and sees the unfortunate man's hard-pressed daughters, as I did in a certain school in Antrim, and talks to them and asks them questions, the thing comes home to one to a much greater extent than if one were merely sitting on the inspector's recommendation; the claims of humanity influence one more if one has been in the school oneself. For that reason my policy, and the policy of the Board, is that if a teacher is bad, he should be dismissed as soon as possible when young. It may seem a pity to get rid of a man who has cost the State £100 in the Training College; but that is a short sighted way of

looking at the matter. A fellow like that should not be allowed to establish himself. The worst of it is that most of these inefficient teachers, if allowed to continue, are certain to have at least ten children.

11750. Mr. HENRY.—I think you are quite right not to leave young men who are inefficient in the service; but I would say it is really a hardship and a cruel thing to keep them in the service when they may be comparatively inefficient all the time, and at the end of 30 years turn them adrift without pension or anything else?—Very few of them are dismissed without pension.

11751. The Dolphin's Barn case?—But those teachers never joined the Pension Scheme. If a man does not insure his life, and leaves his family penniless, it is a pity that we cannot get at him to punish him. Why did they not join the Pension Scheme?

11752. Mr. KAVANAGH.—You could not make it compulsory?—It is compulsory now, every man and woman in the service must join.

11753. The Rector or Boss.—Would not your logic as to inefficient young teachers carry you something farther than the Board has gone?—In what way?

11754. If you simply refuse them a diploma, and refuse them the power of ever becoming principal teachers, you still leave them in the service?—They can be assistants at the minimum salary.

11755. But a great many of these would hold on all the same?—You think they do?

11756. I do not know, but I am afraid they do, and I think it would be better to get rid of them altogether. Would not your logic carry you the distance of squeezing them out?—Yes, I think it would be a good thing to squeeze them out of the service altogether.

11757. Mr. HARRISON.—Are there any means of weeding them out during their Training College course?—Yes, some of them are rejected, but mostly after examination. But some are rejected before. We allow the Principals of the Training Colleges to send away people who they consider would not make good teachers; but as the Training College would probably lose £30 thereby no very great inclination is shown on the part of the heads of the colleges to do that; so that although they have the power it is not often exercised.

11758. Mr. HENRY.—And then when they are tested in teaching the inspectors certainly strain every point in their favour?—In my opinion, such kindness is very much misplaced.

11759. Well, I think it would be a good thing that there should be some failures in the Training Colleges?—Failures, as a rule, occur only in connection with the Diplomas. I am not talking of your College in particular.

11760. I think it would be a good thing to make them realise that they will not get through?—On the other hand, it is not possible to make the door of the teaching profession very narrow, as we have to fill the vacancies in the schools. But, to return to my subject, what is the alternative to dismissal? Before 1900 teachers' salaries varied, to some extent, with their skill, and the B.C. managers were more inclined to utilise their power of dispensing with unsatisfactory teachers. Since "the Mayothon Resolution" they rarely dismiss except for immaturity. Dismissals are now infrequent, as the waste and strays of the old system have gradually been eliminated. The official procedure in the case of inefficient teachers is as follows:—If a teacher is reported for serious inefficiency, viz., if the report on his work for one or more years is "Middling" or "Bad," he is warned that serious action will be taken unless the defects observed by the inspector are removed; if the next report shows no improvement, a senior or chief inspector is directed to hold the next inspection of the school, which must be what is called "a formal school," that is to say, it must be held on a certain day, of which the teacher has notice, and must be, to a great extent, an examination of the individual children. If the report on this is unsatisfactory, the teacher is afforded the opportunity of sending in a statement in his own behalf. If it is proposed to take severe action, extracts from the inspectors' reports, and from the teacher's statement,

are printed for the information of the Board, and the proposed action is set forth in print on the "Agenda," among the "special cases." The proposed action is voted upon by the Board, and any member who is not satisfied with the "provisional order" may propose an amendment, or ask that the case should be placed among the "Agenda" for discussion at a subsequent meeting. The cases of the teachers dismissed between 1897 and 1906 were investigated by Mr. Bryce, in 1906, who professed himself quite satisfied with our procedure. I submit the following notes for a letter in reply to a communication from his private Secretary on May 28th, 1906:—Mr. Lomas. Please describe fully the procedure followed in such cases. There is, as a rule, a long succession of warnings, fines, and finally notices of dismissal. The teachers often appeal to me, and the appeals are reported on by a chief inspector. In the office the cases are examined by an experienced inspector and the secretaries; and finally, personally examined by me." If you take 50, which was the largest number dismissed in a single year, it seems considerable; but, relatively to the 12,600 teachers in the schools, it is really extremely small. It is my own belief—a belief based on an extensive experience of the work done in the schools—that the number of inefficient teachers would be 20 per cent., while only four in a thousand are dismissed, which would be one in 250. When I say that the number of inefficient teachers is from 15 to 20 per cent., of course, I am speaking roughly. I have asked various people, and, in the main, they agree with my estimate. On the other hand, I will give you the estimate of Mr. Purser, whom it has recently become the fashion to regard as being a great friend of the teachers. I will quote from our Annual Report for the year 1906. Since he is a champion of the teachers, I suppose his estimate will be regarded as not unduly unfavourable to them. His comment on the zeal and earnestness of the teachers is as follows:—"If zeal and earnestness are not displayed in the performance of their duties, and in this respect our progress, if any, has been but slow, the other good and useful qualities of the teacher are of little value. Now, the majority of the teachers are sadly deficient in zeal and earnestness, and have a very low standard of what constitutes the proper performance of their duty. This may seem a very sweeping assertion, but it is based on the want of interest in their profession, shown by the absence of any preparation for the daily work on the part of the majority—shall I name too low a figure when I say three-fourths of the teachers of Ireland." But I do not agree with Mr. Purser. I would not put the proportion of unsatisfactory teachers nearly so high. I could not say that the unsatisfactory teachers are anything like three-fourths of the whole number. In my opinion the great majority of the teachers in Ireland are doing very good work.

11761. The CHAIRMAN.—I think you put the number of inefficient teachers at 15 per cent.—15 to 20 per cent.

11762. Mr. HARRISON.—The number dismissed for moral causes, as well as the number dismissed for inefficiency?—In one year they came to 50; but they are generally much less numerous.

11763. Would the 50 you mentioned include cases of dismissal for causes other than simple inefficiency?—Yes.

11764. They are taken together?—It would take too much trouble to sift them, as I should have to go into each case.

11765. The CHAIRMAN.—Are there more teachers dismissed for moral causes than for inefficiency?—No, I think not. Some are dismissed for falsification, some for drunkenness, which, though believed to be common enough, is rarely reported.

11766. Mr. CORRY.—In connection with the question of inefficiency, I understood you to say that the penalty the first year for reported inefficiency would be reprimand and warning?—Yes.

11767. For the second year a temporary deprivation?—You are going back to the penalties of 1869; but these do not always apply now, as classification has been abolished. We rarely reduce a man in grade.

It is a much more serious thing to reduce a man in grade than to reduce him in classification.

11768. You have no code then?—We have a recognised practice. I may tell you plainly, as I implied this morning, that I never approved of that code of penalties, and I disclaim all responsibility for it. I did not think it was right at the time, as, in my opinion, it showed a want of imagination, it was tantamount to saying to the teachers—"In the case of falsification we allow you to know one bit; but on the second occasion it will go very badly with you, and you must be very particular about the third time, as you will be dismissed."

11769. Have you any code at present in regard to inefficiency?—Certainly, the same code, whether we handle, or, at any rate, the same practice. We allow a man's inefficiency to continue under warning for some time, and then if the school does not improve, the teacher is warned that next year the chief inspector or senior inspector will hold an examination. I do not think any man can be dismissed in less than three years, and most of the cases of inefficiency go on for a very much longer time. When a man has an extremely steady career he is given a "mildling" report for one or two years, and then just when the inspector thinks he has him the mark goes up to "fair," and that practically gives the man a new lease of life. Possibly next year the warning begins all over again, and so if the teacher is an ingenious fellow, he may go on for years, and in the end come out with flying colours, as Mr. Kelly of Clonsilla did. He may even be rewarded by the Board, as Mr. Kelly was.

11770. The CHAIRMAN.—Now, you have something to say with regard to the relations between the Board and teachers?—In considering the question of the relations of the Commissioners to the teachers, it is necessary to revert to the principle upon which the Commissioners grant aid to education in Ireland. This principle is that the grants made by the Board are made in reality to managers of schools, who are expected to find and call into existence the schools ready equipped with all the necessary appliances and furniture and supplied with teachers and pupils. The teachers must, of course, be such as to satisfy the Board's requirements in regard to qualifications and character, and they must also observe certain rules which were laid down from time to time regarding their conduct. Provided these rules were observed, and the school conducted in accordance with the Commissioners' regulations, grants were paid, but always to the manager, who was held to be directly responsible for the school. On receiving the salaries he handed them to the teachers. At first no agreements were required to be executed between the manager and teacher, but after the system had been in force for some years (viz., in 1872) the Board required, as a condition of recognition of a teacher, that the manager should enter into a formal agreement with him, the main condition of which was that the engagement could be terminated by a three months' notice in writing on either side. This being the condition of things during the greater part of the Board's existence, all communications and correspondence with the schools took place between the Commissioners and the manager, and no direct communication was held with the teacher. For a great many years the code has contained what were known as "Practical Rules" for teachers. These were mostly concerned with such matters as the daily working of the schools, the keeping of the registers and records of attendance, and the relations of the teachers to the pupils. One of these "Practical Rules" read as follows:—"Rule III.—To avoid fairs, markets and meetings; but above all, political meetings of every kind; to abstain from controversy; to be imbued with the spirit of obedience to the law; and loyalty to the Sovereign, and to do nothing, either in or out of the school, which might have a tendency to excite it to any denunciation of children." I must say that it has always struck me as rather inconsistent that we should tell the teachers to avoid fairs, and still should give a holiday to the school when a fair is going on.

11771. Mr. KAVANAGH.—That is for the children's sake?—And for the teachers' too. I have found schools closed 20 miles from a fair. In that case there

was no danger of the children's being killed by cows, but the teacher had to sell his cattle. Of late years, and especially since 1906, the Board's policy has tended towards closer relations with the teachers, and there has been a considerable relaxation of the rules relating to the teachers' conduct. Thus the restrictions contained in Practical Rule No. 3 (just quoted) were abolished in the Code of 1906, and the only portion of that rule which now remains is the clause relating to the necessity of obedience to the law and loyalty to the Sovereign. As I was told that teachers frequently attended political meetings without let or hindrance, and as I always like to face the facts of a situation, I once proposed to the Board that they should be a liberty to do so, but I was not supported. The Board, however, consented to make a distinction between political meetings, which teachers might attend, and meetings of a party political character.

11772. Would meetings to discuss the programme be permitted; is it not the case that they used to be restrained from that?—They may go to as many of these as they like, but they are not generally considered advisable.

11773. Mr. HESTER.—The meetings they are forbidden to attend are meetings for party political purposes?—Yes, party political.

11774. Mr. KEVILL.—Are there any political meetings in Ireland which are not party political?—I never heard of them, but the majority of the members of the Board thought differently from me on that subject. They tried to solve their consciences by putting in "party." Thus teachers are encouraged to make a distinction which Mr. Keble maintains not to exist. It is a good test of their integrity.

11775. The CHAIRMAN.—The question is whether the whole thing is not futile, as the teachers do not obey?—In my opinion it is, and I am always in favour of recognising facts.

11776. Would it not be better to leave it to the profession, as it is left to the clerical profession?—I have always thought it should be a matter for the manager, and not for the Board. If the manager thinks that a school suffers by the teacher's going to political meetings, he will probably stop him.

11777. Mr. HESTER.—A question was asked by Sir Samuel Dill, whether the teachers are not prohibited from discussing the programme?—No, I never heard so. At any rate, if such a rule exists, it is honoured more in the breach than in the observance.

11778. Have you heard of cases of persons being pulled up for discussing the programme?—Much depends on the way you discuss it. A man might get into trouble if his criticism of the programme was of this kind: "there is no doubt that for the production of this programme the Commissioners of National Education ought to be docked in the Lily."

11779. The CHAIRMAN.—Well, if it was said that the production of the Intermediate Programme proved the man who produced it to have no shillings?—I cannot give an unqualified answer to the question whether a teacher would be allowed to discuss the programme. If I saw his speech first, I might possibly tell you.

11780. There was a circular some time ago that warned teachers that if they discussed the programme it must be done very temperately?—Yes, that was in 1884. I recently saw a copy of it; it is not a circular that one would now venture to publish. It is an interesting document, as showing how things have changed in the last 30 years. It was published in the time of Sir Patrick Meehan.

11781. Would you dream of issuing such a thing now?—No.

11782. Sir HERMAN WILKINSON.—I see that in the rules for 1912-13 there has been an addition made to the restrictions, and I should like to know what this indicated. The teachers are not permitted to carry on trailers, or to be engaged in any trade or occupation, or to be members of any association tending to impair their usefulness as teachers. That last clause is an addition, "or to be members of any association tending to impair their usefulness as teachers"?—I can tell you exactly what that means, but I do not know exactly what it is right to put it down in the Notes.

11783. This is one of the very particular things that we have to make a report on?—Well, I will tell you. I will face the music. It was intended to preclude membership of the Ancient Order of Hibernians and of the Orange Society. That was the intention. There was nothing definite in the rules before to prevent teachers joining those associations, although we prevented them from attending Orange meetings. We dismissed a man some years ago for going to an Orange meeting, but that was under the general powers of the Board, and not under a particular rule.

11784. The CHAIRMAN.—Would the aim of that new rule be understood?—It is dangerous to be too definite. It is an intention thing to mention a society by name, especially a powerful society like the A.O.H.

11785. Mr. KEVILL.—Has no case arisen under that rule?—Yes, we have been asked by the A.O.H. whether National teachers could join them or not, and the Board decided they could not.

11786. The CHAIRMAN.—Have you been attacked on that ground?—No, but it is possible we shall be.

11787. Now, shall we go on to the changes of rules?—In 1906 an important modification was made in the regulations regarding the dismissal of teachers for inefficiency. Up to that time the Commissioners, in accordance with the practice already mentioned, had no direct correspondence with the teachers beyond the occasional forwarding direct to the schools of official forms and returns, but in 1906 the following changes were made:—Extracts from the inspector's reports, which hitherto had been furnished to the managers only, were now sent directly to the teacher for his information and guidance. In cases where the reports of the inspectors contained serious charges of inefficiency or irregularities the Board now decided that before considering these charges the teacher should be furnished with a statement and allowed to submit his reply or explanation directly for their consideration. In cases involving dismissal for inefficiency a full account of the grounds on which it was proposed to take action is sent directly to the teacher, and the substance of his reply is submitted to the Board when the case comes on for consideration. Another change in the teacher's favour that took place in the same year had to do with complaints on the part of teachers against the managers. Hitherto it was allowable for the teacher who felt aggrieved by any action of his manager to submit the matter in writing to the inspector, who was instructed to refer it for the Commissioners' consideration after making such inquiry as was necessary. In 1906, however, the privilege was granted to the teacher of making his complaint against his manager directly to the Board, so that he avoided the necessity of referring it first to the local official, whose possible friendship with the manager might cause the teacher to have doubt of his impartiality. About the same time a very important step forward in the direction of securing the teacher's position was made in connection with the same rule. Whichever ground of complaint a teacher might have against his manager, it was always held, prior to this time, that the giving of a three months' notice in the proper legal form by the latter to the former was not a matter in which the Commissioners could interfere, even though it was obvious that the reasons for which the manager took action were such as could not be defended on educational grounds, but for the past four or five years the Commissioners have taken upon themselves, when complaint is made by the teacher of dismissal by a manager, to review the circumstances in which the notice was given, notwithstanding that it might be perfectly legal in form, and if it seemed to the Board that these grounds were such as to constitute a reasonable grievance, they took action either by suspending the manager from his functions or in some other appropriate way. Thus, for example, in a recent case at Limerick, where a manager gave his teacher three months' notice of dismissal on account of an occurrence which had no connection with school work, the Commissioners ordered that the manager should no longer be recognised, and they stated that they would not pay their grants to a new principal teacher in succession to the one dismissed. This



99th May, 1913.]

Mr. W. J. M. SPARKES, M.A., Litt.D., LL.D., examined.

[Continued.]

action led to the reinstatement of the teacher under a new manager. It is evident that such action on the part of the Board constitutes an enormous increase in the security of tenure afforded to the National teacher. In fact, a large number of Protestant teachers in the North of Ireland, who had been agitating for many years for a reform, sent me a resolution that this action on the part of the Board, which, I may say, I proposed myself, largely solved the problem of the teachers' tenure.

11786. Mr. KAVANAGH.—It might have had the effect of closing the schools?—Certainly, it might. I am very glad to say that in the case of the managers of three-fourths of the schools, where action of this kind by the Board would be very serious indeed, it has been, by the Mayoath resolutions, rendered unnecessary. There have been no appeals, except in two cases, in the last 15 years, from Catholic teachers.

11787. The CHAIRMAN.—That is, making the Bishop refuse?—The Catholic teachers have always said that they were quite satisfied with that arrangement.

11788. But the Protestants of the North?—No, their position is different, as they won't take their Bishops or other ecclesiastical authorities.

11789. Sir HIRSH WILKINSON.—I wish to put the question whether the Board has thought it desirable to go a step further, and to provide that if a manager had a complaint against a teacher, instead of giving notice of dismissal, he might be allowed to give notice to the Board that in his opinion, in the interests of education, it was desirable that the teacher should be removed—has that procedure ever been taken?—That the manager should appeal to the Board?

11790. Yes?—That in his opinion the teacher ought to be removed on the ground of inefficiency?

11791. Yes?—There have been a couple of cases where, in consequence of the new rule which I speak of here, managers have written to ask whether the Board would support them if they dismissed a teacher. Is that the kind of thing you refer to?

11792. It amounts to that?—I got a letter only last week to that effect, and there have been some other cases. But a hypothetical question of this kind is not on any case to answer. Hitherto such cases have been rare; they may be met by asking the inspector to go into the case, and to say whether the teacher is really efficient or not. If the inspector reports that the manager would be justified in dismissing the teacher, he might tell the latter that if the teacher appeals to us, we won't grant the appeal.

11793. There is an alternative that suggests itself, that is, to ask the chief inspector to hold an investigation?—That is practically what I am doing.

11794. Not merely the district inspector?—Not necessarily the district inspector; we might call in the chief inspector.

11795. The CHAIRMAN.—Now, will you continue your remarks?—Another matter in which further protection was afforded to the teacher has reference to the restrictions placed on new managers under Rule 40 (b), which was modified in 1909, and again in 1911. It had happened more than once that a new manager on taking possession of a school had refused to enter into agreements with members of the existing staff, whose appointments accordingly lapsed without any chance of redress. The teachers never agitated about that, although it was an outrageous proceeding. Hence we amended Rule 40 (b), which now requires that on a change of managers the new manager must enter into an agreement with each member of the existing staff, and cannot dispense with the services of any teacher except under the terms of the agreement. This agreement must also be of the same kind as the former one, so as to secure the same form of protection to the teacher. Thus, if the former agreement provided for a referee, the new manager must enter into an agreement couched in similar terms.

11796. Mr. HENLY.—And, of course, the same with the referees?—Yes. But there may be a change of referees if the teacher consents. The restrictions on teachers taking part in politics or acting as county or district councillors were relaxed in 1911, when attendance at political meetings was made allowable, so long as the meetings were not concerned with party politics. In the same year Rule 88 (b) was so modified as to

allow of the appointment of teachers as county, union or district councillors, provided they obtained those positions by co-option, and not as the result of election, the distinction, of course, being due to the desirability of preventing the participation of a teacher in a contested election, with the consequent heat and friction that might be involved.

11797. Mr. KERR.—What about an uncontested election?—Are there many such?

11798. Oh, there are a good many?—We have not considered the possibility of that.

11799. The CHAIRMAN.—In there but another reason against it, namely, that they are taken away from their schools to attend meetings?—That was one of the arguments against amending the rule.

11800. Sir HIRSH WILKINSON.—I think the question came up here, and it was pointed out that those Commissions usually sit at times which would not interfere with the attendance of the teachers?—So we were told; but I had my doubts. In 1911 also the Commissioners abolished the "character query," which used to appear in the Quarterly Returns of the school-attendance received from the managers. These returns formerly required a statement from the manager regarding the teacher's conduct and character, but this is no longer included in them. The rule enabling the manager to furnish confidential reports on the school was also abolished about the same time. There is also a Rule that the order in which the assistants stand must remain unaltered when a new manager comes into office, and cannot be changed without the consent of the Commissioners. An ingenious way of getting rid of a teacher, if the average was doubtful, was to put him at the bottom of the list. In this way he could be summarily got rid of without violating an agreement or anything else when the attendance went down.

11801. The CHAIRMAN.—What is the next subject?—The next subject is annual increments. The system of amending triennial increments, I may say, was introduced in 1910. In the resolutions submitted to the Board in November, 1909, and explained in the so-called Resident Commissioner's memorandum, I proposed annual increments, which passed the Board. They were small sums, ranging from £2 in the third grade to £6 in the highest grade. The initial salary was to be smaller than it is at present in the case of men, viz., £31 a year. Subsequently we could not secure the repeal of the Schedule to the Act of 1902, and as there was a deficiency of some £125,000, due under the Act to the teachers as residual grant, we were compelled to revise the whole system of salaries on which we had spent six months in 1909. In consequence of the deficiency due to the maintenance of the residual grant, we were obliged to get rid of the annual increments, which were a great deal more expensive than the triennial. Subsequently, when Mr. Birrell promised us an additional sum of money in 1904-7, we again proposed annual increments to the Treasury, and actually drew up a scale costing something like £60,000 or £70,000, with annual increments of £2 or £3; I forgot the exact figure. It thus appears that in 1909 and 1906 we tried to establish a system of annual increments. It is obvious that if increments are annual, it would be almost impossible not to make them largely automatic; we could not possibly carry out such a close scrutiny of the inspectors' reports as we do nowadays in the case of the triennial increments. If we could adopt annual increments, which I should personally welcome, I think that they ought to be awarded in every case where the report was satisfactory, and that we should drop the distinctions of "very good," "excellent," "fair," "good," "weak good," "strong good," "middling," and "bad." We should have to make a regulation that every teacher who has got a satisfactory report should receive his increment.

11802. Then the question has been raised again and again, how would that affect efficiency?—It seems to me that if we require a satisfactory report, it will come to very much the same thing as at present, that is, that a teacher who is not pretty certain of his increment will have to work for it. Actually inefficient teachers will continue to live, as at present, in a state

of mental quietude, they will be perfectly certain as to their prospects; but the person who is on the border line will have to work. But it will be desirable not to reduce the teachers to a dead level. I think it is worth considering whether men who work up to a high standard should not get some credit for it. It would be well if you could by some means or other reward higher efficiency. There ought to be some means of advancing a teacher who would be known to be more efficient than his neighbours.

11805. Mr. HENLY.—Could not that be met by something like the Carls and Blake prizes?—Yes, but there are not nearly enough of them. I have been so long exercising my mind on those questions that I think it would be rather difficult to suggest any scheme that I have not considered. For example, I actually got the Board in 1902 to agree to a scheme for giving a silver medal to every teacher of high efficiency, no matter how numerous they might be. I asked the Teachers' Organisation what they thought of it, and they said: "How much money would go with the medal?"

11806. Mr. COFFEY.—Are there not a very large number of teachers who, without any reward, or any chance of reward, are marked "excellent" year after year?—Of course, there are.

11807. Mr. HENLY.—The increments proposed in 1900 were £2 annually in third grade, £3 in second, £5 in second of first, and £6 in first, and your estimate was to save £80,000 per annum?—I do not know what experience you have in estimates, but they are almost invariably wrong.

11808. The CHAIRMAN.—Have you a document to show that?—I have not, as the financial proposals in the Resident Commissioner's memorandum were not carried out.

There is just one remark which I wish to make touching the abolition of the stimulus afforded by the results system. When we brought in the new system in 1899, the change was brought against us that in abolishing the results system and substituting fixed salaries for the fragmentary payments of the old system, we were giving an advantage only to the lazy and inefficient. These objections were put to me, in a very fashion, by a high Treasury official, himself a Cork man: "The new scheme of education is likely to be extremely popular with the teachers and inspectors, but to be harmful to Ireland. Its root idea was refuted long ago by Adam Smith in his criticism of the universities, namely, that if you make a man's position independent of his exertions he will do better work. What incentive will the teacher have? He need not trouble to attract pupils, for if they are only ten he will get the same pay. Suppose he shambles aimlessly through the year, he may lose his increment, but this for the majority means only two pounds, and it is only a Sassenach who would hesitate between the blessings of a year's inactivity and the blessings of two pounds. His sole care would be to escape censure." This prophecy, which is surely the worst ever made, was directed against the original scheme in 1899, which was subsequently altered by making the increments triennial, and by the addition of a capitation grant. The new system is not, from all accounts, popular with the teachers as providing them with unlimited opportunities for idleness, and it has not been harmful to Ireland as destroying the efficiency of the schools. In fact, it is now proposed to alter it, in the direction criticised in this letter, by making the increment independent of the merit of the teacher. This change would, in my opinion, be "harmful to Ireland."

## TWENTY-SIXTH DAY.—FRIDAY, MAY 30TH, 1913.

At 23, Kildare street, Dublin.

Present:—Sir SAMUEL DILL, M.A., LL.D., LL.D. (Chairman); Sir HERMAN SHAW WILKINSON, LL.D.; Mr. JOHN COFFEY; Mr. HEDRAGE E. B. HARRISON, B.A.; Mr. JEREMIAH HENLY; Mr. WALTER MCMURROUGH KAVANAGH, D.L.; Mr. THOMAS MICHAEL KEITLE, B.L.; and

Mr. ARTHUR J. DONNELLY, M.A., B.Sc., Secretary.

Dr. W. J. M. STARRIE, Resident Commissioner of National Education, further examined.

11809. The CHAIRMAN.—We had finished last evening up to the Clonduff case?—Yes, I have to begin with Clonduff.

11810. You say that you heard of the Clonduff case first in March, 1911?—Yes. The Clonduff case was first brought under my notice early in March, 1911, by the secretary, Mr. Leman. I understood that the chief inspector, Mr. Purser, had seriously impugned the judgment of the senior inspector, Mr. Cussen, in the morning of the school, and I directed that the statements concerning Mr. Cussen in Mr. Purser's report should be referred to the former for his observations. In the second half of March, 1911, I spent several days in the West of Ireland, and from the 24th to the 31st March, I stayed at Malleganny and visited schools in the Castlerea circuit. On these visits I was accompanied by Mr. Dilworth and by the senior inspector of the circuit, Mr. Cussen.

11811. Mr. Cussen went to the schools with you?—Yes; when visiting the schools I often ask the senior inspector of the circuit to accompany me. That is only politeness. On the 30th March, Clonduff was amongst the schools at which we called, but quite accidentally.

11812. You called there accidentally?—Yes; on our way to Castlebar I saw a school at the side of the road, and went in. On this day, the 30th March, 1911, Clonduff was among the schools at which we called,

but I did not specially select it for a visit, nor was I aware until after leaving that it was the school about which Mr. Purser and Mr. Cussen had differed. I took no special note of the name of the school when the case was before me in the office at the beginning of March, and there was nothing in the circumstances of my visit to distinguish it from any other. There were 10 or 15 schools on Mr. Dilworth's list for the day, which I may have seen, but the name Clonduff conveyed nothing to me.

11813. The name of Clonduff on the paper meant nothing to you?—Absolutely nothing. I did not even look at the name of the school as I went in. I got it out of the roll book or report book. My memory of Irish names of places is so defective that if you asked me about one, even in connection with comparatively important cases, I could not tell you an hour after it had been before me. The names of these National schools sometimes extend to six or seven syllables, and I could not even pronounce many of them.

11814. And you hit on this quite accidentally?—Yes; purely accidentally. I have here a statement of Mr. Dilworth's, in which he says:—"When visiting the schools in Co. Mayo, with the Resident Commissioner, in March and April, 1911, there was no specific intention on our part to visit Clonduff school. The school was visited incidentally, in just the same way as the other schools in the locality, and the fact that there

30th May, 1913.]

Mr. W. J. N. SPARKIN, M.A., LL.D., LL.D., examined.

[Continued.]

was a difference of opinion between Mr. Pomer and Mr. Cusson as to the mark that should be assigned had nothing to say to our visit to the school. When about to enter the school, Mr. Cusson remarked to me " (that is, Mr. Dilworth), " that he would like me to take a close look into the work, and it was not until then I became aware that it was the school about which the correspondence was proceeding. The Resident Commissioner did not overhear this remark, and it was not until after he had left the school that I called his attention to the special circumstances connected with it. In accordance with our usual practice, on leaving the school we compared notes as to the impression we had formed of the work."

11815. Can you give us the notes you took at the time?—Yes. I considered that the school merited the mark "fair." Mr. Dilworth goes on:—"The Resident Commissioner, who had looked into the written work more closely than I, considered that the school about merited the mark 'fair.' I had formed a somewhat higher estimate; but this did not affect the Resident Commissioner's view, who has always expressed, in his conversations with me, that in his opinion the school did not deserve a higher mark than 'fair' on the occasion of his visit." On leaving the school I said to Mr. Dilworth:—"I think Mr. Cusson has been a little hard on the school. The drawing seems to have considerable merit, and I think the school deserves to get 'fair.'" He replied:—"I inspected only the mental arithmetic, and I thought it somewhat above 'fair,'" or, as he put it, a "strong fair." He also said:—"I know that this is a case in which Mr. Pomer and Mr. Cusson have been at loggerheads." To this I replied that I did not know anything about it. You wanted my notes?

11816. If you have your notes it would be satisfactory to hear them?—Yes, I have a few items.—Cloonduff. Visited on 30th March, 1911. Teacher, P. Kelly. 54, average attendance. No fire, as fuel supplied by children is exhausted. Manager, Father Kelly. Irish is taught. Two ex-teachers live near school and injure it. (He told me that there were two ex-teachers living here by who quarrelled with him. I am pretty sure he gave as good as he got.) "Attached from the altar by Father O'Hara, now at Ballycorry. School used on Sundays for meetings without leave of teacher. Teacher ordered out when he went into the school on Sundays. Teacher complains of Fenton's report." (He did not say a word about Cusson. Fenton's was "fair.") "No colony taught. Reading very monotonous, but intelligible." These are my notes on the school. There is no evidence there of my having any knowledge whatever of any impending question in connection with it.

11817. Mr. HARRISON.—Was there any assistant teacher?—Yes, his wife. The assistant teacher told me she had met me before, when I was going round with Mr. Dulo. She is an efficient teacher. I fancied that the reason the school was of such a low ebb was that she had been in bad health for some time. This was obviously a case where the grey mare was the better horse. Indeed, Kelly struck me as being a dangerous character. He was very ugly and very dirty, he was very quarrelsome, and his outer had been uniformly bad. Certainly the good tone of the school was remarkable for its absence. On my return to Dublin, the senior inspector's reply to Mr. Pomer's statement regarding the school was submitted to me, and for the first time I went carefully into the case. After full consideration I made the following order on the file:—"Having visited Cloonduff school I see no sufficient reason for altering the mark assigned to the school by Mr. Cusson." I intended those words: "I see no sufficient reason," to convey the idea that I did not quite agree with Mr. Cusson, but I certainly did not think it would be worth while to reverse the senior inspector's mark in order to change a "middling" into a "fair." I was perfectly within my right in making this order as the final authority on details of administration, and neither the chief inspector nor any other officer of the Commission had any right to appeal from me to the Board on the matter. It would be impossible for me to carry on the administration if my orders were not loyally

accepted by the Board's officers. It was open to my Commissioner to bring the matter up at a meeting of the Board; it is significant that one of the Commissioners, Mr. Ward, who took up the teacher's case and was acquainted with Mr. Pomer's views from the beginning, did not think it advisable to raise the matter for discussion at the Board.

11818. He never mentioned it at the Board?—Never, as I shall show later on; I have his letters here.

11819. Mr. HENRY.—He has stated that—Has he? In reviewing the case in April, I noted that, in visiting the school on 27th January, 1911, Mr. Pomer had acted in an unauthorized and irregular manner.

11820. Did the secretary, by referring the file to Mr. Pomer, not authorize him?—No; he acted quite wrongly. Entirely after error.

11821. Is it usual to refer a case of that kind to the chief inspector?—Certainly not; our officials have strict orders not to do so.

11822. Mr. CONVEY.—That is, the secretaries?—Yes, or the examiners without my authority. The source of the whole trouble in this case was Mr. Lennan, referring the case to Mr. Pomer.

11823. The CHAIRMAN.—He did that on his own authority?—Entirely. He says: "I had originally referred the file to Mr. Pomer for his opinion."

11824. Mr. CONVEY.—Was it for his opinion or for his observations?—I take any statement from the file.

11825. The CHAIRMAN.—He says: "That letter was intended to go to the manager of the school, in order to receive the teacher's explanation, and to submit the matter for the consideration of the Resident Commissioner, and the Board, if necessary; but before doing so, I thought it advisable, as I had been in the habit of doing in similar cases, to refer it with a note to the chief inspector for his opinion."—Yes, you see "opinion" is the word.

11826. "We all like to have our views upon any matter of action to be taken, fortified as much as possible by the opinion of those who are in actual touch with the school, and I said: 'Refer the letter first to the chief inspector for his opinion as to action to be taken.'"—Yes, that is what I quoted. The secretary had originally referred the file to Mr. Pomer for his opinion regarding the action to be taken concerning the teacher on account of a very improper letter which the latter had addressed to the secretaries. Instead of complying with the secretary's request, Mr. Pomer visited the school and held an inquiry into the marking of the senior inspector, Mr. Cusson, and the junior inspector, Mr. Fenton. Although a chief inspector is at liberty to examine any National school when he deems it necessary, he is not at liberty in the case of an appeal or complaint from a manager or teacher against the report of an inspector to make a re-examination unless specially directed to do so. Such a re-examination is in the nature of a special inquiry or investigation, which should not be undertaken by a chief inspector without direct orders from the Commissioners (see memorandum of chief inspectors' duties). To make this quite clear I made an order some years ago that the chief inspectors were not to re-examine a school on an appeal from the manager or teacher without express directions from me.

11827. Is that order to be seen?—No, I am afraid it is not. It is not forthcoming, but everybody in the office remembers it. As I stated on the first day, I made this order in consequence of some conversation I had with Mr. Dulo in 1908. I asked for it the other day, but it cannot be found; but I can produce any amount of evidence that it was issued.

11828. Although you regarded that procedure as irregular, you treated the report founded on it as regular?—Yes, I did. Strictly speaking, the Cloonduff teachers' letter was not an appeal, but a complaint against the inspector's report as being unfair and unjust, and it was unquestionably the duty of the chief inspector, if he thought a visit to the school necessary in order to reply to the secretary's request, to have said so, and to have sought official instructions. That is a very important point. It is quite possible, it is quite con-

conceivable, that Mr. Purser, on reading the teacher's letter, might have desired to see the school, and to ascertain from personal observation what sort of fellow the teacher was. But the point referred to him was a simple one. It was what action should be taken with regard to a teacher who had violated the rules by writing to the office himself and not through his manager. In addition, his letter was very impertinent. As the mark of the school did not really, except by a confusion of ideas, affect the question, there was no reason why the schools should be re-inspected. But still Mr. Purser might say: "Before I give my opinion I should like to have a look at the school." In that case, no letter was addressed to the Commissioners, and as Mr. Purser was asked to express his opinion as to the suitable action to be taken on it, it was his bounden duty, before undertaking an investigation into the marking of the school, to say to me: "I should like very much to see this school before making my report." In such circumstances I should have been perfectly certain to give him permission.

11829. That would have regularised his visit?—Yes. Notwithstanding that Mr. Purser did not do so, I overlooked the irregularity involved in his holding the investigation into the inspector's marking, and treated his report as regular, by referring it to Mr. Cussen for a reply to the serious charges brought against him by the chief inspector. My inspection of this school on 30th March, 1911, satisfied me that, although I did not think it was then quite so unsatisfactory as to deserve the mark "middling" (four months had elapsed since Mr. Cussen's report), Mr. Purser had certainly taken much too favourable a view of the school and the teacher to warrant its being marked "good." What prejudiced me most against his attitude in this case was the perfectly ridiculous, almost wicked, remark that this school was better than the Beltra school. Beltra school is well known in the Co. Mayo as a very good school. I was in it myself, on the day I visited Clonsilla, and I remember saying to Mr. Dilworth: "This school is an illustration of the immense superiority of schools taught by women as compared with those under men."

11830. That was the school taught by the two sisters Sweeney?—Yes, it is a very good country school. To compare it unfavourably with a dirty place like the Clonsilla school seemed to me to be a most monstrous piece of partiality.

11831. And had Beltra got "good" for some time?—It had got "very good" for years and years, and the other never got "good" until I gave it myself, as you will see later on. I was decidedly of opinion that there was no adequate ground for cancelling the mark "middling" given in November, 1910, and substituting "good" in its place, as recommended by Mr. Purser. The deliberate cancellation of an inspector's report is a very grave matter, and only justifiable for extremely cogent reasons. Mr. Purser lays stress on the fact that he could find no record of my order that the school should be inspected by a chief inspector during the next year. I have since talked over this matter with Mr. Dilworth, who assures me that I said to him—"I must see that the school is inspected next year by a chief inspector." In such a case it does not at all follow that the order would be put down at once. The Secretary had taken a note of it, and there was no doubt about it in the office; everybody knew it was going to be inspected by a chief inspector.

11832. What year did you mean?—Of course, the calendar year. Nobody in the office means "school year" when he says "year." If you mean school year you say school year. However, as I was not quite satisfied that full justice had been done to the teacher, I told the Secretary that the school should be inspected by a chief inspector in the following year, and that if the mark were "good" then, the report should be treated as having been furnished in 1911, and an increment awarded to the teacher accordingly. In this manner the teacher would be put in as good a position as if Mr. Purser's report of 27th January, 1911, had been adopted, and the authority of the inspectors in charge of the school would not be impaired. I might say that in three cases where there is an appeal against an inspector's

mark, or where the inspector's mark is impugned, I usually take that course of action, which I think is the only respectful one. The custom of the chief inspector or chiefs of inspection at one time was to ride roughshod over the inspectors, in the gayest manner possible, and on the simple appeal of the teacher, even when unsupported by the manager, to reverse their judgments. Well, I may tell you, as I think Mr. Dale has told you, that in England no inspector would stand that, and I do not wonder. There is no reason why a district inspector should not be a much more competent man than the senior inspector, and it seems to me a perfectly intolerable thing that his mark should be arbitrarily altered. If this often occurs every manager in the county knows it, and in future nobody cares twopence about his judgment.

11833. The CHAIRMAN.—Do you know any case, Mr. Harrison, of a chief revising a school mark?

Mr. HARRISON.—I have known of cases of re-examination in old days, but I cannot recall a definite case of which I could give you any particulars.

Witness.—That is what I do, and it seems to me much more satisfactory and fairer both to the inspector and the teacher. I make a noting, or I give an order, as I did in this case, that the school should not be inspected in the next year by the inspector whose judgment was impugned, but by a senior or chief inspector, and then if the senior inspector's mark is higher than that of the inspector of the year before, I throw back the increment or promotion for a whole year. Do you see the effect of that? It does not impair the previous man's judgment, because it can be said that the teacher got a warning, and that he had a whole year to improve. If he does improve I reward him from the preceding year. That is what I have been doing for a considerable time in the case of teachers who are in danger of losing an increment or promotion on the third report. I tell the man, "You cannot get your promotion or your increment this year, but you will be examined next year, and if your school improves meanwhile we will treat the mark you get next year as if it was given this year." In such a case the man will get his increment or promotion as if he got a good mark in the preceding year.

11834 Mr. ELVANAGH.—Do you tell him the inspector will be a different one?—We do not change the inspector in the latter case, as his judgment has not been impugned, but in the former case we do.

11835 Mr. CORRY.—What was the date or period when the chief inspectors quite lightly cancelled marks?—Before 1900; until, as I said before, Mr. Dale convinced me of the danger of weakening the independence of the subordinate inspectors.

11836. Till 1903?—Yes.

11837. When were cases of appeal first referred to you?—Before that, between 1900 and 1903.

11838. After 1901, as I understood, the appeals did not go to the Commissioners?—They never went to them before 1900; subsequently so that they ought to have come to me, but I found the examiners, who were used to the old system occasionally, in spite of the regulation that investigations should be held by chief inspectors, only by order of the Commissioners, referring the cases of appeal to the chief inspectors. It is extremely hard to get people out of an old rut. That was between 1900 and 1903. When it came to my knowledge about 1905 I stopped it at once.

11839. But we had it from Mr. Purser, I think, in evidence that an appeal case had never been sent to him?—To him?

11840. Yes?—An appeal case had never been sent to him during the whole time he was in the office?

11841. Yes?—Do you mean by me?

11842. Yes?—That is nonsense. Appeals are numerous enough. Whenever I think a case to be one that would require looking into I send it to the chief inspectors. One of the Commissioners, Mr. Ward, spoke to me about the Clonsilla case in June, 1911, and on 15th June my private secretary wrote to him. There has been a difference of opinion, as you know,

30th May, 1913.]

Mr. W. J. M. STARKIE, M.A., Litt.D., LL.D., continued.

[Continued.]

between Mr. Ward and myself as to the date from which the increment was to be granted to Mr. Kelly, and this letter makes it perfectly clear what my view was from the beginning. Mr. Ward wrote on the 15th June, 1911, that is a fortnight before Mr. Pusey's letter to me, "referring to the case of Mr. Kelly, of Clondraff National School, to which I called your attention on Tuesday" (that settles the date, Tuesday was the 13th June, and that is the first time he spoke to me on the subject, "and with which you are quite familiar, I would like very much if you would reconsider it, and see if you would not be justified in giving him an increment now." (That is very important, because you see that Mr. Ward, writing on the 15th of June, wanted me to give Kelly his increment from the 15th of June, 1911, and there is no mention of 1910.) "You rate the school yourself higher than Mr. Cussen, and I believe Mr. Pusey, after an inspection lasting nearly a day, thought it might be classed as 'good.' The poor fellow has been working since 1869 at £56 a year, and though his peculiar temperament has brought him into many difficulties during that time, still I think a little encouragement, such as I suggest, would not be lost on him, but would be sure to have the effect of making him work more successfully than apparently he has been doing. I am really ashamed to write to him again putting him off till next school year. I have every faith that the man under encouragement is capable of doing better." The answer of my private secretary on the 19th June was—"Referring to your letter of the 15th inst., Dr. Starkie desires me to say, with regard to the case of Mr. Patrick Kelly, teacher of Clondraff National School, Co. Mayo, that the granting of increment of good service salary to a teacher, whose last general report was only marked 'middling,' would be a thing unheard of. Dr. Starkie intends, however, to have the school inspected next year by one of the chief inspectors, and should Mr. Kelly then succeed in obtaining a 'good' report, he (Dr. Starkie) will make the increment which may then be awarded date so as to cover this year." There is no mention there of 1910.

11843. The CHAIRMAN.—That would mean that the increment would begin from April, 1911?—Certainly. Mr. Ward wrote to me again on the 17th of June—"I am very much obliged for the concession you make in the case of Mr. Kelly, Clondraff National School, that if his report is 'good' next year you will make it cover this year. But I really think you should go further. 'Middling' is evidently not the mark to which the school is entitled. You and Mr. Dilworth valued it higher, and I believe Mr. Pusey thought it worthy of 'good.' In these circumstances, and considering that the teacher is still at £56 a year, although not a young man, I really think you should award an increment at present. I am also thinking of the encouraging effect such a recognition will have on his future work." Again, there is nothing in this letter about 1910. Indeed, the suggestion to date the increment from 1910 is a ridiculous one. However much I may sympathise with Mr. Kelly (and I do not sympathise very much), I really do not see why I should pay him, out of my own pocket, an increment, which he did not deserve, from 1910. Such a proposal is rather a large order. Being accounting officer to the Treasury, I am personally responsible for every shilling that is spent. Our accounts are audited by the Comptroller and Auditor-General, and if I paid the increment from the 1st of April, 1910, it would be deducted from my own salary. An increment from April, 1910, would have to be based on Mr. Pusey's report of February, 1910, which was "fair," and from the beginning of this case there never has been a proposal to alter Mr. Pusey's report. Mr. Cussen's report in November, if altered to "good," could not justify any increment except from the 1st of April, 1911. It could not possibly influence an award for 1910, and if I ordered the payment of an increment from 1st of April, 1910, I should be discharged. At the end of June Mr. Pusey wrote to me about the case, and informed me in his letter that "he could not look upon the decision as final until he had appealed to the Board, and been heard by them." In reply, I wrote him two letters, dated the 30th of June and the

of July, 1911, copies of which have been handed in by Mr. Pusey. My first intention was to place the matter before the Board; in that case I should have had to go fully into Mr. Pusey's action in connection with it, and I thought it almost certain that the Board would have found it necessary to censure him for his laudation, with a consequent prejudicial effect on the amount of pension that would be awarded to him on his retirement. For similar conduct Mr. Dowling had lost 5 per cent. of his pension, and it was perfectly certain that Mr. Pusey would lose the same. I personally control the pensions, that is so far as the National Board is concerned. It is my duty to recommend to the Treasury, and I subsequently recommended Mr. Pusey for full pension. If I had brought his conduct in this case before the Board I could not have done so. As I did not wish in his own interests that this should happen, I decided not to bring the matter before the Board, and so informed him in my letter of 1st of July. You will notice that I say in this letter—"If the chief inspector's report next year is 'good' I will pay Mr. Kelly his increment from the 1st of April this year." If language has any meaning, this means the 1st April, 1911; but Mr. Pusey, with his well-known ingenuity (I may say that in my office he is known as the Houdini of the Office), what I chiefly object to in him is, that he always has one up his sleeve, writes, in answer to me, in a way that shows he had thought out the trick that he was going to play later on. Although writing at the very end of the school year, I say "the 1st of April this year," and "next year," he carefully turns my "next year" in his reply into "next school year," thus clearly showing that he already had his plan in his mind. I did not pay very much attention to the letter, and so I did not notice the point of the substitution of "school year" for "year." It was in March, 1912, which was in the next school year, so there was no difference, so far as I was concerned, between "school year" and "calendar year." But Mr. Pusey's meaning is obvious in not quoting my letter exactly, but substituting his own expression for the other. In his statement he says, "the Resident Commissioner obviously meaning the next school year." If you want to make a fair inference, the right way to do it, if I am told by legitimate sources and modern, is to stick to "obviously." Another odd thing in his letter is that, although I promised I would give the increment from 1st April, 1911, he says—"If I had known that you were going to do this, I would not have appealed." He adds that, although he thought the teacher was entitled to his increment from an earlier date, yet, if he had known that I intended to pay the increment if the report was "good" from the 1st of April, 1911, he would not have appealed. As the teacher did get his increment from this date, what was his grievance? What did he write to the Limerick teacher about? Mr. Pusey again visited the Clondraff school on 27th September, 1911, and furnished a report, using the "General Report" form, in which he marked the school and the teacher "good." He proposed to justify his visit by the statement in my letter of 30th June, 1911, in which I said that I had directed that the school should be examined by a chief inspector "next year"; this he interpreted as meaning the next "school year" which commenced on 1st July, 1911. I should like to point out the ingenuity of that interpretation in another respect. I was in the next room to Mr. Pusey, and he admits in his own words that he had an interview with me, and that I was quite friendly in my manner in spite of what he had done, but he never asked me whether I intended any private letter to be official. There was nothing official about it, and I never heard of an official acting on such a private communication, especially when it did not say that I wanted him to hold the inspection. It only stated that I had made an order that it should be done. Some witnesses have been asked why I selected March, 1912, for the inspection by the chief inspector. I can give you the explanation. That was the date fixed in the calendar for inspecting the school, and Mr. Pusey actually sent for the calendar, and showed it with his own hand without any authority from anybody, in order to justify his own visit.

30th May, 1918.]

Mr. W. J. M. STARRIS, M.A., LL.D., examined.

[Continued.]

11844. Mr. HENRY.—Can you show that?—I can; he crossed the date for inspecting the school in order that he should inspect it himself before he retired.

11845. The CHAIRMAN.—What is this calendar?—There is a date fixed for the annual inspection of every school.

11846. Where is that kept?—The calendar is in duplicate. One copy is in the office, and the other one is in the custody of the senior inspector in each circuit.

11847. In the school?—Not in the school, but in the circuit. Mr. Purser sent for the office copy and altered it; his entry at the top in blue pencil was, "To be examined by chief inspector."

11848. Mr. KETTER.—Would he not have discretionary power to alter the date?—No.

11849. The CHAIRMAN.—Who fixed that date?—It is fixed by the senior inspector. This action of Mr. Purser I considered as entirely unauthorised, and as a mere trick to defeat my intentions regarding the examination of the school. In the first place, Mr. Purser had no warranty to act on a private letter, which conveyed no order, but merely an intimation that I had adopted a certain course; then it was not reasonable to suppose that "next year" could mean the school year beginning the day after the date of my letter. Mr. Purser, it also appears (see his Memorandum on the case), enquired whether such an order had been given, and wrote to the senior inspector regarding it; the fact that he received no information as to the order should have led him to request instructions before taking any steps to visit the school. This he did not do; further, he knew from the circuit calendar that the Clondraff school was set down for general inspection in March, 1912, and that, if the chief inspector was to furnish the General Report, there was no reason or warranty for his doing so before the month of March, 1912. That Mr. Purser had seen the calendar is shown by a noting in his writing opposite the name of the school in that document. Consequently his furnishing the report on the school without instructions and not at the appointed time of year was quite irregular, and I could not allow such a report to be accepted as fulfilling the conditions set down in my letter to Mr. Ward. It is obvious that Mr. Ward did not interpret my promise, as Mr. Purser professes to do. If he thought that the school could have been examined, we will say, in September, why did he make such an effort to persuade me to give the increment from the 16th June? He had only to wait till September in order to get it from the 1st of April. He has told me all along that he understood that the inspection was to be held in the next calendar year. In accordance with my intention Mr. McNeill, chief inspector, held the general inspection of the school in March, 1912; he reported an improvement in the general proficiency, but said that the mark of the school did not rise above "very fair." In view of this improvement, I told him that I would treat his mark as equivalent to "good," whereupon Mr. McNeill altered the mark to "good." Mr. Kelly was thereupon, in accordance with my promise, awarded his increment from 1st April, 1911. He never got "good" even from Mr. McNeill.

11850. "Very fair"?—"Very fair." As I said there had been an improvement.

11851. "Very fair" is not one of your marks technically?—That is so, and that is one of the reasons why I would not accept it. I said to Mr. McNeill, you must turn your mark into 'fair' or 'good.'

11852. And he turned it into "good"?—Yes. With regard to the date of the increment, Mr. Purser asserts in his evidence that it was promised that the teacher should get the increment from the 1st of April, 1910. That is in reply to question 4068. I think I am entitled to protest against the language used by Mr. Purser. There is no doubt that he has made imputations of a most offensive character; he practically accuses me of telling lies and of breaking my promise, and of actually denying that I had ever made it. That is scandalous language for anybody to use, considering that he had

only hearsay knowledge of my promise to Mr. Ward, and Mr. Ward himself said that he had no quarrel with me in the matter. He wrote to me in October last year—"In your letter to-day you seemed to suggest that I was dissatisfied with your decision in the Clondraff case. I do not think my letter conveys any idea of dissatisfaction. I merely differed from your recollection of your promise as to the date from which the increment should be paid in the event of the report being satisfactory." Possibly Mr. Ward had lost my letter, which shows that there is not a question of recollection here. You have heard the letter of my secretary in which I say "this year." Mr. Ward went on to say—"To bring a matter like that before the Board never even occurred to me. I never at any time, either in this case or any other, brought under your notice, expressed any dissatisfaction with your decision." As I have proved, Mr. Purser was quite mistaken in stating that the increment was promised from an earlier date. No such promise was made, nor would it have been regular, even had Mr. Purser's first report been substituted for Mr. Cussen's, in accordance with the award in that way. The practice in awarding increments is that the award is made to date from the time at which the school is stated to have reached the standard "good," and there could be no question of granting it from April, 1910, as Mr. Fenton's general report of February, 1910, was only "fair." It was not at the earliest until the year following Mr. Fenton's report that the question of awarding the increment could be considered. If Mr. McNeill's report had been furnished by the usual course Mr. Kelly would not have received his increment until 1st March, 1912, so that owing to the special action taken in this case he really received it a year earlier than otherwise would have been warranted. Consequently there is no ground whatever for the statement on the last page of Mr. Purser's memorandum, that the teacher was deprived of a year's increment. As no formal withdrawal of the reprimand addressed to the teacher after Mr. Cussen's report of November, 1910, has been made, the teacher has been treated as if the report and reprimand were null and void, as he received the increment from the 1st April following the receipt of a report as unfavourable that in the ordinary course it would have prevented the award of any increase of salary for a period of three years. And this is the man who, according to Mr. Purser, has been treated with such injustice by me. So far from being injured, he has been treated with such extraordinary leniency, that in the midst of the trouble and turmoil in which I have been involved with this ex-chief inspector in a case of extreme unimportance, Mr. Kelly's action in writing an impertinent letter was forgotten, and so far from being punished, he has got his increment at least three years earlier than he could possibly have got it normally. From what I have said, it should be clear to any fair-minded person that neither Mr. Purser nor Mr. Kelly could have been treated with greater consideration. As I was unwilling to have trouble with the former, in view of his approaching resignation, I overlooked the fact that, contrary to official orders, he had undertaken an important investigation; I overlooked the fact that, contrary to an express office direction, he approached a member of the Board, and constantly urged him to bring the matter before the Board; I overlooked the fact that he refused to accept my ruling in a case within my jurisdiction, and that he endeavoured to foment my authority by appealing to the Board over my head. At a meeting of the teachers in the Mansion House on 25th October, 1912, portions of letters written by Mr. Purser to a County Limerick teacher were read, stating that the greatest grievance the teachers had was that the Resident Commissioner or any high official should be allowed to intercept an appeal addressed to the Board. I may observe that, when it suits him, Mr. Purser contends that this was not an appeal; that the teachers had no means of making an effective appeal in the case of an unjust report, and that it was not the Board that was unwilling to do justice to the teachers, but Dr. Starris, who suppressed facts and reports, and then prevented the Board coming to a proper or any decision. When making these libellous statements, which with curious moral

30th May, 1915.]

Mr. W. J. M. SPARKS, M.A., LL.D., examined.

[Continued.]

obliquely be subsequently justified as not having been intended for publication, but to be used more judiciously, it was well known to Mr. Purser that appeals from individual teachers had never come before the Board at any period of its past history; that "suppression" was not a proper word to use except in relation to matters which ought to have been brought before the Board, but were kept back by my order. The only case of "suppression" mentioned was the Glenduff case, which was well known to at least one member of the Board, Mr. Wood, who was watching it in the teacher's interest, and when Mr. Purser mentioned that case as one in which he failed to get justice done to the teacher he suppressed the fact that a chief inspector had inspected the school, and that the teacher had got his increment from April, 1911, which amounted virtually to the asking side of Mr. Cosser's report. In the same letter Mr. Purser implies that I have adopted some course or other with respect to appeals from teachers which deprives them of some privilege enjoyed before my time, but I cannot find that the method of dealing with these appeals was in any essential respect different before 1900 from that which is at present in force. One of the officials of the Board, Mr. Friswell, who for over thirteen years acted as clerk to the chiefs of inspection, and drafted a great majority of the orders and notices on inspectors' reports and managers' letters connected therewith, informs me that when a manager appealed against an inspector's results' examination the ordinary practice was (as it is now) to refer the letter of complaint to the inspector concerned for his observations. If the inspector in question made a good defence, and showed conclusive reasons for the statements in his report, the appeal was at once disallowed on the order of the chiefs of inspection. The manager was so informed, and, as a rule, extracts from the inspector's letter in reply to the appeal were sent to him, along with the official decision, for his information. In some cases, however, where the inspector's reply did not seem entirely conclusive, the papers were sent to the head inspector for enquiry and report. Before making any visit to the school the head inspector would call for the written work which was produced by the pupils at the original results' examination. The inspection of this work would show clearly whether the correct marks had been assigned to the pupils in such subjects as arithmetic, spelling, writing, drawing, &c., and very often these written exercises were quite sufficient to dispose of the necessity for any further action in the matter. In some cases, however, the head inspector would think it necessary to visit the school and hold a full results' examination, the report of which in an extreme case where there was a wide divergence of marking took the place of the district inspector's. Mr. Friswell is positive that in his time such appeals were not placed before the Commissioners personally to any greater extent than has been the practice since 1900. Indeed, they never came even before me, until I directed in 1908 that they should invariably be submitted to me for a decision whether the appeal should be sent to the chief or senior inspector or should be rejected. Mr. Purser's whole charge of "suppression" of reports appears to be founded on the fact that I used my judgment in dealing with recommendations of his, and did not follow them when I thought them unwarranted by the facts of a case. But if the chief inspectors' opinions are to be looked upon as binding on me or on the Board, the Resident Commissioner and the Board would cease to have control over the administration, which would pass into the hands of these subordinate officials. Mr. Purser's action herein is quite in conformity with his whole attitude since 1900, as shown by the manner in which he has presumed to set himself up against my authority and that of the Board in any matter in which the policy adopted by us did not commend itself to his judgment or square with his prejudices.

11853. Mr. Cosser.—Did you learn from Mr. Friswell if appeals were numerous in the results time?—I should like to ask for that information; there would be no difficulty in getting it.

11854. The CHAIRMAN.—Mr. Friswell is coming before us?—Well, he can tell you all about it; he is the accountant now.

11855. Sir HENRY WILKINSON.—Is that the financial under-secretary?—We call him accountant; he presides over the finance department.

11856. Does he occupy the post in which previous correspondence is referred to as the financial under-secretary?—It used to be financial assistant secretary, but he is called accountant now. I have found the calendar which I mentioned above. (Witness hands in calendar.) The month of March is marked, "Previous Inspection, November. To be examined by Chief Inspector." Mr. Purser took it out of the month of March and transferred it to September, 1911. An order of that kind could not possibly be made except by me.

11857. The CHAIRMAN.—That is the change of date?—A change of date for a school to be examined by the chief inspector would have to be initiated by me.

11858. Sir HENRY WILKINSON.—I have a few questions. In addition to the subject expressly referred to us, in which there seems to be some misunderstanding at least between the Board and the teachers, the question of finance has been brought before us, and we find that not only the teachers, but people who ought to know public affairs much better than the teachers, are under a misapprehension as to the powers of the Board in the matter of finance, and it occurs to me to ask you whether you would not consider it well to take advantage of this opportunity to make clear what really the powers of the Board are, as distinct from those of the Treasury?—According to Mr. Stanley's letter, the Board has got absolute control of the money voted by Parliament. We make our own rules without submitting them to the Lord Lieutenant or the Government, excluding, so I and yesterday, the fundamental rules and certain financial regulations, which must be approved by the Treasury. When our money is voted by Parliament we can make any use of it we like, consistently with the financial regulations just mentioned. Of course, our accounts have to be audited like those of any other public department.

11859. The CHAIRMAN.—You cannot transfer money from one head of a grant to another?—Not without the permission of the Treasury. The money must be voted by Parliament, which has absolute control over our finances, and could shut up the doors of the Education Office any time it liked by refusing to pass the estimates; but before the money is voted we have a great deal of trouble. Outside the money earmarked for certain purposes, we cannot spend sixpence. If we wish to finance any new scheme that we think desirable for education, for instance higher grade schools, we have to get the consent, not only of the Irish Government, but of the Treasury. As to the Irish Government, at any rate, since 1900, when Mr. Wyndham stopped the policy of starving us to death (such was his professed object), we rarely can get anything out of it which it can possibly avoid recommending. Even if the Irish Government does approve of a scheme, it does not follow that the Treasury will adopt it. Very many proposals approved by the Irish Government, generally on political grounds, have been refused by the Treasury.

11860. Sir HENRY WILKINSON.—I was an accounting officer for many years, so that you need not assume that I share the misapprehension?—The Comptroller and Auditor-General's men know the rules of the National Board a great deal better than we do, seeing they are three months of the year in the office scrutinising every payment, so that we have much less discretion in spending our income than most people believe.

11861. The point on which we find the greatest misapprehension occurs is that money is voted which is not expended?—Yes.

11862. And the public generally do not know that the Comptroller and Auditor-General explains to Parliament why it was not expended?—Yes.

11863. Here is the report of the Comptroller and Auditor-General for the Appropriation Account of

30th May, 1918.]

Mr. W. J. M. STARR, M.A., Litt.D., LL.D., examined.

[Continued.]

1910-11. It shows the amount voted by Parliament, and the amount actually expended, and then the expenditure compared with the grant, where the expenditure was less than the grant, and in a few cases where it was more than the grant; and then comes some explanation of the causes of variation between expenditure and grant, and there is very minute explanation given there by the Comptroller and Auditor-General from the information you have supplied to him. That, of course, you are quite familiar with?—Quite.

11864. Then I need not go into all of that. I want merely to refer to some of the heads, and to make a suggestion. Let us take the sum under the head E.1?—That is salaries.

11865. The amount of the grant is given as £1,867,500, and the expenditure as £1,340,408 13s. 3d., showing that the expenditure was less than the amount granted by £17,093 8s. 10d., and the whole was carried forward about that there was a saving on the whole vote (10) for public education in Ireland; that the expenditure was less than the amount granted by £27,018 17s. 11d., and on the other side some items were expended upon separate votes in excess to an amount of £1,797 13s. 3d. Then comes the explanation about the saving in the sum for principal teachers, assistants, and so on, in E.1, about £4,000; and this first saving is accounted for by the fact that a great many teachers who had taken up extra subjects in the early portion of the school year, and had notified their intention to present pupils for fees in those branches failed to continue those classes throughout the year, or neglected to comply in other respects with the requirements essential under the regulations for securing payment of fees; and the saving of about £12,000 on the estimated expenditure out of the whole of the Government grant payable to the teachers was due to the unfavourable effect on the attendance of children at National Schools of the exceptionally inclement weather which prevailed in Ireland in the earlier months of the year 1910; the diminished attendance led to a smaller payment of the Capitation grant than would have occurred under normal conditions, causing also a withdrawal of salary from assistant teachers in many cases, and preventing schools from qualifying for additional assistant teachers. That explanation, of course, you are quite familiar with?—Quite.

11866. I was going to ask you whether you would not consider it advisable to direct the accountant to prepare a statement, which need not be very full, showing what in each year was the cause of the diminution, and removing the misapprehension which prevails, and some misapprehension with regard to what the Board does in, of course, to be deprecated?—There is no difficulty in what you suggest, and I should be delighted to do it. I never could understand how it was that this impression prevailed with regard to the money surrendered at the end of the year. Many statements are made by ignorant persons in the press, but whenever I talk to people I think they do not believe them, but still they are constantly repeated.

11867. The CHAIRMAN.—They do believe it in Belfast?—Do they? I sometimes get anonymous letters calling me a thief and a beggar for sending this money back to the Treasury, so I may as well make a statement here, not for the information of the Committee, but of the general public. As we have to make our estimate a year and a half before the end of the financial year for which the estimates are drawn up, a good deal may happen during that time to alter the circumstances on which the estimates have been based. The unfortunate sin, at any rate, in the case of an Irish department, is to ask for a supplementary estimate. Ministers have the greatest possible objection to that. In England it is easy. In the case of an English department, I constantly see votes for supplementary estimates, sometimes of £200,000; but if an Irish department presents a supplementary estimate of £10,000 or £20,000, it means a debate for an evening, and the consequent loss of a night for the Government. I remember on one occasion pre-

senting a supplementary estimate, which was the occasion of the first defeat of the Conservative Government in 1905; that shows the danger of supplementary estimates. For this reason we are compelled to draw up our estimates on the most liberal scale. The public generally think that the money is handed over to the National Board, and kept in a strong box, and that at the end of the financial year we take as much money as is left in the box and hand it back to the Treasury. As you know, we never see a sovereign of our grants. My only function is to sign money-orders. That, it is easy to see that the money which is put down in the estimates is never in our possession; we are only credited with so much of it as we can spend according to the rules approved by the Treasury. We might at any time run up the estimates to two millions, and the Treasury might not object, because they would know perfectly well that we could not spend more than £1,800,000 according to the rules; so far as already sanctioned items of expenditure are concerned, the Treasury do not trouble very much as to what you put down under the various heads, as they know they are perfectly safe.

11868. Sir HENRY WILKINSON.—Except that they find a difficulty in balancing the estimates of income with the public income?—Quite so, it does affect them in that way; but, of course, an increase in our vote does not matter very much. It is only a matter of £30,000 or £40,000; it is a comparatively small matter. As regards the Navy and Army, it would be a very different thing.

11869. I just ask you whether it would not be advisable to direct the accountant to prepare a memorandum which would really cover the period from 1907?—Quite so.

11870. Setting out the matters that you consider right?—You mean something like the notes we append to the Appropriation Account.

11871. The CHAIRMAN.—That could be inserted in the Annual Report?—Yes.

11872. Sir HENRY WILKINSON.—I suggested that it should be handed in to us. Many times here require explanation, and it appears to me that that would be about the best document that could be given?—It would not be a very long document.

11873. Mr. HENRY.—Was not the money voted for education voted as a lump sum up to 1912?—I really do not know.

11874. I was told that by Sir Patrick Keenan, and he told me that in the same way when the results' fees were granted they got control over the results' money?—I cannot answer that; I was only a child at the time; but there is no doubt that before the Comptroller and Auditor-General's Department was created departments had greater independence.

11875. Sir HENRY WILKINSON.—My recollection of Government Audit goes back to the year 1894, with documentary knowledge extending to long before that?—Was it in existence then?

11876. Oh, yes; a Consul or Ambassador received a document every quarter stating that he was charged with so much, but that he had acquitted himself of so much, and that there remained to his charge so much; and this was a long and formal document, perhaps not very long, but certainly a formal document; and then when a Consul left his place he handed over the balance to his successor, and a certificate was given to him that he was even and quit. I have seen a document going back into many years before 1864.

11877. The CHAIRMAN.—But this is the point I was raising. People have asked me again and again what is the meaning of the words "surrendered to the Treasury this year," which appear in your accounts that you publish at the end of your Annual Report?—That is exactly what Sir Henry has referred to.

11878. Here is the suggestion that I think he was going to make, that you should insert some memorandum below that, explaining what the meaning of it is, as it is generally misunderstood by teachers and other people?—Apparently our department is cursed



30th May, 1913.]

Mr. W. J. M. SPARKES, M.A., LL.D., examined.

[Continued.]

with a double dose of original sin, or at least is supposed to be. A word like "surrendered," which would be quite innocent in any other department, has a most intelligent meaning as a curse.

11870. That unfortunate word "surrendered" has misled the teachers?—The Treasury would not allow us to use any other.

11880. Sir HIRSH WILKINSON.—Might I suggest that you might consider whether some statement of that sort could with advantage be put as an addendum to your financial statement in your Annual Report?—I think it would be a very good thing.

11881. Mr. KERRAN.—Does any witness appear on your behalf before the Public Accounts Committee?—I was there myself this year for over an hour.

11882. Sir HIRSH WILKINSON.—There is one question that has occurred to me, and I do not put it at all controversially. It occurs to me with regard to this Cloodaff case. Before coming to the particular notice you took with reference to that school, you described your practice of not sending an inspector to inspect at once, but waiting over till the next year, and acting upon the more favourable opinion of the inspector in that following year to substitute the increment?—Yes.

11883. And you then spoke of the impossibility of doing it in the Cloodaff case for the year preceding that. Will you kindly explain that?—The explanation is this; there was no proposal or suggestion that Mr. Panton's report of February, 1910, should be altered; but only Mr. Cusack's of November, 1910. When I spoke of substituting an increment, I meant that I actually substituted, so far as the increment is concerned, the report of the succeeding year for the preceding one, so that when the Controller and Auditor General asks for the report of the preceding year he gets the substituted report. It is actually substituted by the Board's Order. We can do that: at any rate, they have allowed us to do it.

11884. But such a substitution would not have come within the powers of the Board?—I had already substituted Mr. McNeill's report for Mr. Panton's, which I did not agree with, of the year before, but I could not go further and substitute Mr. McNeill's for Mr. Panton's of the preceding year, that would be a double substitution.

11885. Then there would be no way under the rules, suppose you wished so to do?—No, we could not have done it under the rules, so far as I know; and I may say in addition that I did not desire to do it.

11886. The reason I asked the question was that there was an apparent discrepancy?—I quite understand, and I hope I have cleared it up.

11887. Mr. KAVANAGH.—I want you to give me some explanation about the merit marks. There seems to be a school mark and also a teacher's mark?—Quite so.

11888. What is the actual value of the teacher's mark?—Well, the teacher's mark is of very considerable value to him; if he is an assistant, it is the one on which he gets increments and, possibly, promotion.

11889. That is the teacher's mark?—Yes; the mark on the school does not affect an assistant.

11890. But the school mark has to do with increments?—For the principal.

11891. I am only talking of the principal?—With regard to the principal, the personal mark may sometimes be of value. A good teacher may get an appointment to a very poor school, a school marked "bad"; if such a school is inspected within six months of his arrival, he cannot be expected to have raised it from "bad" up to "very good" or "good" in six months; but his personal mark may be "excellent," I know many such instances. In that case, in awarding an increment, and even promotion, I may disregard the mark of the school altogether. I will give you a case. There is a school in South Galway, a very remarkable case, which I visited about four years ago. The teacher of the girls' school had been dismissed two years before, and when I saw this school I found that her successor had raised the school in the first year from "bad" to "fair," and in the second year to "excellent." The school next door, in which the husband

of the dismissed teacher was serving, was marked "bad." He was subsequently dismissed, and that school is now as good as the one next door, so you see if a good teacher is appointed to a bad school it would be very hard to make him for the faults of his predecessor. In such a case we often follow the personal mark.

11892. The personal mark may have something to do with promotion?—It may have. Take the case of the teacher in the school I speak of. Supposing she got a couple of "excellent" in her previous school, and only "fair" for the first year in the new school, and "excellent" afterwards; that "fair" would destroy her chance for special promotion if I did not do regard it.

11893. The teachers do not know their own personal mark, do they?—No.

11894. They are not aware of them?—No.

11895. There seems to be some distrust of them. Is there any reason for concealment?—There is this that if a principal teacher knows his own merit mark, he will base a claim for promotion or increment on it, irrespective of the school, and it will give us much trouble to conduct him that his claim is absurd. There is no reason, however, why an assistant should not be informed of it. On the other hand, a principal teacher shall not get promotion or increment on his own merit mark, as you would thereby disregard his responsibility as head of the school. Nevertheless, I am not anxious to continue the two marks, the personal mark and the school mark. I should prefer to abolish the personal mark, or, abolishing the mark on the school, to make the personal mark of a principal teacher reflect how he has carried out his responsibilities. At present, in assigning the personal mark, the inspector considers only the proficiency of the classes taught by the teacher, and I think it would be a bad principle to give promotion solely on this, irrespective of how he controlled the school. After all, we pay a principal teacher better than an assistant on account of his greater responsibility. If you disregard this responsibility altogether, it would be a great mistake.

11896. Does the manager know that personal mark?—I do not think so.

11897. He is not officially informed?—No, I do not think so.

11898. Now about uniformity. You say that you believe in uniformity in the results?—Yes.

11899. You think that it is possible; but you do not believe it is possible for all Ireland, and you say that it is undesirable?—What I mean is this: whether uniformity within a district is possible or not, it is extremely desirable, because you are dealing with the same people, and if a teacher who is accustomed to an easy inspector, gets a hard one, I sympathise with him; but if a teacher in Donegal has an easy inspector, and a teacher in Cork a hard inspector, no great injustice is done to either. Where there is such close supervision as that of the senior inspector over his two subordinates it ought to be possible to have something like uniformity; but it is otherwise in the case of a remote country. I do not say that it is positively undesirable, but merely that the only way to get it would be by making inspection mechanical. The more mechanical you make it the fewer variations there would be, and the cure would be worse than the disease.

11900. You do not approve of mechanical inspection?—I do not.

11901. I do not see how you can secure uniformity all over Ireland?—Well, as a matter of fact, I may say that as I have travelled all over Ireland and have visited nearly 3,000 schools, nobody knows as much about the schools as I do, and I confidently assert that there is a great deal more uniformity than people think. I said yesterday, and I am sure that several members of the Committee would say the same, that a great deal too much depends on the inspectors' reports, that the system of giving large increments on the inspector's reports is a very bad one; it makes a great deal too much depend on the judgment of individuals; but apart from that fact I would say that the general standard of

over Ireland is about as near as you can get to uniformity. In certain parts of the country where education is very low, the inspectors assembly adopt their standard, as indeed they should, to their surroundings. Thus in Cavan Leitrim, Sligo, and Donegal, where the education is faulty, the inspectors are easier than in Antrim, Cork, and Kerry.

11902. Mr. CONVEY.—Do you think the standard is much lower in Donegal?—The standard is low in Donegal, because the older children go to school for only four months in the year.

11903. The CHAIRMAN.—There are some districts in Donegal good, are there not?—There are districts in East Donegal where there is good land, and the children do not hibernate out. What I say does not apply to such districts. Strabane and its neighbourhood is just as good as the other parts of Ireland, the people there do not migrate in summer, but along the coast, near the Bloody Fordland, and down to the Rosses, all the older children hibernate out on June 1st in Donegal for six months and they do not go to school; so if you go to an ordinary school in West Donegal, you will find nobody present over nine years of age. They go to school from November to March and that is all.

11904. That applies to the Western district?—It applies to West Donegal, and I dare say to Mayo also; but not to such an extent.

11905. Mr. KAVANAGH.—Therefore, the standard in that circuit could not be the same as in Leitrim?—I would not say Leitrim, as I have a very low opinion of Leitrim, I may tell you but of Dublin City at any rate. The country schools in Counties Dublin, Wicklow, and Wexford are as bad as they are in any part of Ireland.

11906. In the case of an inspector going from one circuit to another, would you have a change of standard?—Not necessarily, but it sometimes happens, as in the case of Mr. Welby. I think Mr. Welby's mistake was that he carried his Belfast standard into Tipperary. There ought to be a little "tempering of the wind to the shorn lamb."

11907. The CHAIRMAN.—It is a very important point that there ought to be a variation in standard corresponding to certain differences of social condition?—Certainly, and there is no doubt that the great majority of the inspectors feel that; they certainly do apply different standards to convent and ordinary schools, and they are right in doing so. Viewed absolutely, the very worst convent school is better than the great majority of the ordinary schools.

11908. Mr. KAVANAGH.—Then about annual increments, you are in favour of the increments being annual instead of triennial?—Yes.

11909. But it would cost more?—Yes, annual increments are far more expensive.

11910. But supposing you had only the same sum to distribute, would you still be in favour of annual increments instead of triennial increments?—I would; but I do not know that the teachers would. If you give them an annual increment of one or two pounds, I do not think they would thank you for it.

11911. Mr. HENLY.—It would be so much in hand?—Do you think they would like it?

11912. Well, I would not like to speak for them?—If the annual increments were like that, I would give them as automatically as possible, provided the reports were satisfactory.

11913. Mr. CONVEY.—I think that a substantially satisfactory report ought to be sufficient without adopting precise terms such as "satisfactory" and "unsatisfactory," for in that case the question as to the merit marks would arise, and the question of the judgment of the school by impression. Would it not be better that if the inspector says the school is unsatisfactory, or the work done not good, that the teacher should not get the increment?—But in that case there would be just as much friction as at present. Whether you call a school unsatisfactory or fair is only a difference of language.

11914. I mean would it not be better that the officer should decide on the general report of the inspector, and the decision ought not to be put on the inspector?—I have no belief in the possibility of the officer doing it fairly.

11915. Mr. CONVEY.—Certainly, it could be quite easily done?—It might be done so as to satisfy bureaucrats; it would not satisfy me.

11916. Any man reading it in the office could state whether it was satisfactory?—I think reports are very lifeless things. I would prefer seeing a school for five minutes to reading a dozen reports on it.

11917. Mr. KAVANAGH.—If annual increments did not satisfy the teachers, would the change be worth while?—The change would be worth while from the point of view of the Resident Commissioner. If, consistently with the maintenance of decent efficiency in the schools, I could abolish every restriction of that kind, it would give me the greatest possible delight, and I should consider that I was getting holidays for the rest of my life compared with my present condition.

11918. Mr. HENLY.—I hope you will get the holidays?—Instead of reading abusive letters I would devote my self to playing golf.

11919. Mr. KAVANAGH.—But you would not make the increments absolutely automatic?—No, I say the report must be satisfactory.

11920. Still that is a merit mark. You cannot get away from the merit mark, is not that so?—No.

11921. You would lessen the responsibility of the inspector, but not quite do away with it?—That is so. But apart from the question of increments altogether I hold that the teacher should be aware that he is really doing good work. This is clearly so in the case of promotion, on account of the way that the men in the higher grades are blocked. Promotion is now competitive, and is awarded on what is equivalent to a general examination of all the schools in Ireland. For instance, I objected some time ago to the number of "very good" in the Limerick Circuit, and I spoke to Mr. McNold about it. It was not because I objected on principle to these schools getting "very good," but because I saw that they were not getting "very good" elsewhere in similar circumstances. The consequence of this want of uniformity was that the teachers in Limerick were getting an undue number of promotions, and that seemed like treating men unfairly who were in for an examination.

11922. The CHAIRMAN.—It is the selection that is the great trouble under the present system?—On account of the block of promotions due to the Treasury.

11923. That only confirms what Mr. Dale said at this table that the result of inspection should be by rejection and not by selection?—But this defect is not inherent in the system, and was never contemplated. As the Treasury has refused to increase the standard numbers, promotion to the first grade is foregone, by selection. It is not so amongst the women.

11924. You mean with regard to the limit of numbers?—Yes. Every woman who is doing good work is regularly promoted.

11925. Mr. KAVANAGH.—The change to automatic increments would be agreeable to the teachers I think?—Yes, it should be.

11926. But, of course, the education of the children is the first consideration?—Yes, I agree with you; but then I am fond of paradoxes.

11927. But in spite of all these objections you would be in favour of annual increments?—Yes.

11928. Now you mentioned, not here but elsewhere, something about the security of tenure of the teachers, that their tenure was very insecure?—Where did I say that?

11929. I read it in evidence before another Commission, and might I bring it in?—I do not know that I said "very insecure."

11930. You said you would not like to occupy by the same tenure?—Yes, that is so.

11931. Would you explain what you think is the insecurity?—A teacher can be got rid of with a three months notice, and in this country, where the appointments are made by individuals, if a man is dismissed, he is very unlikely to get a job elsewhere. If the manager is a member of a great organisation, the difficulty the teacher has in getting new employment is still greater.

30th May, 1913.]

Mr. W. J. M. SPARKES, M.A., LL.D., LL.D., examined.

[Continued.]

11932. I asked you how you would improve the tenure of the teacher, how would you wish to do so, would you give six months notice?—I do not think that would improve the security of tenure to any great extent. In the civil service a man has security of tenure during good behaviour, and can look forward to completing his career and getting his full pension; but the teacher of a National school may have a quarrel with the manager's wife and his prospects are at once blighted; I have known some cases of that. Amongst the Catholics, as I said yesterday, since the Mayothon resolution there is great security of tenure, at any rate the teachers are satisfied with it. Except for immorality, Catholic teachers are rarely dismissed by their managers; they are not dismissed even for drunkenness.

11933. There is always an appeal to the Bishop?—The Bishop must counterbalance the notice of dismissal.

11934. The CHAIRMAN.—Is not the Protestant Bishop of Down a referee in that direction?—If so, his teachers must be very exceptional; Episcopalian teachers have always refused to accept the "ordinary" as a referee.

11935. Mr. HENRY.—I presume the agreement proposed by the Church of Ireland Managers' Association has come under your notice?—Yes.

11936. They proposed to have a supplemental agreement, so that when the Bishop would be recognised as referee he would enter into an agreement that he would not allow a notice to issue to a teacher until he had summoned the teacher and manager before him and heard both sides of the story, and then if he thought it was a case for it, he would allow the notice to issue?—The Church of Ireland Managers were willing to have the Bishop as referee, but the teachers who have sent me their views on the subjects have always said they would not agree to this proposal.

11937. This was the suggestion of the Irish Church Managers' Association?—How did the teachers treat it?

11938. They would not have it?—So I thought. The teachers, strange to say, want to have the National Board as referee; but that is an office which we have declined with thanks.

11939. The CHAIRMAN.—That is a great compliment that has been paid to you?—As great as it was unexpected.

11940. Mr. KAVANAGH.—That is Protestant teachers?—Yes, Protestants.

11941. The peculiarity of their case is that they have two masters, each of whom can dismiss them; but you have no suggestion to make about security of tenure?—I did my best to make it as secure as I could. I am not concerned about the Catholics; they do not complain but with regard to the Protestants, I got the Board to agree that a teacher who feels that he has been unjustly dismissed can appeal to the Board over the head of his agreement. Although the manager acts in a perfectly legal way, still we hold that it is impossible to do injustice even in a legal way, and so over the head of the agreement we hold an investigation as to whether the manager was justified in dismissing the teacher.

11942-3. The CHAIRMAN.—That is a great invasion of the manager's powers as compared with the original theory?—Yes. We will call it inequitable, but there is a saying somewhere *pro sumus injuria*. The new rule is effective more in the way of a warning than of actual results in particular cases. The manager knows that he is likely to have his decision reviewed. For example, he knows now that if he dismisses a man for not playing the organ, he is subject to having the case brought before the Board, and he shrinks from the prospect. That is a great security.

11944. The CHAIRMAN.—Have these managers that are affected expostulated with you?—Not as yet. In two or three cases we have dismissed managers who, in our opinion, had treated their teachers unjustly. What we do is this. We either dismiss the manager after holding an investigation under rule 40, or we tell him that we cannot recognise a successor to the outgoing teacher. Not long ago in Lisburn a man was dismissed because he did not go to the manager's Church; he was a very good teacher and his school was marked "very good."

11945. And that was the only cause for that dismissal?—The only one we could discover after investigation. In this case we told the manager that we would not allow him to appoint a successor to the dismissed teacher.

11946. Mr. KAVANAGH.—If the manager held out what would happen?—He could not appoint a principal teacher, and the school would have to be closed.

11947. Mr. CORRY.—If another clergyman, or if local merchants established a school there, would you recognise it as a National school?—Under a new manager?

11948. Yes?—I do not know exactly what you mean by that.

11949. The manager of this school refused to withdraw the notice of dismissal and you removed him?—We did not ask him to withdraw the notice.

11950. If he is obdurate, the district is without a school entirely?—Yes.

11951. If local people establish a school independently of the clergyman, will you recognise their school?—If we did not allow the manager to appoint a teacher, the school could not go on. In that case somebody else might set up a school, and we should not consider the existence of the school which had been struck off any obstacle to taking on another school.

11952. The CHAIRMAN.—That would be the bare walls of the schools?—Yes; stone walls do not make a school any more than a city.

11953. Mr. HENRY.—How would that work out supposing it were a vested school?—In the case of a vested school what we should have to do would be, I fancy, to remove the manager. In the case of a non-vested school, we prevent him appointing a teacher, or refuse grants to the school; but we would actually dismiss the manager in the other case.

11954. Mr. KAVANAGH.—Now, we are inquiring into the present educational system. Might I ask you how far you are satisfied with the present system as it stands to-day?—I have made at least a dozen speeches denouncing it. I am not satisfied with the present system, which is merely the disjointed members of a system. There are too many Boards. We have the National Board, and the Intermediate Board, and all the other Boards that Lord Dunsany discovered in his peregrinations in Ireland. There is no such thing as an organised system of education in this country.

11955. What I mean by system is the question of inspection, merit marks, and increment, and so forth?—That is a much more limited question. With regard to inspection, I am clear in one respect at least. I think the inspectors, from too great conscientiousness, have been treating the schools as if they were children under examination, that they have been looking for minute differences between one school and another, which, I think, make no difference to the State. I mean, if there is weakness in the reading of one or in the arithmetic of another, the State is not interested, and why should the unfortunate teacher suffer for it?—The whole point of my policy for 15 years has been to try to induce the inspectors to look at the aim of education as a whole, and not merely to treat it as a method of getting the children, or rather only a few of the best children, into the Civil Service. In my opinion, the common method of inspection is the great cause of the friction between teachers and inspectors. There has been an idea on the part of the inspector, descending from the old results system, that he is a sort of detective. It is endorsed on him by some of our regulations, for which he is not responsible. One of the most objectionable things is that an inspector should be considered to be a person who is on the look out for the teacher's failings.

11956. Mr. CORRY.—We were told that the attitude of the inspector very often is brusque?—That is exactly what I am saying; from causes over which he has very little control, that idea may have grown up. It is a very unfortunate attitude; if there is an inclination to it, it is possibly increased by the fact that the inspector in addition to supervising

the educational work, has to look after the accounts as well. When he goes into the school, the teacher is inclined to fancy that he casts a suspicious eye on the number of children present. I often get complaints of this kind: "When the inspector entered the school he counted the children with a loud voice, implying that he suspected that I was swindling." Whether that is true or not, it is a very unfortunate thing that if you are doing your work in the school and an inspector comes in, no matter how honest you are, you may feel that you are looked upon for some minutes, at any rate, as a possible criminal.

11957. That is the fault of the individual, not of the system?—It is the fault of the system; Mr. Harrison can tell you that.

11958. Mr. HARRISON.—It was so in England in the past, when we had 250 attendances to qualify for the examination and so much money was paid for individual passes. Of course, there was a great temptation to teachers, when a promising scholar approached the 250 attendances, and we had to look into that?—I thought that was still the case.

11959. It is now the duty of the inspector to see that the Registers are correctly marked, but the inducement to mark inaccurately is extremely small now, because the present system of fixed salaries in most of the schools has removed the temptation to the weaker brethren to do wrong?—The temptations to falsification are not now so great as under the results system, when the children had to make 100 days' attendance, of which they might fall short by a single day. But even at present the teacher's salary, or even his continuance, may depend on a single decimal point. Thus when a school is just under 20 or 35 or 50 or 75, the temptation to falsification is still very great.

11960. Mr. HENLY.—But there is one regulation that you know of that even for the principal inspection of the year the inspector is not to give notice to the teacher, and not even to the manager until the morning of the inspection. Does not that tend to induce that spirit of the detective among the inspectors?—Well, Mr. Henly, it never occurred to me that it would. The withholding of notice is intended for a very different purpose; it is in order that the inspector may see the school in its everyday working life. The falsifying of records is generally discovered at the incidental visits.

11961. But as the inspector visits three times in the year, might not the teacher get notice of one of the visits?—I think not. We are all very much opposed to that. Under the results system, when the teacher got notice it meant that he had everything prepared up and open, everything whitewashed. I have been in schools which were very dirty on ordinary occasions, where they had whitewashed everything, even the seats in the out-offices.

11962. But would not that react on the teacher, and if he showed the school in that state for that day, should he not be required to keep it that way for the year after?—You are arguing with a person who refuses to be converted; I am deaf to argument on that subject. I am fanatically in favour of the absence of notice.

11963. Mr. McNeill told us every system had its period of usefulness and then got worn out. Would you say that of the present system?—That is generally true. Even the universe will fall some day. Nothing is eternal, not even the examination system. If you mean by the present system the absence of examinations, it cannot be said to be worn out, as it has not yet come fully into being. The examination system cannot be said to be decrepit yet, although it has gone through a period of storm and stress which showed it to be still pretty lively; it cannot be said to be dying out. For instance, in the Intermediate system, you have nothing but examination.

11964. The CHAIRMAN.—A good many people say there is too little examination now?—In Ireland?

11965. In National schools?—Allow me to say something on that subject. I am not altogether against the examination system in National schools; in fact, I think we examine our schools a great deal more than they do in England. In 30 per cent. or 40 per cent.

of the schools we provide that the class examination every year shall be thorough; in the case of very satisfactory or satisfactory schools we provide that every three years or so they shall get a good drawing; that is in the 1911 circular. If you increased the examination system further, what would be the result? Incidental visits would practically cease, as they did before 1890, when they were extremely few. Take the case of big schools, such as the convent school in Upper Gardiner Street, or the Rutland Street school, where there are 1,000 children. It would take at least a fortnight for two inspectors to examine either of those schools. We should have to double our staff if we returned to the examination system. I think, personally, and I fancy the experience in England, Scotland, and America is the same, that examination ordinarily tends to destroy the teaching, since it moulds its character for the whole year. That was certainly the case under the results system.

11966. Mr. HENLY.—Had you to double your staff under the results system?—It was very much larger than now. It was 86 then, I think it is about 76 now.

11967. The CHAIRMAN.—Under the results system, if I remember rightly, but I may be wrong, they had what you called real inspection in about a third of the visits?—Under the results system the incidental visits were rare. You will see in the report of the Manual Instruction Committee that a great many witnesses admitted that incidental visits had been largely dropped; I won't say that the system was entirely examination, but that a great part of the year was given up to examination.

11968. Mr. CONRY.—You will find in a return that has been handed in here that the allocation of time for each inspector in Ireland was not forth, showing the number of hours spent.

11969. Mr. HENLY.—The rule now is that the inspector is to visit three times?—At present they do.

11970. Mr. KAVANAGH.—I was asking you, comparing the results system with the present system, how far are you satisfied with the present system?—I have always held very strongly that the results system was ruinous to education. First, it made the teacher's salary to a large extent depend upon the children's answering. Secondly, it made the very low standard of the No. 2 pass the real standard for the whole of Ireland, because as much money was given for the No. 2 as for the No. 1 pass. Again, as it was known when the school was to be examined, the year's work was crammed into a couple of months before the results day, and the teacher could take it easily for the rest of the year. Such a system is condemned by every educational authority in the world. I defy you to find any educational authority in favour of it.

11971. Mr. CONRY.—Do you mean payment by results or examination?—I say payment by results. As I said, I am in favour of a certain amount of examination. Our present method of inspection includes a certain amount of examination. I will take my own case. When I go into a school I invariably examine. I invariably hear the reading, and test the mental arithmetic. I do not simply listen to the teacher teaching.

11972. Mr. HENLY.—Would you have each child examined?—No, certainly not; we could not do that; as I said, in some large schools it would take a fortnight to examine each child individually, and I do not think the result would be worth the cost; but the teacher's examination of the children is very important, if he is an honest man and capable man, he should examine all the children himself. That kind of examination is a very different thing, because it does not injure the teaching.

11973. You require examinations to be held under the superintendence of the manager?—Yes, and the results are handed to the inspector who can compare the teacher's standard with his own by examining some of the children, if he is an experienced man, he can form a pretty good idea as to the capacity of the teacher, or rather as to whether he is influenced by a desire to make his school appear as good as possible.



30th May, 1913.]

Mr. W. J. M. STANLEY, M.A., Litt.D., LL.D., examined.

[Continued.]

11092. But did you not furnish the explanation for those attacks when you said that the National Board was like nothing else in the world?—I do not know that that is a good reason. You know the proverb: *Omne ignotum pro mirifico*. The phoenix is a subject for admiration in all the poets. The National Board is like the phoenix in this, that it rises from its ashes; it is in certain respects incapable of defence, and still it survives.

11093. Then the body charged with the primary education of Ireland is a body incapable of defence?—You have studied logic, yet you are gesticulating from a *dictum secundum quid* to a *dictum simpliciter*. I say indefensible in certain respects; you infer that it is indefensible in general.

11094. It has no minister in Parliament to explain its policy?—Mr. Russell said he was our spokesman, but, as I have said somewhere, it is a very feebleish instrument.

11095. You are not satisfied with his explanations of the policy of the Board?—You never know what tune the spokesman is going to play.

11096. In 1900 you introduced a new programme which, in my opinion, was a very great improvement on the old one; but owing to the isolation of the National Board from public opinion that new programme was not really explained in any detailed way that the teachers might understand?—Well, I often tried to explain it. In order to make it popular, I couched it with Irish. Indeed, it was at first very popular. You remember those certain passages from the papers commenting on it which I was not allowed to quote. If I had been allowed to read them you would have learned, possibly with surprise, that the new programme was thought to be one of the most wonderful creations that ever emanated from Tyrone House. That was the view of the *Freeman's Journal*.

11097. I quite agree with that comment; but with the exception of the series of addresses delivered by you, was there any attempt made to explain the new policy to the new programme to the teachers throughout the country?—How was it to be done? We explained it, for instance, in our annual reports; but then you might say: "Who reads them?"—In what other way could we do it?

11098. But if you had a mouthpiece in Parliament?—Our present mouthpiece in Parliament is very efficient, but it suffers from being entirely detached from our body.

11099. The absence of a mouthpiece has kept the country to a considerable extent in ignorance?—Certainly.

12000. And that would be one of the possible causes of the atmosphere of discontent?—The atmosphere of discontent is largely due to the persistent efforts of our Parliamentary representatives to discredit us. There is no doubt about that. I have read a passage from Mr. Wyndham's speech in 1903, in which he said that it was not for him to justify or understand, or even to attempt to falsify, the decisions of the National Board. No Board could thrive, even if it were under popular control, whose mouthpiece in Parliament tells everybody that he is not responsible for this, and does not understand what it is doing at. In such circumstances, you could not expect it to be popular.

12001. That is the reason I put it to you that the whole position is anomalous?—It is not only anomalous, but impossible.

12002-3. In addition to the existing constitution of the National Board, you yourself have given another explanation in one of your addresses as referring to its history?—Yes. If you do not mind, I will read this out to you; it seems to me to be the key of the situation that we are investigating:—"And yet, although more sinned against than sinning, they cannot be acquitted of having initiated a most disastrous policy. We are told that National education is 'an expression of the social, religious, and political mind of the people which it serves.' A Presbyterian clergyman as Resident Commissioner, and Archbishop Whately, with his well-known racial and religious prejudices, were not the men to mitigate the suspicions of an intensely suspicious race, nor was the Archbishop's ambition 'to uproot the gigantic fabric of the Catholic Church,' a

hopeful policy in dealing with a people whose religious fervour has always been a byword. The design against religion was now professed at the time, but the Archbishop waged open war against the language and national feeling. To speak Irish was not permitted in the schools, even in Irish-speaking places, which were very numerous 70 years ago; children were punished for using the language, and the extraordinary spectacle was presented of teachers who knew no Irish endeavouring to teach from reading books children who knew no English, and never heard a word of it in their own homes. Archbishop Whately's attitude towards national feeling was still more unympathetic. In 1888 he struck out of the ordinary reading book: "Breathes there a man with soul so dead," and forbade the recitation of "Freedom struck when Kosciuszko fell." In these circumstances it is not strange that an atmosphere of national sympathy, which is now held to be essential to educational efficiency, was wanting."

12004. That being the history of the National Board and the constitution of it being such as you have described, are you surprised that it is not surrounded by an atmosphere of public confidence?—The only comment I make is that, as head administrator of the Board, I tried to show that I did not think very much of Archbishop Whately, and that I sympathized with the National spirit of his day. And what was the result? For five years after that speech resolutions were passed all over the country that I should be dismissed. I did not think that was very encouraging. If I had backed up Archbishop Whately I fancy I should have fared better.

12005. That was at the beginning of the new system. You mention in another address, the Belfast address of 1911, that there was not more than a single member of the Board eleven years ago who was not bitterly against the encouragement of the Irish language when you first tried to give it a reasonable place in the programme?—I may remind you that on the first day I was here I read out that member's letter about Irish in 1901. I was then in a very unpleasant position on the National Board, with 18 against me and only one supporter, but the Board has changed very much since those days. There is no doubt about that. My speech at Glanville about Irish, the first speech I made, very nearly dissolved the National Board and produced troubles, which led, ultimately, to the resignation, not only of Archbishop Walsh, but of Dr. Bernard and Mr. Devlin. There is no doubt the Board in those days was unpopular, and in my opinion deservedly so; but things have changed.

12006. But that introduced an additional obstacle?—Yes, it certainly did. I tried to make that clear in my direct evidence.

12007. While the attacks on the National Board are deplorable, there is no reason to be astonished at them?—But why should they attack most the person who is solely responsible for the Board's change of spirit?

12008. I suggest that the country was not sufficiently aware of the movement of ideas in the National Board?—I do not suppose they read my speeches. They certainly made no attempt to grasp what I was trying to do. My aim was to get the support of the country for the liberal policy I was advocating, and that was the very thing denied to me. I had myself out 15 years ago to benefit the teachers and children, as far as I could, and I have done so consistently ever since, no matter what they say of me. In a like way I have laid myself out to alter the traditional policy of the National Board with regard to Irish feeling. Such has been my aim from the beginning of 1900, and I have never taken my hand from the plough. In the first years I was in a minority; at present, I happen to be in the majority; but the country shows no appreciation of the change. The history of Ireland proves that suspicion never fails to pervert the public mind, and that they attack the people on their side more than their own enemies.

12009. I think it was the result of ignorance. I agree that you succeeded in showing the traditional policy of the National Board, but the country was never sufficiently informed of the change that was coming over the spirit of the dream of the National Board?—But I cannot go about always blowing my own trumpet.

30th May, 1913.]

Mr. W. J. M. SPARKS, M.A., LL.D., LL.D., examined.

[Continued.]

12010. But you happen to be the only Commissioner who has made any such effort?—I know that the others did not make speeches, and perhaps it is just as well they did not.

12011. I think it was Mr. Purser you were referring to yesterday when you said that he had crowned his career of beneficence by having this Committee appointed?—Yes.

12012. The word "beneficence" was used sarcastically, I presume?—Yes.

12013. But do you not think that the appointment of this Committee was valuable as giving the National Board an opportunity of explaining its policy?—I have always heard it laid down that people are not to do evil that good may come. What I say about Mr. Purser is that he did evil, not in order that good might come, but with the result that good may come. I do not say that you are not going to do good, for I am sure you will; but I say the methods by which you were appointed were abominable.

12014. But we are giving you an opportunity to explain?—And I am delighted to have it. After all no man is responsible for his paralytic. Rome is quite a respectable city, although it was founded by a set of brigands.

12015. The CHAIRMAN.—You are getting such an opportunity as you never had.

12016. Mr. KERRAN.—The other unfortunate event that prevented the use of the new programme was the resignation of the Archbishop?—Yes.

12017. The one Commissioner in whom the great majority of the people of this country had perfect confidence?—Yes. When I came on the National Board, as I said on the first day, I knew nothing about the Manual Instruction Commission. That may seem a curious thing; I had been living in Trinity College, and it is quite possible in that quiet atmosphere not to know what is going on in the world. I had never heard of the Manual Instruction Commission, and I did not know it had been sitting till I was appointed Resident Commissioner. I soon found that the two men on the National Board really interested in its findings were Professor Fitzgerald and the Archbishop of Dublin. The Chief Baron was also interested, but he could not be said to be an expert. Professor Fitzgerald died in 1901, and the Archbishop resigned in 1901. In this way I was left with a system on my hands for which I was not responsible, and which I had to carry out in the face of the rest of the Board, who did not care twopenny about it. Probably if you had asked the opinions of all the members of the National Board you would have found that about 16 out of 18 of the members would have been in favour of continuing the old system. I had the two chief inspectors against me, and some of the head inspectors, who were dissatisfied at their change of office. I had to carry out a great revolution, for which I was not responsible, without the proper instruments.

12018. Mr. CORRY.—I understood you yesterday to refer to Mr. Purser's influence as beneficent?—I said his influence was malignant. I said he crowned his beneficent career by securing the appointment of this Committee.

12019. Mr. KITTLE.—That leads to another point. Do you think it quite fair to Mr. Purser to put that in your evidence?—I do, really. From the beginning Mr. Purser has been opposing me in the office, making my work extremely difficult. I have spared him on several occasions. You can see from the extracts I read from my own diary (that diary was never intended for publication) that on several occasions when he exhibited the ordinary respect usually shown to the head of a department, I was delighted to welcome it. I promised that I would recommend him for his full pension. In spite of various affronts, I did recommend him for his full pension; but what I cannot forgive him for is this, that he should have given me a slap in the back. He wrote letters, not intended for publication, but to be used against me among the teachers, letters that I could not answer, containing false statements. His charges against me were such that I could not remain in public life if

they were true, and these were not intended to be published so that they could be refuted. They were to be used, as he said, maliciously. That is what I cannot forgive.

12020. I observe that your complaint about him does not start from now, because in the memorandum in 1901 apropos of the resignation of the Archbishop, you expressed precisely the same opinion about the hostility of the heads of the staff?—Yes.

12021.2. And I think it might be of some little importance to put it in?—Was that not put in?

12022. The CHAIRMAN.—The two papers about Archbishop Walsh's resignation we have seen.

12023. Sir HENRY WINDHAM.—The papers about Archbishop Walsh are public property, and can be referred to the same as an Act of Parliament?—They were placed on the table of the House.

12024. Mr. KERRAN.—In that you expressed precisely the same opinion, in 1901, about some of the heads of the staff, as at present; but the mystery to me is this, if Mr. Purser was engaged in trying to kill the new scheme, why was he not retired?—Do you want to know the reason?

12025. It does not seem to me to have been good administration to retain a man who was trying to kill your policy?—I had not the power of retiring him, and that is what I complained of here.

12026. I think a subsequent resolution of the Board gave you, in 1902, the power to supersede any official over 60?—But he was not 60 until 1907, and the trouble had much abated by that time. Besides I had promised to secure for him his full pension. I stated that. You may call it bad administration if you like, but a pension is sometimes influenced by other motives.

12027. Undue leniency would occur to me, but might there be this explanation of the matter that at the time of the change, Mr. Purser was more or less an elderly man?—About 55.

12028. And he had worked his way up from the position of being an inspector in the country to a position in the office?—Yes.

12029. And he naturally was not desirous of having to start out again at 60 to examine his peripatetic inspection in the country?—He had only given it up the year before.

12030. But still he was at an age at which travelling through the country comes to be obstructive?—I may say that it was not I who brought about this. Mr. Purser's grievances always has been that he had lost £200 a year by not being appointed secretary. He has stated as to me more than once in his letters; but I had nothing to say to that. He may have blamed me for it; but I was not the author of the change in the secretariats. The Commissioners made a certain change which, in their opinion, the interests of the service required. They gave Mr. Purser £20 a year extra as a solution. The Treasury offered special terms to men under 60 years of age, as he was then, if they desired to retire on pension. If an officer finds himself unable to carry out the policy of the Board, it is certainly his duty, as an honourable man, to retire, and not to remain on and be a thorn in the side of the Board.

12031. But considering the new material at the disposal of the Board I was suggesting that the new arrangement was not altogether wise?—I do not agree with that. They increased the salaries of the head inspectors by £100 a year when they changed the title from "head" to "senior." In the case of the chief inspection they gave them £50 a year extra, and it never entered the mind of any member of the Board that the chief inspectors would have resented the change. They were put in the same position as the chief inspectors in England, which was no less honourable than that of the chiefs of inspection, and it never occurred to us that any man sitting in the office would prefer to remain there than to go about the country. Personally I should much prefer to be relieved from a sedentary life, and Mr. McNeill and Mr. O'Connor tell me the same thing; but these two men, Mr. Downing and Mr. Purser, for some reason or other, got it into their heads that they were being degraded, as they put it to the position of inspectors.

12083. But he made some specific complaints. He told us that he was not invited to the Conference in 1908 of inspectors, who discussed the question of uniformity?—But he had a right to be there.

12084. But he was not asked?—An invitation was not necessary.

12085. Was he summoned?—He was in the office while the senior inspectors were there. I do not know whether he was specially invited or not. My order was to summon the head and senior inspectors to Dublin. Certainly he was not deliberately left out. It was my intention that the chief inspectors should be present at the conference. In fact, I thought they were presiding, because every meeting of the inspectors in the office is presided over by the chief inspectors.

12086. This other complaint related to by Mr. Coffey was about appeals. He said that in the Glenside case he did not know until after his resignation that there had been two appeals to the Resident Commissioner by this teacher in November and December, 1910, till the teacher mentioned it haphazard?—I do not remember anything about them.

12087. You do not remember any appeal?—No; but it would be very easy for me to forget; I receive 900 appeals in the year. They are looked after by my private secretary, who tells me the substance of them; but I can easily ascertain the facts by inquiring. I have no recollection, however.

12088. Is not what Mr. Purser says with regard to appeal roughly accurate, that in case of appeals coming up the appeal does not come to the Board, but it comes up addressed to the Board?—Yes.

12089. And the teachers think it does go to the Board?—I get letters every morning from managers, of this kind: "I understand that the case of my junior assistant mistress is coming before the Board next Tuesday." Such is the general belief. I dare say in England also people believe that their cases come before the Board of Education, which has only a paper existence.

12090. He was asked: "Will you tell us precisely what is done at present, supposing a teacher appeals against the report of an inspector?" and his answer is: "I never knew of such a case; appeals never come to me." Then Mr. Coffey asks: "No appeal ever came to you?" and his answer is: "No, I think not; I do not think appeals ever went to the chief inspector."—I suppose what he means is that they did not go direct to the chief inspector, as was formerly the case. Under the old system appeals went directly to the chief of inspection, and they never got any further, as the Resident Commissioner knew nothing about them. The rule made by the Board in 1900 was that when the chief inspectors became perambulatory (they are supposed to spend the greater part of the year in the country) appeals came to me direct; but the teachers, so far from suffering from that, got closer to the Board, because I was the head administrator of the Board, and its most important member. I refer these appeals to the chief inspector when I think it desirable. That was the change made in 1900.

12091. Mr. COFFEE.—The evidence rather suggested that no appeal was ever sent, but I think that is capable of another explanation?—What I say is perfectly certain. For instance, I can give you a case that occurs to me. An appeal was made against a senior inspector's marking some years ago. Mr. Purser investigated it and supported the inspector.

12092. My memory this morning was that he said "no appeal was ever sent to me for investigation," but reading it afterwards in the Blue Book, I think it is capable of another interpretation. He says that "Appeals were never referred to us"—Of course, it is a ridiculous misstatement if he means that I never referred appeals to the chief inspectors. I do so as a piece of regular routine. Whether the appeal should go to a particular chief inspector would depend on what part of the country he was in supervision of. Mr. Purser was in charge of the South and West of Ireland, and so any appeal from that part of the country that I thought it desirable to investigate would go to him, and it could not go to anybody else; at least, it would be a very exceptional thing.

12093. Mr. KERR.—With regard to the Glenside case, was not the sequence of events this, that first Mr. Purser was summoned, and I think very properly, or it, at any rate, had been brought to his knowledge that his action was irregular?—I want to clear that up, as there has been so much confusion of ideas on the subject. I will discuss the Glenside case first, as it was treated officially, and I will then discuss it as it was treated in my private letters. This case was dealt with officially as if Mr. Purser's first report was perfectly regular, and there was no snub of any kind.

12094. I do not want to go into any technical points, but the substantial point was this, that Mr. Cussen's merit mark of the school was altered?—No. It was never altered.

12095. Well, the effect of all the evidence was certainly to suggest that Mr. Cussen's merit mark was not accepted?—No; I made a point of denying that.

12096. But the merit mark of the following inspection was different from the previous one?—Yes; Mr. McNeill's merit mark was higher, and I made it operate a year earlier; but if you ask in the office for Mr. Cussen's merit mark of November, 1910, you will find it has not been altered.

12097. But the new merit mark worked retrospectively?—The merit mark of 1912, by my order, was made to work retrospectively as from April last, 1911.

12098. Does not that suggest that you had some doubt, or that the Board had some doubt, as to the accuracy of the first merit mark?—I have said that from the very first; on leaving the school I said it. My point was that there was not sufficient reason to alter Mr. Cussen's mark, as the difference between "middling" and "fair" would not have secured an increase; but not being satisfied, as I said this morning, that full justice had been done to the man, I arranged that the chief inspector should examine next year, and that his report should work retrospectively if the school improved in the meantime. There was no snub. I maintain that there was no snub of Mr. Purser in the whole of this case any more than in the case of any subordinate officer whose judgment is not fully accepted by the head of his department.

12099. But Mr. Purser's estimate of the merit of the school was substantially that on which the Board subsequently acted?—You must remember that two years intervened. Mr. McNeill said, on reading the whole case, that it was obvious that most of the defects mentioned by Mr. Cussen had been removed; the teacher was no longer what I described him this morning to have been; the school was next and the discipline had much improved, and these things influenced Mr. McNeill's report; but it is an incorrect inference that Mr. Purser's report was adopted, because Mr. McNeill found afterwards an improved condition of things. The teacher is rather a clever fellow, and he worked hard for that year, because he knew what depended on it. Besides, Mr. McNeill said that the school was not "good," but only that it approached "good"; he marked it "very fair," and I said I would treat it as "good." Be that as it may, whatever the character of Mr. Purser's report was, I gave it full consideration at the time. I treated it as regular and compared it with Mr. Cussen's report line by line. I also made use, as I had a perfect right to do, of the information I got myself, and I came to the conclusion, which I recorded on the file, that there was no sufficient reason to change the mark. That voting implied, and I intended it to imply, that I was not quite satisfied with Mr. Cussen's report. I put the irregularity of Mr. Purser's report carefully out of my head, and I considered his report as if the case had been referred to him, and I took the action which, as I said this morning, I would take in all similar cases, that the chief inspector should examine next year, and that his mark, if it were favourable, should work retrospectively. That practically meant that I accepted Mr. Purser's judgment for 1911 against Mr. Cussen's.

12100. The point of my question was this, that your evidence, given yesterday and to-day, will be so disadvantageous to Mr. Purser's reputation, that I was endeavouring to see if we could find anything that would make Mr. Purser's conduct intelligible?—I was in very



great doubt, in coming before this Committee, whether I would touch Mr. Purser at all. I said to some of my friends: "Is it not beneath the dignity of my office for me to soil my hands with Mr. Purser?" But I was assured that, in justice to my colleagues and to myself, he could not be dismissed so summarily. Mr. Purser has assailed my character; I have been suffering for six months and have said nothing. You can readily imagine what are my feelings when I am accused in public of dishonourable conduct, as I have been. Mr. Purser has been going round the country saying the most horrible things of me. He may deny them if he likes. I speak now in order that he may have an opportunity of denying them. I have been told that he has been explaining to his friends that by "suppression" he meant that I destroyed documents in the office. That is a criminal offence. I might have dealt with his charges in the law courts, but I preferred to keep silent.

12061. That was the point of view from which I was asking the question?—I will say in conclusion, that there never was a man whom I was less inclined to fight with than Mr. Purser, for reasons that are well known to many of you. I forgive him many times. The only explanation I can give for his conduct is that for years his mind has been so poisoned by his malignant hatred of me that he is not any longer accountable for his actions.

12052. To pass to the general system and increment, if I understood you rightly yesterday, I understood you to say that at the beginning of the new system the National Board proposed a scale of annual increments?—Yes.

12053. And that was arbitrarily set aside?—The explanation is this. We proposed annual increments. This policy was based on the assumption that the 4th Schedule of the 1892 Act would be rescinded. Mr. Gerald Balfour brought in a Bill to that effect, which was blocked, and the result was that we had to pay certain fees, amounting to £125,000 a year, to the teachers under that Act. Consequently we could not afford annual increments, consistently with our agreement with the Treasury that a new scheme should not involve an increase in the estimates.

12054. The CHAIRMAN.—It is asked whether we could not have a copy of the Board's scheme for annual increments?—It is in the so-called Resident Commissioners' memorandums. The increments were to have been £2, £3, £5, and £6, according to the grade.

12055. Mr. KERR.—In short, it comes to this, that if the National Board had its way we would have had a scale of annual increments?—Yes, it was passed by the Board.

12056. And you think that a scale of annual increments would work better?—I do; I think the triennial system is very bad, because it involves that, for instance, the increment in the first of first grade, £12, often depends on a single report of an inspector.

12057. Precisely, and you have considered that from the point of view of the teacher. Now, from the point of view of the inspector, was not that scheme also bad?—Do you mean the triennial?

12058. Yes, did it not put the inspector into a very difficult position?—Yes, it put the inspector in a very difficult and unpleasant position. If the teacher does not get his increment on account of the third report, the inspector is liable to the charge that he lowered the report simply because it was the crucial year. In answer to that, I would say that it would be impossible for him to do it, because, so far as the Board is concerned he does not know where the increment is due. Even supposing he did, I can show that the teacher does not believe that he would do it by the fact that it is the common practice of teachers to tell the inspectors that their increment depends on the result of the inspection. This conclusively disposes of the charge that inspectors have a tendency to lower the mark in the third year. It is not human for inspectors to do it. Why should they act so devilishly inhuman? It is not their interest, they gain nothing by keeping back the money.

12059. The CHAIRMAN.—We have had it stated that in the third year the tendency of the inspector is to give a "good" mark?—That would be the case.

12060. Mr. KERR.—The evil of his system would work both ways?—I do not believe any inspector is capable of such things.

12061. The CHAIRMAN.—That is, that he would give an inferior mark in the third year?—Yes, deliberately I mean.

12062. Mr. KERR.—So that if you got rid of those marks you might expect a great improvement in the relations between teachers and inspectors?—Yes.

12063. We were told that under the Intermediate system the inspectors had come to regard the teachers as fellow-workers?—Under the Intermediate system nothing depends on the inspection. The inspector is looked upon as a most respectable person, whose only duty in life is to give advice and do good.

12064. Would it not be a very happy condition of things if the inspectors of the National Board were to be that?—But under the Intermediate system the inspector's task is limited. He goes into the school and is looked upon as a welcome visitor and well treated; he walks about the room, and examines as much or as little as he likes; he may give advice (his advice can be taken or not, and that is the advice people like to get) while the efficiency of the school is entirely tested by examination. But we could not do that in a National school; it would get rid of efficiency altogether.

12065. But do you not propose to divide schools into two broad classes, satisfactory and unsatisfactory?—If you like; but I always maintain, no matter what anybody says, that the man who gets an unsatisfactory report will be dissatisfied.

12066. I quite agree that he will?—At present 80 per cent. of the teachers get "good," and 20 per cent. of the schools get "good," so that 80 per cent. of the teachers in Ireland get their increments.

12067. Sir HENRY WATKINSON.—Is that 80 per cent. of those who ought, under normal conditions, to get an increment?—80 per cent. of all the teachers get increments in the ordinary course, of the remaining 20 per cent. a very large number are debared from increments by the average attendance. Consequently the number of teachers in Ireland who are debared from increments by insufficiency is really extremely small. I should not look for any great change if I were to divide the schools into satisfactory and unsatisfactory, as there would be a tendency on the part of the inspector to regard "unsatisfactory" as equivalent to "fair."

12068. But do you think it possible to work the present system of six merit marks satisfactorily?—I am entirely against these ridiculous merit marks as they are often administered; they are too numerous. There are at least three of those that are lunaries. I call "bad" a lunary. It is only given to 1 per cent. of the schools in the whole of Ireland, "middling" only to about 5 per cent., and "excellent" I think to something about the same number. That leaves "fair," "good," and "very good"; so that the effective marks are reduced to three.

12069. In practice?—Yes, in practice.

12070. And you might as well reduce them in theory?—But if the schools are divided into satisfactory and unsatisfactory, you must provide some standard by which promotion will be given. I don't see how you can get on without "very good."

12071. Would you think it necessary to differentiate between "good" and "very good" for the purpose of promotion?—If you don't have "very good" you will require a recommendation for promotion from the inspector. That will involve the process of selection which Mr. Dale objects to.

12072. I do not myself see how, for the purpose of promotion, you are going to avoid that?—Neither do I.

12073. Mr. CAVERT.—Could it not be avoided by a recommendation from the inspector, to the effect that "This man is doing such good work that I recommend him for promotion?"

12074. Mr. KERR.—And ought it not to be possible to arrange promotion something in the same way as you have in the rules, where it depends on seniority,

general attainments, training, and so on—ought not those to be sufficient?—But how are you going to compare men who have those qualifications in Donagel and Cork? If I had an unlimited number of places in the first and second of first grades, I should say, "Give promotion to every man in Donagel or Cork who is recommended by an inspector as being a very satisfactory teacher"; but if you have only got a limited number of places you will have to compare the Donagel man with the Cork man, and this introduces the principle of competition. It is only shifting the ground. Remember that I hold there is very little difference between the two systems. At present the comparison of "very good" in Donagel with "very good" in Cork is an unreal comparison, because you are comparing two things which only appear to be the same. It is like comparing numbers which may represent anything. "Very good" might represent one thing in Donagel and an entirely different thing in Cork, but they are treated as the same.

12076. Mr. KERRIE.—For paper promotion I suppose the Treasury is responsible?—Yes, entirely.

12077. With regard to the method of inspection, the evidence of nearly all the witnesses not connected with the National Board is that it is too impressionistic. It is very good to get an impression, but it is liable to mistake?—After all, everything is impression; you yourself are only an impression on the retina of my eye. How are you to get rid of impressions? If I examine reading I get an impression. The better the system of inspection is the more liable it is to that charge; the more mechanical it is the less liable it is to it. If nothing is left to the discretion of the inspector the charge of impressionism would disappear, would it not?

12078. Yes, it would?—Then the cure would be worse than the disease.

12079. The word "impression" always came in company with the word "tone." This is what Mr. McNeill said about it. (Bends evidence of Mr. McNeill.) Would that be your experience also?—Certainly. I ascertain certain aspects of the tone the moment I open the door of a school. If I go into a school where the tone turns out to be good, the children do not all turn round and open their mouths. In a good school they continue their work and do not talk. When I sit at the desk and observe the bearing of the children, if it is not a good school, they constantly nudge each other, while in a good school they sit quietly and go on with their work. You can see, even from the way they sit and hold their pens, that their habits are good; if you ask them to read you will see whether they stand properly and hold their books properly, and whether the reading is properly punctuated, and is given out with expression, and that sort of thing. You can test these things very easily, and in a short time.

12080. But five or ten minutes seems to be too short—dash?—I know perfectly well what people say about my visits being slap-dash, but remember I am not an inspector, and I have never altered a mark. Mr. Dale told me he was asked whether he thought it right that the Resident Commissioner should hurry into a school, stop ten minutes, and then alter the mark of the inspector. My answer is that I never do this; I do not inspect the schools; I go round to improve my own information; that is my main object. I want to learn what is going on in the schools, and to observe certain aspects of the schools which I consider have been in danger of being neglected. There is not the slightest danger of arithmetic being forgotten. Subjects of that kind which were looked after under the results' system are not going to be neglected, but I pay attention to certain very important aspects of education which have been disregarded in the past. I have succeeded, I am glad to say, in improving a great many of them; for instance, cleanliness and neatness. I always observe whether the cubicles are clean, whether there are flowers in the garden and creepers on the wall, whether the house is kept nicely; I cultivate composition, which is the most important of all subjects, and drawing, which is the indispensable introduction to practical training. I see whether the paper is clean and whether

the children are neat in their work. Thus one can see an immensity in a quarter of an hour. If the teacher's future depended on my impression of the school, I should stay a great deal longer. Again, I try to encourage good work whenever I find it. During the ten years I have been going round the schools I have never made an uncomplimentary note in the observation book. I constantly leave remarks in the schools, but they are invariably of a laudatory character, because I think they are required. The teachers do not get enough of them.

12081. I was considering it from the point of view of the inspector?—I do not think the inspector ever pays short visits.

12082. But there you have Mr. McNeill telling us that in five or ten minutes he could make up his mind as to the tone of the school, and the circular telling us that the tone of the school is the most important matter?—I don't think Mr. McNeill acts so in practice.

12083-4. You think he does not?—I think he was trying to justify me, to do me a good turn.

Mr. HANSTON.—I think he said that he could do it, and that he afterwards considerably modified that.

12085. Mr. HERMAN WILKINSON.—But there is the case of the Templeogue School, where the visits were short, and I will read you the report (reads)?—I would not at all approve of an inspector expressing any judgment on a school affecting the teacher's character after less than a two hours' visit.

12086. I think Canon Mahaffy used a phrase that was very apposite when he said that, even if the merit mark were accurately assessed, the teacher was not impressed with the justice of the process by which it was assessed?—That is exactly my view. I quoted some time ago a letter I wrote to a senior inspector in which I said that when a formal inspection is held in a bad school it is not so much to ascertain the value of the school, as to bring it home to the manager that the school is in a bad condition. I have always held that no teacher's services should be dispensed with except after notice, so as to give him every chance. You can then examine the school if you like individually, so as to bring home to him the fact that he is in an inefficient teacher in a way that he cannot deny. I agree with Canon Mahaffy that a short visit does not improve the teacher. I know it has been said of my visits that they have affected the increments of teachers when I have been in school only a quarter of an hour or twenty minutes, but my visits have never had any effect except in a good way.

12087. Mr. KERRIE.—Another point is, that the circulars seem to set up a false antithesis between the acquisition of knowledge and good intellectual habits?—No such antithesis was intended. It is one of those unreal distinctions that were once so common in philosophy. It is like a phenomenological head, with memory in one part and perception in another, and the animal qualities somewhere else. It is an unreal analysis. Habits are formed in the acquisition of knowledge, are they not?

12088. That is just the point. There is one other point. The documents laying down the principles on which inspectors are to proceed are confidential documents, issued only to the inspectors, are they not?—Yes, I think they are.

12089. The CHAIRMAN.—I think they are marked confidential?—Yes.

12090. Mr. KERRIE.—Does it not strike you as somewhat unfair that the teacher should have his school inspected according to principles unknown to him?—The 1911 circular was never confidential, it was published in the newspapers.

12091. But a misunderstanding may arise with regard to a circular. You explained that circular in a passage of your evidence, and it struck me as being most valuable, but I did not know that it had ever been doubted?—Something like it appeared in the annual report, but I suppose the annual reports are as little read as the Talmud. You know the proverb about giving a dog a bad name. Dr. Traill and others took it into their heads to denounce this circular, on the ground that you meant a flower-pot in the window. The Independent debated the question for a month.

A lot of more or less illuminating letters were written on the subject of the bare circular, which I have always held to be the charter of the teachers' liberty. Mr. Ward said at the Board—"This is the best document that ever has been issued by the Education Office." But it was attacked. There may be historical reasons for expecting nothing good to come out of Tyrone House; nothing else could justify the condemnation of this circular.

12092. Mr. CORRY.—How long ago is it since Mr. Ward said that?—He said it on the day it passed.

12093. Have you any reason to think he has changed his opinion?—None; he never told me so. He said it at the Board, now he cannot be accused of being unsympathetic towards the teachers although he is a member of the National Board. I sent it to Mr. Edmund Holmes, late chief inspector of the English Board, who said he was delighted with it, and that it was the most humane circular he had ever read.

12094. Mr. HENRY.—It is a pity that the circular is not obeyed?—Even the Ten Commandments are not obeyed.

12095. Mr. KERRIE.—But you can understand that a circular might be misinterpreted by an inspector?—Indeed it might.

12096. Now, about the question of uniformity, I suppose there is no doubt that the teachers in the Channel circuit had a substantial grievance?—Yes, I think so.

12097. And I think that the chief inspector and the senior inspector and yourself all inspected schools in the Channel circuit?—Yes.

12098. And the two results differed rather widely?—From Mr. Welpy's?

12099. Yes?—I don't agree. I inspected 70 schools, and I agreed with Mr. Welpy in 40. In 30 I disagreed with him. In 10 of these I thought he was too severe, and in 10 too lenient. I selected 10 or 11 where I thought he was too severe, and sent them to Mr. Henry, who agreed with Mr. Welpy in 6 or 7 of them. But it is not right to say that Mr. Henry differed from Mr. Welpy in 40 or 60 per cent. of the schools. It would be more correct to say that he differed from him in 5 cases out of 70. I exclude the 30 in which I agreed with Mr. Welpy.

12100. Mr. HARRISON.—That is not quite right. He differed in 5 out of 12 specially selected cases?—But I am assuming that where Mr. Welpy and I were in agreement our judgment was right. At any rate, it is not correct to say that because Mr. Henry differed from Mr. Welpy in 5 out of 12 he would have differed from him in 50 cases out of 70. At any rate, there is no evidence of such a disagreement.

12101. Mr. CORRY.—But the facts as they are exhibit a notable difference of opinion?—Between the senior inspector and myself?

12102. Yes?—No, I do not think so. Take my 70 cases. My differences from Mr. Welpy in the 10 or 12 cases in which I thought he was too severe were not very great. I have them all in my notebook, and if you want the information about any of them I can give it to you. The differences were comparatively slight, such as between "fair" and "good," or "good" and "very good." Where I thought he had overmarked schools the differences were also slight. It is true I differed from him altogether in 20 cases out of 70, but I doubt very much whether, if you took a number of inspectors and set them to examine 20 or 30 schools, you would not find a difference amounting to about 20 per cent. I do not think you could expect closer uniformity than that.

12103. Mr. HARRISON.—There was one point I wished to be clear on. What difference in time was there between your visits and Mr. Welpy's visits?—About a year.

12104. So that those schools might change a good deal?—Yes.

12105. Mr. KERRIE.—I suppose it is admitted that uniformity of standard is not to be secured throughout the whole of Ireland?—I do not believe uniformity is

possible, that is absolute uniformity, but I think that the existing uniformity would be reasonably sufficient if promotion to the higher grades were not made by competition, otherwise slight differences would not matter very much. It was no loss to the teachers in the vineyard that another man got the same reward for less work; although they complained they had no real grievance.

12106. Is it any harm to ask you whether, as a result of the actual working of the National Board, you are able to classify intelligence in the various counties in Ireland?—That is like classifying inspectors according to severity. Do you want to make me more unpopular than I am?

12107. You said, I think, that in the County of Dublin it was very low?—That is a nice question. One of the inspectors who was before the National Board the other day was asked what the schools were like in the Counties of Dublin and Wicklow and he said "extremely bad," then somebody asked whether the children were less intelligent, and he said it was not the children, but the teachers. He gave many reasons for this view, but I did not agree with him.

12108. Mr. HENRY.—That is absolutely wrong.

The CHAIRMAN.—It is quite wrong?—Possibly the teachers that he complained of may be Dublin people, and so are deficient in intelligence, as the children are; but, as a matter of fact, I think they mostly come from Clare. The teachers in there are very good, but the good ones stop at home. Without drawing up a list of the counties according to their standard of intelligence, I may say that it is generally acknowledged that my native County of Cork is far and away the highest in intelligence.

12109. Mr. KERRIE.—There is no doubt whatever that it is convinced of the fact. The only other question I want to ask you is with reference to the civil rights of the teachers. I gather that you signed the rule restricting their freedom as citizens so being to a large extent nullified?—We have got rid of most of the restrictions. Teachers are allowed to be members of the County Councils; they are allowed to go to fairs. The only thing remaining is that they are not allowed to go to party political meetings. I actually proposed to the Board that we should strike out this, but the only support I got was from Mr. Ward, so that we were in a minority of two; the Board put in "party" as a compromise. As we all know that they do attend political meetings, it seems to me useless to keep the rule. This is a matter for the managers. No doubt, if a man makes himself unpopular by taking part in politics, his school will be boycotted; but that is his own affair and the affair of the manager. If the manager thinks his school is going to be crippled because the teacher has taken part in a political contest he will take care that the teacher does not do it again. I do not see why we should pluck the chestnuts out of the fire for anybody else. Many other things are left to the manager, and I do not see why we should step in between him and the teacher in this matter.

12110. Mr. CORRY.—I think the manager has power enough already?—Would you prefer us to do it?

12111. I would prefer nobody to do it. I have never known a teacher to be punished for attending a political meeting, so it is not a practical grievance; cases may have been brought under my attention, but I fancy I turned a blind eye to them.

12112. Mr. HENRY.—Was there not a case from Mayo in which a paper was sent up to the Board about a teacher attending a political meeting?—A teacher was dismissed for attending an Orange celebration, but I do not remember the case you mention.

12113. It may have been before your time?—If it came before me, I should not take the slightest notice of it.

12114. Mr. KERRIE.—Teachers are forbidden to be members of the Orange Society or the A.O.H. Is it because they are secret or because they are political?—A great many members of the Board think they are political.

20th May, 1915.]

Mr. W. J. M. STARKES, M.A., Litt.D., LL.D., examined.

[Continued.]

12115. Is it because they are political or secret?—Political, I think. I cannot tell what a Commissioner's opinion is; perhaps he has none. He votes, but I cannot ask him for the ground on which he votes. I cannot tell what reason he may have, but the general opinion seems to be that the Hibernalists are political. Everybody is agreed that the teachers should not be Orangemen, and in order to balance that we take the closest analogy we can find on the Catholic side, the A.O.H., and forbid them to join that. If the A.O.H. write to us and ask us why a teacher cannot be the secretary of a branch of this organisation, we say he cannot become the secretary of an Orange society either, and that satisfies them. In like manner, when the Orangemen put a similar query, we say we do not allow the teachers to be members of the A.O.H., and that satisfies them.

12116. Mr. HARRISON.—I think from your evidence that you will agree that it is the difficulty in grading schools that is mainly responsible for the present agitation?—That is certainly one of the reasons alleged.

12117. Is it in your opinion a very potent factor?—I think the recent agitation against the National Board is mixed up with all sorts of things, political, religious, social, educational, but I think the chief cause was to have a knock at an unpopular institution. There is no doubt that it began with the dissatisfaction of the Belfast teachers; then it went on to Tipperary, and it gradually grew, like a snow-ball, becoming more political as it went on.

12118. Grading has added fuel to the fire?—It originally lit the fire; but we are spoiling the metaphor of the snow-ball.

12119. And there is no doubt that the system of grading does impose a very onerous duty on the inspectors?—No doubt.

12120. And also that it has caused a considerable amount of friction between the teachers and the inspectors?—Certainly.

12121. And would you be inclined to agree further that it has also incidentally been a very bad thing for education, inasmuch as the anxiety that a teacher must feel whenever the time of his triennial increment comes on will seriously and adversely affect his work?—Yes, it is open to some extent to the great objection against the old results system, but it is not so bad.

12122. And further than that, would you say that it also induces a teacher to study what may be the idiosyncrasy of the inspector rather too closely?—That was, I believe, invariably the case under the results system, and I should say that it has not disappeared.

12123. Now, with regard to the inspectors, I think you told us what I did not know before—that the Irish inspectors had asked Mr. Dale's opinion on the effect of unannounced re-inspection by chiefs?—Some of them had. I do not suppose he ever told me how many, but he said that they had been writing to him.

12124. And he expressed the opinion that these re-inspections were likely to have a bad effect?—He told me that no inspector in England would stand them.

12125. Do you not think yourself that the district inspectors ought to have notice that the chief is coming into their district, and that that would be only fair and courteous to them?—I do, most decidedly. I dare say you remember I said that when I visit the schools in a district I often take the senior inspector with me, largely for that reason.

12126. Mr. Purser went into this Mayo district to review the work of a senior inspector without giving any notice to him?—He had no right to do that.

12127. That is another point, but he had a right to visit the district?—He had a right to visit the district and the schools, but he had no right to hold an investigation. He could send in a report on a school, but he could not send in a report on the marking of a subordinate inspector without permission from me.

12128. He might send in a report?—Yes. He could report to the office that he discovered the teacher was owner of a public-house, or that the out-office were in a bad condition, or that the room required to be divided, but he could not report on a subordinate officer's inefficiency without being instructed.

12129. My interpretation, when I read those rules, was that Mr. Purser in visiting that school was within what you might call the four walls of the regulations, but that he was acting against the spirit of them, and against what he knew to be the practice?—Yes.

12130. But then I want to ask you whether there is not some danger of a similar result from your visits?—What do you refer to?

12131. That when your visits, for instance result in giving a hint to some of the inspectors that they are too lenient or too hard or something of that sort, that might have some effect in destroying at any rate their confidence in themselves?—Such a thing could happen extremely seldom. It is well known to the inspectors, and I tell everybody, that I am not inspecting the schools, and I am most particular whenever I disagree with an inspector not to tell him. I have never informed an inspector that I considered his marking was too easy or too hard.

12132. But he comes to know it?—Not necessarily. I refer the case to the chief inspector, who very often does not agree with me, but whether he agrees with me or not no notice has ever been taken of my judgment touching the mark of the school. The chief inspector is responsible for the maintenance of uniformity. If he hears from me that I have been over a district, and that, having compared it with other districts, I hold the marks to be either too high or too low, he will visit the district himself, and he will talk over the matter with the inspector without bringing my name into the matter. I am most particular that my name shall not be brought in.

12133. But the inspector will connect it with you visit?—No doubt it is difficult to keep these things secret.

12134. I am not in the least desiring the real good that your visits produce?—Possibly there are some dangers connected with them.

12135. I only want to bring out the possible danger in challenging the verdict of an old experienced official?—I have already said that I do not remember more than eight or ten cases which I never referred to the chief inspector for inquiry. It is a very rare thing.

12136. Now, on the subject of inspectors, I have not been able to get clearly from anybody what is the actual authority of the seniors over the inspectors who are working to some extent under them, though in separate sections?—I think the chief point is that the sectional inspectors cannot lower the mark of a school without the consent of a senior.

12137. Is he authorised to go with the junior men if he likes?—Yes.

12138. On his own initiative?—We say in some of the circulars that he "may" visit.

12139. And would he in that case report or not?—To the Board?

12140. Yes?—No, he would never report to the Board on such a visit with a subordinate, with a view to revising his standard of marking.

12141. He would only report on his own one-fifth?—Yes, he would not report at all on the others. They might go round together, but the report on the school, though possibly the result of their united inspection, would not bear the name of the senior inspector.

12142. The other man is responsible?—Yes.

12143. Do the reports of the junior men come to the senior man for his approval?—If there is any change of mark.

12144. Only if there is a change of mark?—Certainly. There has been a difference of practice. At one time the reports of assistant inspectors used to go through the higher inspector, but they now come direct to the office.

12145. So that except in that point where there is a question of change of merit mark the senior exercises no control or decisive authority over the junior?—I would not admit that; they confer pretty often and they arrange methods of inspection together. For instance, the senior inspector has the fixing of the dates of the inspections. It is pretty well known nowadays that the senior inspector sets the tone of inspection in the district.

N

12146. Yes, he can do that if he is a strong man, but you give him no definite authority?—Yes, we do.

12147. In what respect?—If he finds that the men under him are not carrying out the inspection as he would like, he has a right to report the fact to the office; that is if he finds that the sectional officers are not carrying out his instructions. His authority is not minutely defined by regulation, because, for certain reasons, we do not think it advisable to do it.

12148. We have had varying accounts of it, and I wanted to know exactly what the position was?—There are no regulations so far as I know on the subject beyond the general regulation about not altering the merit mark; but the senior inspector must confer with the others, and he arranges the dates of the inspections. A good deal is left to the discretion of the senior inspector, but it is understood that he is master in his own circuit.

12149. It is understood, but there are no definite regulations, it is not laid down in black and white anywhere?—I really could not tell you. I think we deliberately avoided laying down rigid regulations.

12150. Mr. HARRIS.—It is a recent thing, that regulation against altering the mark?—It is in the circular of July, 1911.

12151. Mr. HARRIS.—We have had that two or three times?—I don't know of other regulations.

12152. No, but we have had rather a varying evidence as to how these people respectively stand in the hierarchy?—Under the old system before 1900 the district inspectors were quite independent, except of the head inspector, and we had to bring these men (who considered they had certain vested rights) under closer supervision. Some of them came to me in a deputation and objected very strongly to the authority of the senior inspectors. On the other hand, it was represented to me that the senior inspectors had not sufficient authority over the junior men in the matter of standard, and that led to our fettering the junior men to alter the merit marks. It sometimes happened that the senior inspector gave a mark to a school and a junior inspector came in some time afterwards and reversed it; but that cannot be done now.

12153. The senior to some extent felt that they wanted more power?—They did.

12154. Now under the present arrangement the senior takes one-fifth of the schools in each year?—Yes.

12155. So he goes round all his districts once in five years?—Yes.

12156. Is that sufficient to enable him to know his district, and have anything really like first-hand knowledge of the schools in it?—If a man has not seen a school for five years, I cannot say that his knowledge is very great, but the difficulty is how to provide anything better.

12157. In what respect is the present an improvement on the old district system?—The present is an improvement in this respect, that the senior inspector has very much closer supervision over a single circuit than the old head inspector had over eleven districts. There were only six of them.

12158. But I said the system of district inspectors?—The district inspector before worked without any supervision at all; he could do very much what he liked.

12159. But under supervision of the head?—I stated on the first day that one of the head inspectors did not examine any of his schools for a year.

12160. The CHAIRMAN.—He had eleven districts?—Yes.

12161. Mr. HARRISON.—But he had enormous duties which ought not to be put upon him or there was a case of gross neglect of duty.

12162. Mr. CORRY.—Was it not rather that he did not hold any check examination?—I always understood from that return that he did not hold any sort of inspection or examination with a view to supervising the marks of his juniors. He may have held and probably did hold incidental visits, but I fancy they were not very numerous. I am sure that he did visit schools incidentally.

12163. Mr. HARRISON.—You have asked for divisional inspectors or provincial inspectors in order to complete the hierarchy?—Yes.

12164. These in your opinion are very necessary?—Yes, as additional to the present staff.

12165. I can quite understand that, because it is quite impossible for two men to do very much to secure uniformity throughout Ireland, especially if they have other duties in the office?—Yes, and again, it would be no use taking four of the present senior inspectors who, as you say, do not see as much of the schools as we should like. Of course, in addition to having a fifth of his circuit to inspect in the year the senior inspector spends the rest of the year in supervising the work of his juniors. It does not take him more than half a year to inspect a fifth of the schools. He has got half as much as the district inspector. The district inspector takes the whole year to go over his two-fifths, and the senior inspector takes half a year going over his one-fifth.

12166. And would he have no other duties outside his district?—Not to any great extent; he may be employed for holding investigations. He is not employed solely for inspection work. He may have to write reports on appeals against the sectional inspectors, but not to any very great extent.

12167. You mentioned just now that one of the inconveniences of the inspector's life is his being looked upon by many of the teachers as a sort of detective when he comes into a school, because it is his duty to test certain accounts?—Yes.

12168. I thought you lumped together all the registers by the general name of accounts?—Yes, it is the inspector's duty to count the children and compare them with the number on the register. He is expected to go back over the register for some months. The scrutiny is very strict. For example, I sometimes am told: "I found a big attendance on such a day, which was very wet, and I have a strong suspicion that few children attended on that day." As there are no Government auditors, who have been refused, the inspectors are asked to go into such matters. I know one case in which an inspector reported that there was a big attendance entered for a certain day, but as there had been a terrible snow-storm on that day (a month before) he was perfectly certain that no child could have attended.

12169. We have had such experience in England in old days, but we got rid of most of the temptations that tempt weak men to falsify any of the returns. Is it impossible to do so in Ireland?—I do not think it is possible, not unless you adopt changes of a most revolutionary nature.

12170. Because the temptations are very great?—It would not be possible unless you introduced capitation payments and fixed salaries, as in England, irrespective of the average attendance. The change to such a system would cost a million of money.

12171. Mr. HARRIS.—Would not the temptation then be greater than ever?—As far as I can understand from Mr. Harrison, in England the temptation is slight, because the money is in the hands of the local authorities, who employ their own teachers irrespective of the average attendance, and so if there is a small fall in the average attendance, it does not involve the dismissal of the teacher; it only means a small loss to the local authority. The local authority might falsify but the teacher has no temptation to do so.

12172. But if you had the capitation system of payment with the present system of management the temptation would be greater than ever?—Possibly it would be very like the results system.

12173. Mr. HARRISON.—At all events it is a great blot to any system deliberately to put temptation in the way of a large body of people who are not too well paid?—Decidedly.

12174. Is it quite impossible to devise any plan which will minimise this?—I fancy so.

12175. You do not say that?—I fail to see it. The salaries are paid from head-quarters and the Treasury insist that the teacher shall be paid if the average falls below a certain point.

12174. Are the Treasury responsible for this?—Yes. In order to diminish this hardship, we were allowed to introduce the "swing," and that has diminished for a time the inducement to falsification, but when the average falls down to 40, the temptation comes in again. It is only for a time that the evil is staved, but the principle remains.

12175. Incidentally the question arose in the case of a large school the other day, whether it would not be possible to have a double mark, a mark for the morning attendance and for the afternoon attendance?—If you have two attendances that is always done, there are, however, very few schools which have adopted these.

12176. I was counting the interval as breaking the attendances?—The great difference between Ireland and England is that there are two attendances in England, and the roll is called twice.

12177. Yes, that is so?—Well, in Ireland where there are two attendances the roll is called twice, but where there is only one attendance, with a break for recreation, the roll is called only once.

12180. But suppose the average falls below the fixed point, by a child not continuing at school after the recreation, ought not that child to have its attendance marked?—The Treasury would not agree to that. If a child is two minutes late for roll call, it does not count, and that, as you know perfectly well, is a great inducement to falsification. The excuse of the teacher is always, "I knew the child was coming; I saw him coming up the road. I was just putting down the attendance for that child when the inspector came in and found that the child was not there. Or it may be that the 'absence' mark has been altered into a 'presence' mark when the child came up two minutes late. The temptation is always there, but we cannot alter it.

12181. My suggestion would, to a certain extent, obviate that, but I have heard that it was considered a hardship on the teacher to call the roll twice?—Personally I do not object to your proposal, but that is a thing that we cannot do ourselves.

12182. Sir HIRSH WITTMAN.—I understand, but I do not know whether I am rightly informed on the point, that in some schools there are boys who attend only for half a day?—Yes, half-timers.

12183. The half-timer goes away at a particular hour, and he gets half-time attendance, but if another boy who goes out with him at the same time, and is not a half-timer, does not come back, the whole of his attendance is cancelled?—Quite so.

12184. So that there is a strong reason there why Mr. Harrison's suggestion should be adopted if it could be adopted?—I wonder whether the teachers would care about it.

12185. Mr. HENRY.—I do not think they would; I think the clerical labour would be more than it would be worth?—They would not like to have to mark the rolls twice.

12186. Mr. HARRISON.—It is the easiest thing in the world to do?—In a few cases we allow children to go home for lunch, it is not very often done, but the roll has to be marked if they come back, and the teachers object to it very much.

12197. I have seen a teacher fill in the attendance in a class roll almost before you could look round?—If your proposal gave general satisfaction, we should be delighted to adopt it.

12198. You have told us that more examination is desirable, but it would entail an enormous increase of the staff. I want to ask you whether, supposing perhaps as a result of this inquiry, this system of grading is superseded, it would be necessary to have a full inspection of every school every year?—I do not know that I went so far as to say that more examination was desirable.

12199. I understood you to say words to that effect?—I do not mind restating my views with regard to it; what I intended to convey was that if money did not depend on the examination, and if it did not injuriously affect the teaching (and these are two pretty big "ifs"), I should have no objection myself to schools being examined as much as you like, because children like examinations, and if they do not spoil the teaching, they are a harmless amusement.

12190. I had not in my mind individual examination with any record of the results?—I quite understand.

12191. I had not that in my mind, and I do not think you had, but it was rather as a corrective to what some of the witnesses have called the imprudent style of inspection?—I always approve of a certain amount of examination.

12192. And it is exceedingly important to satisfy some teachers that their work has been tested, and should it be necessary to give a bad report upon a school, to have some distinct record of what the children are taught?—We do that.

12193. But supposing you were not under the necessity of grading every school and every teacher every year, you would not require any increase of staff to make this full inspection, we will say every two or three years?—No.

12194. Would there be any objection to omitting occasionally a report?—Do you mean to omit the inspection altogether?

12195. I won't say to omit to visit the school, but to omit a report?—None. I do not think the annual report is necessary when you omit the minute inspection. I do not think the annual report is necessary in these years.

12196. The annual report is absolutely necessary to you now under your present system of grading?—The annual report does not involve a minute inspection. It is sufficient if it sums up the results of incidental visits; but we require to have a mark sent in.

12197. Now we had a good many managers here, and almost all of them have complained that it is very difficult now to arrange to meet the inspectors?—That is one of the results of our system.

12198. Have you any suggestion to make?—That has always been before me. You will see that in the rules we say that the inspector ought to confer with the manager. It was easy enough in the days of the results system. Notice of the annual visit was given a month before, and the manager was always there. The results' day was rather a gala day, but now the inspector turns up like a thief on a dark night, and what he is in the school he sends word to the manager. Having done that, he is supposed to have done his duty.

12199. Would there be any objection to inform the manager beforehand?—I may mention that I have at the request of a manager written to him a few days before to announce the date of my visit at the same time asking him to treat my letter as confidential, and I do not think that that confidence was ever abused. I suppose you would recommend something like that?—We have considered that at the National Board, but we did not do it.

12200. And you have not found any way of meeting this difficulty?—No, except by giving notice on the morning of the visit, but we encourage the inspector, after the inspection, to see the manager; we are anxious that conferences with the managers should now be omitted.

12201. The CHAIRMAN.—I was greatly struck in the examination of all the managers by the fact that they spoke of this as a serious matter, that they did not get notice till the morning of the inspection when their engagements had been already made, and some of them had not seen an inspector for a whole year?—I think that must have been the fault of the inspectors. But I am aware of their complaint. The managers in Ireland, whatever faults they have (and managers in Ireland, like everywhere, are, at any rate, some say they have a good many), are, at any rate, hospitable. In the country places they enjoyed very much having the inspector to lunch; there is no doubt the day of examination was a great day in the district, and they miss it. They also liked conferring and talking about the school. But what would you gain by introducing that again?—You would deprive the inspection, in my opinion, of almost its total value.

12202. Mr. HARRISON.—I quite understand your objection to giving notice to the teacher, but is there no way you see of giving notice to the manager?—No, as the teachers would be certain to hear of it. Even as it is, it is difficult to control the movements of

30th May, 1913.]

Mr. W. J. M. STARRIE, M.A., LL.B., LL.D., examined.

[Continued.]

inspectors, unless they employ motor cars, which whirr them from one part of the country to another. We should be most anxious to give the manager information of the coming of the inspector, if it could be kept from the teacher.

12203. Personally I should take the matter into my own hands, and where I knew the manager was anxious about the school, I should give him notice if I were an inspector in Ireland, and take my chance of what the authorities said. But you told us just now that you thought that there had been some inaccuracy in arithmetic since the abolition of the results system?—I do not know that of my own knowledge. I am told so.

12204. You were repeating a common saying?—A Yes.

12205. Do you think that there may be a considerable fallacy underlying that very common statement, namely, that in the old days the test in arithmetic occurred on a fixed day, and that the children had been trained to a very high pitch for that day?—I should be very much inclined to say so, a good deal of examining went on for a considerable time before the examination.

12206. And it is extremely difficult to draw a trustworthy comparison in the matter of accuracy between the present system and the old one?—The results of the comparison largely depends on temperament. Some always admire the old, while others will have nothing that is not new. If you could bring up the children of 10 or 15 years ago, and put them by the side of the children of the present time and examine them, you might compare them, but you cannot do that.

12207. Do any complaints of large employers of labour in Ireland trace personally as to a decline in accuracy of arithmetic or in the style of writing or in the spelling?—I have not seen them except in letters in the newspapers.

12208. You have had no personal experience of that?—No, nothing of the kind so far as I know has been sent to the Board.

12209. You have told us that a great majority of the children in Ireland never get beyond the Fourth Standard?—I think that is very true.

12210. Have any steps been taken by the Board to remedy that?—The most important step has been our attempt to improve the education of the children in certain parts of the country. In some places it is a usual thing to find children of 14 years of age in the Fourth Standard, while in other schools they would be in the Fourth Standard at 10. Improvement is almost imperceptible in the backward parts, at least in a short period of time. But let us take periods very widely apart, for instance, the time of the Potts Commission and now. At that time 7.9 per cent. of the children were above the Fourth Class. At present the percentage is 19.

12211. Mr. COOPER.—But then you are comparing things very different. The Fourth Class at that time was equal to the Sixth Standard now?—At any rate the Potts Commission drew very unpleasant inferences from this fact. But I agree that it is dangerous to compare things in different circumstances. Another important step has been by encouraging more regular attendance. The attendance, at any rate, has gone up in Ireland by 10 per cent. since 1900. It is 78 this year, which is not particularly high, but when one considers that they go to school in some places only for four months in the year, it is not very bad; and at any rate, it is a great improvement.

12212. Mr. HARRISON.—Upon what do you rely for improving attendance?—Mainly on improving the teachers. My experience is that a good teacher can always get a good attendance.

12213. I think that is very true?—As far as I know it is almost universally true in Ireland.

12214. Mr. HENRY.—Is not the increased percentage due to the new mode of keeping the registers?—The increase is slightly, but not greatly due to that. I dare say it might count for two per cent. if you compare the year when we made this change with the year

before it, the difference is not very much; it is something like one and a half per cent. At one time the children's names were kept on the rolls for 12 weeks if absent. We now strike them off after an absence of four weeks.

12215. Mr. HARRISON.—You have no rule here as to the age at which little children are admitted?—They are not admitted before three.

12216. Is not that much too young?—I am afraid to say that, because babies are just as valuable from the point of view of the teacher as persons of 14.

12217. Have you seen the English medical evidence on the subject of babies in small schools?—No, I do not require it.

12218. You are convinced that it is a bad thing for those children?—Of course I am, but we think they are better off now with junior assistant mistresses to look after them than they were ten years ago, when they learned nothing.

12219. And not only learning nothing, but compelled to sit still, and keep quiet when their whole business in life is to move their limbs about and make noise?—Yes.

12220. Is it not possible to do something to stop the admission of these children under five?—I once saw an argument of Association proposed at the National Board that the children under five should be excluded, but that was in order to save 127 (4), which provided for the education of infant boys by women. There was great agitation on the subject, and there was a danger of the rule being rescinded. I proposed then at the Board that if this rule were dropped all children should be excluded from school under five years of age, except where there was a proper infant school. The consequence of this proposal was that the opposition on the Board to 127 (5) disappeared. I remember talking to various people about this proposal to exclude children under 5; but everybody was against it, I was told it would ruin the attendance, and a very large number of teachers would lose their job.

12221. If you repeated children under five?—Certainly; it was calculated that it would cause a fall of over 50,000 in the attendance, and that would mean a loss of £160,000 a year from the Treasury.

12222. The CHAIRMAN.—And the loss would fall on the worst paid teachers?—Yes.

12223. Mr. HARRISON.—At any rate educationally and hygienically you are satisfied that it is thoroughly bad?—In every other way, except so far as it affects the teachers, it is bad.

12224. Would you mind telling me exactly what the Development Grant is to which you referred?—The Development grant is a grant voted for education, and employed in providing steam dredgers and such things.

12225. And where was it voted?—1902.

12226. Is it an annual grant?—An annual grant of £160,000 a year. A similar grant was made to England and Scotland; it was over a million in England. That was the time when it suddenly came home to Mr. Wyndham that the National Board was a thoroughly unenterprising institution, and that it was a waste to give it any more money; then the scheme of the Trillick and Dingle Railway became paramount, and steam dredgers, and Wexford Harbour, and the fisheries of land stock; and so the whole of it disappeared.

Mr. HENRY.—It was applied for educational purposes in England and Scotland, but diverted for its proper purposes in Ireland.

12227. Mr. HARRISON.—I suppose it is no use inquiring into these lamentable deficiencies of accommodation in Belfast. I suppose you cannot give us any information about that or suggest any remedy?—I can give you complete information.

12228. Of the actual numbers?—I can send the information to you; we have collected it.

12229. But I suppose I may assume for the purpose of this inquiry that the National Board are perfectly powerless in the matter?—Perfectly. According to the Irish system we can not take the initiative in providing of school buildings.





17th June, 1913.]

Mr. W. J. M. STARKER, M.A., LL.D., examined.

[Continued.]

subsequently to 1905. I do not deny that there were some cases before 1905. That rule about the senior inspector's report, as well as I remember, was made in 1906.

12240. The CHAIRMAN.—Since that they have never been dismissed except after special inspection?—That is so. This code of rules gradually grew up. As I said last day, Mr. Bryce investigated the dismissals in 1906, and he was satisfied with our procedure. Mr. Birrell took it up in 1907. I had conferences with him, at which we discussed various suggestions on the subject of the dismissals of teachers, in the light of the present regulations in the code. These were approved by Mr. Birrell, and subsequently by the Board.

12250. What power has the Chief Secretary to investigate these cases?—No power whatsoever.

12251. The SENIOR or DEAN.—I see he visited in another place that he had no power?—He had none, but he made representations to the Board all the same.

12252. Was it by invitation that he came to do that?—He did so through me. He could, of course, write to the Board, and say, "I consider the system you follow in the dismissal of teachers is indefensible," but we are not compelled to adopt his views. If a Chief Secretary is anxious to move the Board to do anything, I should advise him, if I may give him advice, to ask to see me, and to convince me first. I am always ready to discuss education with anybody who will approach me in a fair way; but in the case we are speaking of Mr. Birrell did not interfere officially.

12253. What did Mr. Bryce do—did he hear this case over again?—Mr. Bryce directed his private secretary to inform me that the teachers had approached him with regard to dismissals, and that he should be very glad to have my observations on the subject. I was away at the time, but I drafted for Mr. Lennan the letter in reply which I have already quoted. Subsequently to that I brought the matter before the Board, which ordered a list of the dismissals for a certain number of years to be made out with the reasons in each case. The list was drawn up, discussed by the Board, and sent, as well as I remember, to Mr. Bryce.

12254. The CHAIRMAN.—Did he see the teachers?—I believe so.

12255. Mr. HENLEY.—Now, Rule 90 says that in no case is a teacher dismissed for inefficiency on the report of a single inspector. And that before his dismissal there must be a thorough inspection of the school as a whole, and an examination of all standards. Now that rule provides for two things—thorough inspection of the school and thorough examination. Now here is Dr. Alexander's report. (Reads report). Now in that report from beginning to end there is not one word about examination of the children?—I have no doubt that the report mentioned it. I do not suppose that the whole of it is printed in that document.

12256. That is what they were dismissed on, so they were dismissed in violation of that rule?—I do not think so. I will inquire if you like as to whether Dr. Alexander carried out the official instructions.

12257. Mr. HENLEY.—Was this an infant school?

12258. Mr. HENLEY.—No, but there are infants in it?—The regulations must have been carried out. A formal inspection must have been held involving examination of the kind you mention.

12259. But does it not seem an extraordinary thing that these two teachers should be dismissed on a report which does not state specifically whether that school was examined as well as inspected?—That document does not mention the examination; but it mentions what is certainly at least as important as the examination, and that is the inspection.

12260. I am not disputing that, but here provided in your own rule are two things examination and inspection?—But you have not proved to me that the examination was not carried out.

12261. You bring up a document on which the Commissioners acted, and it appears on the face of that document that he did not hold an examination?—I deny that in fact. The fact that examination is not mentioned does not prove that it was not carried out.

12262. It does not prove it?—It certainly does not prove it.

12263. But the Commissioners before they dismissed these unfortunate teachers ought to have proved that it was carried out. So that does not clear up the point?—I did not say it cleared up the point, but there is no doubt, at least I have no doubt, that this experienced inspector carried out that most important rule, and did hold a formal examination.

12264. Still the ugly fact remains, that these, in the face of that document, these teachers were dismissed, and the Commissioners had not before them the information that they should have, whether the school was examined and whether it was not?—In my opinion, the Commissioners were right to assume that their rules were carried out until it was proved that they were not. My second statement touches a question which was put to me on the last day. Mr. Keble wished to know why the chief inspectors were not invited to the conference of June or July, 1906.

12265. The CHAIRMAN.—That is when all the inspectors were there?—Yes, I answered that they did not require any special invitation, as they were supposed to preside at our meeting of the senior inspectors in Dublin. Since then I have looked at Mr. Parker's evidence on the subject which I might read. Mr. Coffey asked (Question 2014), "The chief inspectors had no official knowledge of the conference nor of that decision, nor of the discussion of the conference, and Mr. Parker says, 'Not at the time, but, of course, they were submitted to me later on.' Then Mr. Henley asked, 'You were not present?' and his answer is, 'No, I was not present.' I find a notice on a letter by Mr. Lennan of the 19th of June, 1906, 'Request each of the senior inspectors to arrange to meet the Resident Commissioner in conference at this Office on Tuesday, the 20th inst., at 11 o'clock a.m. Advise the chief inspectors.' By Order, P. R. Lennan." Under that the word "Done" is written by the clerk in charge. As you see, this is another of those ill-fated statements of Mr. Parker which sustains to the slightest touch of documentary evidence. He said he had no official information of this conference. But he was advised of the conference, he and Mr. Devlin. If they were not present it was because neither of them wished to assist at it in accordance with their duty. They were not present at the conference, and they did not hear about its recommendations until afterwards.

12266. Mr. HENLEY.—Was not Mr. Lennan's letter an order to them to attend?—It was certainly a notification to them that there was to be a conference, and as I said it is the duty of the chief inspectors to preside at any conference of inspectors at Dublin. The only excuse Mr. Parker made for not being present was that he had no official knowledge of it.

12267. But this was official knowledge?—Certainly.

12268. And was it not a command to them to attend?—Yes, practically a command. They were told that the senior inspectors were to meet, and if they got notice of that it was practically an order to them to be present.

12269. It did not say "Your presence is requested?"—No, that is not the form that we would use.

12270. The CHAIRMAN.—Who put that notice on it, "Done"?—That is by the clerk in charge.

12271. Then he did advise them?—Certainly.

12272. Mr. COFFEY.—The invitation was to confer with you?—Yes.

12273. But they did not confer with you?—Yes, because I sat in the minutes that they met in the Boardroom, where I addressed them for an hour, or rather I find in my diary that I addressed them for an hour, and I arranged certain heads of discussion with them, which you may see in the report of the conference, as having formed the "agenda" paper.

12274. What I am not quite clear on is this. The invitation to the chief inspector was to come and confer with you?—Yes.

12275. Mr. HENLEY.—The words are "Request each of the senior inspectors" and "Advise the chief inspectors."

12276. Mr. COFFEY.—Yes, that is the way it is put?—That was to give them notice.

1916 June, 1913.]

Mr. W. J. M. STARKIE, M.A., Litt.D., LL.D., examined.

[Continued.]

12277. Sir HERMAN WILKINSON.—With regard to this point, "Don't," you mentioned the fact that the senior inspectors did not attend before you?—Yes.

12278. Was there any official record of that meeting which would show whether the chief inspectors did or did not attend? No, I should not say so, but I can state that they did not. I know they did not.

12279. The CHAIRMAN.—You were in the chair?—Yes. My recollection is perfectly clear that the chief inspectors were not there.

12280. Sir HERMAN WILKINSON.—It did not occur to you to send for them?—No, I would not do that, as I knew very well what they were up to.

12281. Mr. CORRY.—Did you call for any explanation of their absence?—No, I did not. The other point I wish to draw attention to is much more important. In fact, I might say that it is the most important matter before the Committee. It deals with the question how far Mr. Purser was cognisant of Mr. Welply's opinion of the state of education in the Glenside circuit. Mr. Purser was asked some questions on that subject. Question 4000 is, "And you were chief inspector while this fall of marks was taking place?" His answer is, "I was part of the time, certainly, but I do not know; I think Mr. Welply had not come to the district the year before the date that I left." I may note that that is entirely wrong. Mr. Purser retired at the end of October, 1911. He states that Mr. Welply had not come to the district in 1910. As a matter of fact he came to the district on the 1st of July, 1909. Then he is asked (4000), "I suppose you are aware that the Glenside teachers sent up an appeal against the marking of Mr. Welply. Was that appeal referred to you as chief inspector?" His answer is "Oh, no, I knew nothing about that until after I had gone out of the service." Then (4002), "You did not know that that great change of marking was taking place?" His answer is "No, I did not know that there was any change. When I say I did not know I had no official knowledge of it, but I could guess very well that Mr. Welply would give a smaller proportion of higher marks than when Mr. Brown was there, because Mr. Brown is certainly an easier marker than Mr. Welply." That is the evidence given by Mr. Purser, that he had no official knowledge of any fall in the marking. In fact he implies that beyond the general power of anticipation which he possessed from his knowledge of Mr. Welply as to what would be the probable result of his activity in Glenside, he had no other means of knowing, or rather that he had no other knowledge of what was going on. Well, that statement seems to me difficult to harmonize with certain questions put by Mr. Coffey, I think to Mr. Dilworth. The questions are 754, 756 and 757. I suppose I am right in assuming that Mr. Coffey's information in these questions came directly or indirectly from Mr. Purser, because nobody else could have had it.

12282. Mr. CORRY.—That is a serious imputation. I never met Mr. Purser until I met him in this room?—I will read the questions if you like—"754. After Mr. Welply took charge of the district did he send a private report to the Board on the condition of the Glenside circuit?" "756. Do you recall his contrasting the standard of education of the district with other districts, and making a comparison of the heights of two mountains one much higher than the other?" "757. "Would you be able to find it for us, because it is very important? You have two inspectors differing so widely that one of them, I am informed, has said that the standard of proficiency of this district is as much below what it ought to be as the height of one mountain is below that of another higher mountain, and if the chief of inspection noted in the margin of the report that he dissents from this, the case is very serious." I quite agree with Mr. Coffey that it is very serious. But my assumption is not a very violent one when I say that the information as to Mr. Purser's noting must have come directly or indirectly from Mr. Purser.

12283. Mr. CORRY.—I never spoke to Mr. Purser?—I do not say you did. I only say it must have come directly or indirectly from Mr. Purser. No doubt it was a case of telepathy, but unfortunately by means

of telepathy misstatements can be made just as well as through the telephone. But be that as it may, I say that Mr. Purser's own evidence given here, that he had no knowledge of what was going on in Tipperary, is difficult to reconcile with that which has trickled into Mr. Coffey's mind in such an insensible way that a report reached the Office which was annotated by Mr. Purser as dissenting from Mr. Welply's judgment. It is difficult to reconcile these two statements.

12284. Mr. HENLEY.—However, there is no evidence before this Committee that that particle of information that was in Mr. Coffey's questions did come from Mr. Purser?—I will assume that is so. On these questions I wish to make two observations. They are very interesting questions, I must say. They involve, in my opinion, to use Mr. Coffey's own words, a very serious imputation. First of all, that we were informed that the standard of education in the Glenside circuit was much lower than that of the rest of Ireland, and that having been informed by the chief inspector that he dissented from Mr. Welply, we took so steps to check the latter's activity, so that he continued for a year and a half lowering the marks in the belief that he was doing it with the approbation of his official superiors; secondly, that we kept back Mr. Welply's report with Mr. Purser's noting from the knowledge of this Committee when we were sending in the other documents about the grievances of the Glenside teachers. In fact the purpose of these questions seems to be, and, mind, I am very far from wishing to impute that this was Mr. Coffey's purpose, to show that I had full knowledge of what was going on in the Tipperary circuit, but that I suppressed it from the Secretary, who declared he never saw the report, from the Board and from this Committee. If Mr. Purser were here I should be glad to ask him what was the character of this report, because the description of it is rather ambiguous.

12285. Mr. CORRY.—Dr. Starkie, before you go any further, to clear the matter up I may tell you distinctly that that story did not reach me directly or indirectly, from Mr. Purser?—That is very correct.

12286. Either directly or indirectly?—Yes.

12287. You cannot blame me for asking?—You cannot be blamed for asking.

12288. I had some doubt for a considerable time whether I would tell you that Mr. Purser had no communication direct or indirect with me?—I wanted to bring that out, because, so far as I know, the noting of Mr. Purser which you mentioned was never seen by anybody except Mr. Purser.

12289. It did not come from Mr. Purser either directly or indirectly?—I may say that I made anxious inquiries from the time I saw that evidence, which was, when your first volume was published three weeks ago, as to what this report was, and I could not find until quite recently anything about it, but I think I can clear up the matter now.

12290. The CHAIRMAN.—This report of Mr. Welply?—First of all I had a letter from Mr. Welply, so there is no wonder at my knowing of its existence. There is an ambiguity in Mr. Coffey's information. Two reports have been confounded. One was the report in which Mr. Welply compared two schools in the way I have stated. He says himself he made a comparison between Mount Everest and Carrauntoohy; Mr. Coffey put it in a less picturesque way. Mr. Welply informs me that that phrase did not occur in any general report on the district, but in an incidental report on a single school, and there was no note of Mr. Purser on that dissenting or otherwise, because a chief inspector cannot annotate a report of that kind; he is not allowed to do so as he is an out-door officer. The report in which the heights of certain mountains are referred to is not yet forthcoming. Our clerks are going through every report of the Tipperary circuit for a couple of years, and they have not found it yet; but Mr. Purser, the examinee, and two of the clerks say that they remember Mr. Welply's picturesque expression. But the report to which Mr. Coffey's question really referred is a general report\* on the condition of the Glenside circuit furnished by Mr. Welply to the secretaries. I have it before me.

12291. Was that published in any of your reports?—I never knew of it till last Saturday; and thereby hangs a tale, and a very interesting tale, which I will proceed to unfold. I see from Mr. Lemaire's noting that this report was mentioned to me on the 26th of January, 1910, that is seven months after Mr. Welby went to the district. I did not read it, as I never do read a report at this particular stage, in fact until all the notings have been put on it, so that I may have full information. The order of Mr. Lemaire was, "Before to chief inspector for personal observations." That is to Mr. Purser. This is Mr. Welby's report:—"I beg to report that I had to-day a conference at the Limerick Junction with my colleagues of this circuit." I do not intend to read the whole document, because I will hand it in, but the last paragraph is of extreme importance:—"On comparison of our standard of marking schools my personal conclusion is that a great many of the schools in this circuit are too highly marked, and I told this quite plainly to my colleagues. I found schools marked 'V.G.' which are not nearly on a par with one another, and it seems to me that the marks were not awarded with due discrimination. The experience of Mr. Cole, junior inspector, who worked for three months in the circuit, tallies with mine. Mr. Cole refused the awards in 78 per cent of the schools, and Mr. Carroll, the recently appointed junior inspector, who, however, has had several years' experience as teacher in a primary school, also expressed to me his surprise at several of the awards. Mr. Kelly, another junior inspector, who marked in the district last summer, was equally emphatic in his disagreement with several of the awards." Mr. Purser wrote on that, "This paragraph has no business here. I disapprove of Mr. Welby's dragging in the names of other inspectors and his opposing the opinion of junior inspectors like Mr. Cole and Mr. Carroll to that of men like Mr. McEneaney and Mr. Yates.—A.P. 28th January, 1910." I may say in passing that Mr. Purser's noting was not a disavowal, as Mr. Coffey thought. The point I wish to make is this, that when Mr. Purser stated that he had no official knowledge of the condition of things in that circuit, he had seen and annotated that report. It is dated by Mr. Welby the 22nd of January, 1910, that is a year and nine months before Mr. Purser left the service.

12292. Mr. COFFEY.—Mr. Carroll and Mr. Cole and Mr. Kelly referred to there were these three new appointments on probation at the time?—I do not think Mr. Cole was on probation.

12293. Well, Mr. Kelly?—Mr. Kelly probably was.

12294. And Mr. Carroll?—Yes; I do not want to enter into that question which is quite irrelevant at this particular moment.

12295. The question arises that their opinion in support of Mr. Welby would be worth very little?—I am not going into that, but I would ask the Committee to observe the nexus of events in this case because it is very important. First of all Mr. Welby succeeded Mr. Brown on the 1st of July, 1909, not in 1911, as suggested by Mr. Purser. Though he was well known to Mr. Purser as a stricter marker than his predecessor, no steps were taken so far as I can ascertain by the chief inspector to warn him as to the injudiciousness of suddenly enforcing a high standard in a district which had experienced a succession of easy-going inspectors.

12296. Mr. HENRY.—In reference to that statement, are you giving up altogether one of the points which this Committee has been appointed to inquire into, namely, whether there is uniformity of inspection or not?—If you mean uniformity in general, I am perfectly willing to discuss that.

12297. Are you giving up the case altogether on that?—On that point?

12298. Yes?—In my direct evidence on the first day I admitted that there had been a very serious breakdown in the Tipperary circuit; I did not attempt to deny it. On January 22nd, 1910, Mr. Welby sent to the Secretaries a report of a conference with his subordinates, in which he stated very clearly that he could not continue to assign the marks of his predecessor. This report\* was sent to Mr. Purser for his personal observations, but so far as I can ascertain was not again seen by the Secretaries or myself until it was accidentally

discovered last Saturday by Mr. McNeill amongst some waste papers left behind in the chief inspector's room by Mr. Purser on his retirement.

12299. The CHAIRMAN.—Not seen for three years?—For three years till last Saturday, when it was found accidentally. In addition to receiving this report Mr. Purser had two conferences with Mr. Welby. I have Mr. Welby's letter to that effect, in which he gives the dates from his journal. On June 14th and 16th 1910, five months after this, Mr. Welby had conferences with Mr. Purser, during which the condition of the schools in Circuit 18 was discussed at length (I am quoting Mr. Welby's words). As all this information was suppressed from my knowledge, and as Mr. Purser took no notice upon it, Mr. Welby was allowed to assume that his judgment of the circuit had official approval. In 1911, when the marks of numerous schools had been reduced, and an agitation was on foot "to amend the Board," to use Mr. O'Callaghan's expression in a letter to Mr. Purser, because its action on the petition from Tipperary had not satisfied the petitioners, Mr. Purser at once proceeded to exacerbate the excitement in the circuit by some letters to Mr. O'Callaghan, and (so I have heard) to other teachers making serious charges against the head of the administration. By these letters he succeeded in diverting the attack of the teachers from the Board on to myself.

12300. Mr. HENRY.—You said he sent letters to other teachers. Who were they?—I do not know. I say I am informed.

12301. Mr. HARRISON.—The document was found in the waste-paper basket, but is it not the practice in the case of a document of that sort to register it?—It was registered.

12302. And was it never discovered that it had never come back?—The curious thing about it (and it is a very curious thing, about which I cannot get any information) is that on the 26th of January this document is recorded to have been brought back; but it was never brought to the Secretaries. Mr. Lemaire never saw it.

12303. But it would not necessarily go to the Secretaries again?—It would.

12304. It would be filed?—Anything referred by the Secretaries to another officer for his observations must go back to the Secretaries. The explanation they give me downstairs is that Mr. Purser returned the document, so that it was registered as having been returned, and immediately afterwards asked for it again.

12305. The CHAIRMAN.—He had it in his keeping for three years?—He had it until he left the office. Mr. McNeill brought me the box in which it was found. It was among a mass of papers that would usually be consigned to the fire, a lot of old circulars, and things of that kind.

12306. Mr. HENRY.—Is it only a surmise that Mr. Purser brought the document down to register it, and then asked for it again?—The only evidence I can produce is that it is registered as having been brought back, but the clerks say they never had it again in their possession; they say he must have asked for it again. At any rate, it never reached me as it ought to have done, and it never reached Mr. Lemaire.

12307. But it is not evidence to say that because you cannot account for it in any other way, therefore it must have occurred in that way?—I think it is good evidence when the thing is found in the man's own box that he had it in his possession. It is a strong presumption, I think. When a report of this kind is submitted to me, and I direct it to be sent to the chief inspector, and it is never brought to me again or to the Secretaries, and is found amongst the goods of the chief inspector, there is certainly a strong presumption, and I only offer it as such, that he must have recovered the documents after it had been registered. I wish to say this very emphatically, that by the suppression of Mr. Welby's report, Mr. Purser has done grave injustice not only to myself and to the Board and the teachers of Tipperary who have lost increments and promotion, but Mr. Welby, whose conduct, in my opinion, has been misrepresented even by myself to the Board in such a way as injuriously to affect his prospects of promotion. If I had known

17th June, 1913.]

Mr. W. J. M. STARKIE, M.A., Litt.D., LL.D., examined.

[Continued.]

at an early date that he had warned the Board of the condition of the Tipperary circuit, I would not have suggested that he was too drastic in his methods, as I have done both at the Board and this Committee. In my opinion his conduct has been impeccable throughout. If he acted on his opinion of the Tipperary teachers, he only did his duty, which as he had every reason to believe, had been approved by his superior officer and the Board.

12308. Mr. HARRISON.—Was there no search after this when it was not found to have been returned?—In a big office, like ours, these underdone things occur occasionally. You see it was registered. It was mentioned to me, but I never charge my memory with a document of that kind till it is ready for consideration. I have not the slightest recollection of having ever seen it. Mr. Lomas tells me that he has a faint recollection of the character of the document. For these reasons it was lost sight of. It was the duty of the person who had charge of these documents to have looked after it, and all I can say is that he was in fault.

12309. And he never missed it?—He never missed it. It was not asked for since, and the clerk in charge lost sight of it. It is a curious incident.

12310. And the question is, how did it appear in Mr. Purser's possession afterwards?—I cannot explain; I asked Mr. Lomas about that, and he says that in the case of an office like ours, with thousands of documents being constantly handed about, there is a certain looseness. Supposing the chief inspector said, "I want to see the file on the Clonsilla circuit which I returned the other day," they would hand it to him without a receipt. This document appeared to be within his particular province, and possibly they gave it to him without question, and so there was no record. At any rate, it has been found amongst his papers.

12311. Sir HERMAN WILKINSON.—There is one question that seems to arise out of that. You have only received that information quite recently, and you have not had time yourself to consider or the Board to consider whether any steps ought to be taken in consequence of that?—Steps of what kind?

12312. I will just explain. Mr. Purser made a statement which you consider ought not to have been made, and it is quite right that any corrections should be made that are necessary. Amongst the people whom you mentioned as having been affected by Mr. Purser's action are the teachers. Now the teachers might say, and the point of view of a teacher would naturally lead to that, "Here is a dispute between the Board and Dr. Starkie and Mr. Purser. It affects us. Whether Dr. Starkie is right or whether Mr. Purser is right is a small matter to us, and whether Mr. Welby is right is a small matter to us. If Dr. Starkie recognises that through the fault of Mr. Purser our interests have been affected in a way in which they ought not to have been affected. Is it too late to give us some redress?" I do not ask you to answer that question now; I merely ask you if you would take that point of view into consideration, and see whether there is any force in such a supposed statement on the part of the teachers?—As what I have just said referring to the teachers was written down this morning before I came here, you may take it that it has been fully considered. I have the fullest sympathy, as in fact I expressed on the first day, with the teachers of Tipperary. I said that possibly the new marks were the right ones, and the old marks the wrong ones, but still that they were not responsible for the old marks, and from that point of view I had great sympathy with them. On the other hand, as I rather condemned Mr. Welby's drastic methods, I am anxious to-day to make to him what reparation I can, because he gave us full notice of what he considered to be his duty. I say at once that if that report of Mr. Welby's had been brought to me at that time, as he no doubt believed until quite recently that it had, I certainly would have acted in accordance with my practice in other similar cases. No other cases on so very large a scale have come before me, but I have dealt with isolated cases. I should have said to Mr. Purser, as I am saying here, that it is quite possible that the teachers in Tipperary had been

enjoying fat years under Mr. Brown, but we could not allow them to lose at one fell stroke whatever advantages they had got, and that if there was to be a change of marking, it must be done very gradually. I am perfectly well aware of the situation, and I must face it. I am perfectly well aware that what I am saying to-day will not in the slightest degree tend to lessen the discontent among the teachers of Tipperary whose marks have been reduced. We had a similar difficulty in the case of Belfast, although there the reductions were perfectly explainable and comparatively slight, but what should be done in the case of Tipperary is a still more difficult problem. There is nothing in the world harder than when certain people have lost their increments or promotion to make it up to them afterwards. In the first place, how is one to show that the high marks were deserved? One cannot reproduce the state of the school as it was when it got the high or low mark.

12313. Mr. BAKER.—Was not a man dismissed?—What man?

12314. Mansfield?—Surely the question of Mr. Mansfield does not arise here. If there is one man unaffected by what the teachers will probably call the "revolution" of this morning, it is Mr. Mansfield. It has nothing to do with him.

12315. Sir HERMAN WILKINSON.—Am I right in saying that in the course of your evidence it is contended that the mark should not be reduced without giving a year's notice?—That is the advice I have always given to inspectors.

12316. We know it has not been always acted upon?—Not always. There is no rule that such notice should be given, but it is implied in the circular of July, 1911. There is something in that about not abruptly reducing the mark. Since the circular was published I have been told by inspectors they give notice, and I see such warnings in the observation books pretty often, by Mr. O'Connor, for instance, and Mr. O'Connor. Indeed, it has become the practice since the 1911 circular. I constantly see that the teacher is informed that the inspector cannot continue the present mark of the school next year unless there is some improvement. I think it would be a good thing to make that universal.

12317. Seeing that wrong has been done to the teachers and hardship imposed on them?—I would not say "wrong."

12318. Well, hardship. We have referred to the distinction between justice and equity. We will call it inequitable that they should be reduced. Would it not be possible, and I throw out this as a suggestion to consider their cases in the simple light of such a rule as you mention having been in force at that time?—Anything of the kind would be a most tremendous job.

12319. I am not misquoting the amount of it, but you know what the reduction of increment means?—The reduction of "goods" was 20 per cent.

12320. I was not speaking to that point at the moment, but I was speaking of the result of the reduction of one year's increment. The reduction of one year's increment means a loss to a teacher if he continues in the service of £119; two years' increment, a loss of £238, and three years' increment, if any man should be so unfortunate as to lose it, a loss of £357. I quite recognise the point that you make now; how difficult it would be to restore the status quo before Mr. Welby arrived there, and carry it on to the present time; but I would submit for your own consideration and the consideration of the Board, that the trouble it involves would be well repaid by the satisfaction which the teachers would receive—I do not mind the trouble in the least, Sir Herman.

12321. Yes, and the conviction that they would come to that when a case is brought before you it is not right, and that you do not simply say, "Well, it is over now, and you must submit to it." Of course you quite understand that I am not going into every individual case, and saying this case or that case ought to be dealt with in such and such a way, but I would ask you whether these considerations might not be laid before the Board, and a conclusion arrived at as favour-

N

17th June, 1913.]

Mr. W. J. M. STARKIE, M.A., LL.D., examined.

[Continued.]

chile as possible to the teachers?—I think there is a great deal in what you say, a very great deal.

12322. Mr. KERRIE.—I suppose the Treasury would have a word to say about any scheme?—They have their say.

12323. Sir HIRSH WILKINSON.—There is no one more anxious than I am to clear up misapprehensions with regard to the Treasury, but it does not occur to me that the Treasury could make any possible objection to the righting of a wrong, and I use the word "wrong" again not aggressively?—They are not likely to admit that there is a wrong, even in invented cases. It is possible that they might come to the conclusion that the new marks were the right ones, and that the teachers had been enjoying increments to which they were not entitled during Mr. Brown's time, and that they were deprived of what they had no claim to under the juster administration of Mr. Welby. I disagreed with this line of argument on the first day, but it may reasonably be held.

12324. Sir HIRSH WILKINSON.—Yes, and I think it could not be answered more strongly than you answered it yourself, so I will not at present pursue the subject.

12325. The CHAIRMAN.—It is evident to Dr. Starkie that this is perfectly new matter.

12326. Sir HIRSH WILKINSON.—Dr. Starkie does not consider that I am pressing him at present except to press him to bring the matter before the Board and to consider it himself.

12327. The CHAIRMAN.—Wouldn't you be prepared to leave it at that, because he has now quite fairly?

12328. Sir HIRSH WILKINSON.—I am quite prepared to leave it at that. On the last occasion I limited my examination to an endeavour to clear up the misapprehension with regard to the Treasury and the Board, and to have it made as clear as possible to the teachers what the Treasury are responsible for and should not be attributed to the Board. With regard to what I am now going to do, I propose to go generally over the points that have been referred to us, and if I repeat some of the questions that have been already asked, I will repeat them simply for the purpose of continuity, and I suppose you will not object to them. The Board's powers are laid down in the letter of Mr. Stanley of 1861, and subsequent charters. The last charter, I understand, is the charter of 1881, and under that charter the present Board is constituted of 10 Catholics and 10 Protestants. I think there is nothing said about a Resident Commissioner in the charter so far as I know?—I am like the Prime Minister who is unknown to the constitution.

12329. I propose to refer a little to the history of the Board and its committees, with a view to eliciting your opinion as to the possibility of committees in future. You are the fifth Resident Commissioner. There have been Carille, MacDonnell, Keenan, Redington, and yourself?—Yes.

12330. The first Resident Commissioner was appointed in consequence of the want of sufficient attendance of Commissioners to dispose of the business?—Quite so. The fact that they would not attend was discovered very early; the Board was not in existence a year till it was discovered. It was in 1862 that the first sub-committee was appointed.

12331. Yes. In 1868 there were changes made in the Board. It appears from the report of the Pwne Commission that originally all the Commissioners were unpaid, but in consequence of the pressure of business and the other Commissioners not being able to give that attention to it which was absolutely necessary, the Reverend J. Carille agreed to relinquish what he received from his congregation and became a Resident Commissioner with a salary of £500 a year and apartments, with an allowance of £100 for a car and horse?—I have been deprived of the car and horse.

12332. I understood that you were afterwards given a motor?—Only for a short time in each year; it is not a permanent arrangement.

12333. Mr. Carille, it appears, from the same report, retired somewhere about May, 1887?—Yes, with the general approval of the Board, I think.

12334. With regard to that, that has not come before me. In 1870 it was an old story although Mr. Carille

was able to appear before the Pwne Commission, and of course it is a very old story now as to why he left; but in 1837 before Mr. Carille's resignation, it is said that the Commissioners in making their report to the Lord Lieutenant said: "Finally the Commissioners on account of increased duties asked for an augmentation of the number, so that they may be enabled to appoint two committees for the despatch of general business"?—Yes, the Finance Committee and the Sub-Committee.

12335. Yes, subject, of course, to the control of the entire Board?—Yes.

12336. And that led to the appointment of further Commissioners?—At that time there were 20, as there are now.

12337. Those changes left the Board with nine Commissioners?—Seven at that time, fifteen and twenty afterwards.

12338. They got the additional Commissioners. On the 17th of June, 1880, three members were added to the Board, and Mr. Alexander MacDonnell, a clerk in the office of the Chief Secretary, was appointed Resident Commissioner?—Yes.

12339. So that although they got the additional Commissioners for the carrying out of the business they found they wanted a Resident Commissioner?—Of course. Twelve Commissioners who do not attend are not a bit more valuable than seven who do not attend.

12340. This was done in consequence of the representations that the Board made in a letter to the Lord Lieutenant, dated the 29th of April, 1880. After saying that the system of education which they had to administer had extended, they say: "But as it has extended, so have our duties, until it has become impossible to attend to the discharge of them satisfactorily without having more frequent and prolonged sittings than it is possible for any of us to attend. We have now 1,637 National schools in actual operation, which are attended by 180,000 children. We have under ten years in aid towards the building and fitting up of 336 others, and additional applications are from day to day coming in upon us. Under all these circumstances we deem it essential that there should be two Commissioners appointed who could devote themselves mainly, if not exclusively, to that branch of the public service, and we consider it highly expedient that one should be a Protestant and one a Roman Catholic." That was the recommendation in 1880. And then as an excuse for themselves they say: "We are not seeking to exclude ourselves from the care of superintending the general work of the system on the principles originally laid down and steadily maintained by us. We only wish to make over to them the principal charge of those details which require the agency of persons who are not more subordinate officers, but members of the Board, and are found to be too anxious to attend to with sufficient regularity." Well, in their letter of the 29th of April, 1880, it may be mentioned that the Commissioners also proposed that a Government representative should be appointed on the Board?—That is not a representation they would make at present, I think.

12341. They say: "We would further suggest, considering how we have been opposed in every step of our progress, and our acts and our proceedings misrepresented, and how many discussions take place upon them in Parliament, that some members of Her Majesty's Government should be added to the Board, so that they may be acquainted with everything done by it, and may partake, though not of the whole of its labours, yet of its responsibility." This suggestion was approved, and the Chief Secretary was nominated?—He never took his seat, I fancy.

12342. Well, it appears by the report of the Pwne Commission that Lord Morpeth retired from the office of Commissioner to hold the office of Chief Secretary in 1841, and if he did not attend regularly, at any rate he showed his interest in education by leaving the Board as an earnest of good will a donation of £1,000, the interest of which he desired to be conferred on the most deserving school masters?—So far as I remember, there has never been any representative of the Government or any member of Parliament on the Board. In spite of the fact that the appointment of Lord Morpeth was so entirely successful, it was never repeated.

17th June, 1938.]

Mr. W. J. M. STARKIE, M.A., LL.D., LL.D., examined.

[Continued.]

12343. Do you say it was successful?—Of course, I am referring to your statement that he left an earnest of his goodwill; but at any rate they did not try another experiment of the same kind.

12344. There is nothing which I have read which shows the opinion of the Powis Commission as to whether it was a successful thing or not; but then they had taken into consideration all these things when they came to consider their recommendations?—That is the recommendation of the Powis Commission.

12345. Yes. What I wanted to bring out is that the present position of the Board was the result of a recommendation of the Powis Commission. Recommendations were made by the Powis Commission with regard to committees, and I wanted to get the benefit of your experience and opinion as to how far those recommendations were carried out, and as to how far they could in the future be carried out. Their recommendations are that it is inexpedient that the whole Board should be summoned weekly to consider routine business, and that routine business should be conducted by a Committee of the Board sitting in Dublin, whose names should be known to the public, and that all questions of general policy of the system, such as changes of rules or interpretation of rules, should be referred to the whole Board, to be specially summoned, and then they explain what they mean by a committee. A permanent committee of the Board should periodically meet to consult with the Resident Commissioner on such questions of discipline, complaints against inspectors, managers or teachers, disputed accounts, applications for building grants, management of office and training schools, and other routine business as he may think it needful to bring before them. They had before them that question of the equal number of Protestants and Roman Catholics, and they go on to say that such a committee should consist of an equal number of Protestants and Roman Catholics, like the Board itself; its minutes should be laid before the Board, and approved by them, with power to any single member to require an appeal to the full Board at the next meeting, and suspension of action and decision when that meeting takes place. You have told us, Dr. Starkie, that the recommendation of the Powis Commission was adopted as to appointing two committees?—You are mistaken; the two committees are much older than the Powis Commission. So far as I know, no change was made in the committees owing to the recommendations of the Powis Commission. The Finance Committee existed from the year 1832, and the sub-committee (which was called the office committee afterwards) from the year 1833. I do not think any change was made through the Powis Commission. When I came into office the same state of things still continued that the Powis Commission found in existence in the year 1838, so that it seems to me unlikely that any change was made in the interval.

12346. You found the same state of things that they had found?—Yes.

12347. Could you describe it generally with regard to what the committee did?—Certainly. As I said in my direct evidence, a sub-committee was appointed in 1832, because the other members of the National Board did not attend frequently enough to carry on the details of the administration. The committee consisted of the Resident Commissioner and any other Commissioners who wished (I am speaking of the sub-committee); but it appears in the evidence given before the Powis Commission that in the space of 35 years a Commissioner turned up on only two occasions at the meetings of the sub-committee, and he was a Presbyterian dogmatist. The Resident Commissioner or Mr. Keenan was asked at the Powis Commission when did the committee meet, and he replied that they had not stated times for meeting. He was asked whether there was an agenda paper, and he said not; so that it is perfectly clear that the sub-committee was a committee with a quorum of one, and he was the Resident Commissioner. There is no doubt about that, and for that reason, in 1902, the committee was abolished, because the Board preferred to face the facts rather than to carry on a figment of that kind. They abolished this office committee, and

since then I have been doing exactly the same work as I did in the office committee. My orders are not now called office committee orders, but provisional orders, which become full orders when they are assented by the Board. There is a certain amount of confusion I see even in Mr. Dilworth's evidence on this subject. He speaks of the office committee (at least I think it was he) as a court, composed of the Resident Commissioner, secretaries, accountant, and the chief inspectors. Now, I deny that entirely. Even the word "court" is ambiguous, it may mean everybody in the court, or only the judge, if the latter is a correct description, since this Committee consisted of the Resident Commissioner and of nobody else. The secretaries were there simply to carry out his orders in accordance, no doubt, with the policy of the Board, but they were not members of the committee. When I came on the Board, office committee orders were introduced by these words—"Present, the Resident Commissioner, attended by the secretaries, accountant, and chiefs of inspection." The same thing is true of the finance committee. The Resident Commissioner was the finance committee. Any other Commissioners who liked could turn up, but as there were not stated hours for meeting, his position would have been rather onerous, because the Committee sat for seven hours a day, in fact as long as I was in the Office.

12348. It was said here the other day that two or three members of the Board once determined to take up their residence at Tyrone House to watch the administration. Did you ever hear of that?—I never heard of it, nor has anyone else.

12349. Mr. HENRY.—Did you not hear that Dr. Walsh and Mr. Molloy and Mr. Wilson and Dr. Evans?—That is a perversion of the real facts.

12350. That they took part in the revision of examination papers?—That is another story. You are referring to a committee which was appointed for a special purpose, viz., for the revision of the papers. That was not an office committee.

12351. But Sir Patrick Keenan, in giving evidence before the Powis Commission, contended that that committee consisted of the Resident Commissioner, plus the officers in attendance?—I have no hesitation in differing from Sir Patrick Keenan. I am not going to take his opinion as settling the matter when I know that the contrary is the fact. That would be a most unconstitutional proceeding, that a man who is a subordinate officer and not a member of the Board, should have a seat on a Committee of the Board. I put that question to Sir Hiram Wilkinson as a lawyer.

12352. Sir HIRAM WILKINSON.—There are so many things that require explanation with regard to the Board that I would not like to express an opinion at the present moment?—Well, Sir Hiram, I am perfectly ready to explain them.

12353. That was your experience, and by the order of 1902 the figment, as you call it, of a committee was abolished?—Yes.

12354. What has been done since in the way of committees, because Mr. Ward mentioned to me that a committee of the whole Board met from time to time?—In addition to the finance and the office committees, which were fictitious, there were real committees too; for instance, the committee of agriculture, controlling the model farms at Glasnevin and in Cork, which used to meet once a month at 6 o'clock, just before the meetings of the Board. That disappeared when the Department of Agriculture was instituted. Then there is the Committee of the whole Board, which is called together whenever we wish to discuss at leisure something of general interest, requiring more thorough consideration than could be given to it at a meeting of the whole Board; for instance, the interviewing and nomination of inspectors. A Committee of the whole Board is a committee which any member of the Board, without being specially summoned, can attend. Such committees are popular, as there is nothing invidious in their constitution. Committees are specially nominated for other things; for instance, the building of the house of residence at Glasnevin, the choice of school books. Every book that is specially published for Irish schools is read by a committee to see whether it will offend the morals or the historical

17th June, 1918.]

Mr. W. J. M. SPARKIE, M.A., LL.D., examined.

[Continued.]

prejudices of any class of Irishmen. There are really committees on all kinds of questions. A very important Committee of the whole Board sits once every three months for the purpose of discussing the cases of small Catholic and Protestant schools; I mean, whether they are necessary or not, whether it is possible to re-arrange the schools of a district in such a way as to be more beneficial to education. This committee has to deal with details so bristling with points of controversy and unpleasantness that, although, as I said before, I have the jurisdiction to decide such matters of detail, I never think of doing so; I leave them to the whole Board to fight them out.

12316. The CHAIRMAN.—What is the quorum of the Board?—Three; but I have never known so few to attend. I sent a return to Parliament the other day of the average attendance at the Board. It is 14 or 15.

12317. They wanted to get the names of those who attended?—I think they would have preferred to get the names of those who did not attend.

12318. Sir HIRSH WILKINSON.—In speaking of the average of 14, over what period would that extend?—Five years, so far as I remember.

12319. Because the evidence before the Povey Commission would not lead one to think that there was anything like the same proportion of attendance?—I said in my direct evidence that, before 1902, it was very small, so small in fact that I had come to the conclusion, I will say frankly, not only for that, but for many other reasons which Mr. Kettle examined from me, that the Board was not an institution to be encouraged. The attendance was very unsatisfactory—hardly more than 7 or 8, I fancy. The difficulty then was that when a case was decided by a Board of, say, seven members, the other thirteen, seeing the decision and not having been there, would say: "We are not going to allow the minority to ride rough shod over us, and they would turn up the next day and reverse the decision. In similar circumstances the Intermediate Board had to make a rule that a matter decided at a meeting could not be brought up again except with the consent of a subsequent meeting.

12320. From your experience of the meetings of committees of the whole Board, as distinct from sub-committees do you think that if they wanted to appoint a committee for the consideration of appeals of teachers, it would be a committee of the whole Board?—Yes; but I do not think we would ever appoint a committee of that kind.

12321. But there was a recommendation by the Povey Commission?—I may shorten matters by telling you that I would no more be responsible for the recommendations of the Povey Commission than I would for the Westminster Confession of Faith. The remarkable thing about the Povey Commission, and I hope another Commission, which I need not mention, will not suffer the same fate, is that its recommendations were not adopted by anybody.

12322. There is one recommendation here that was adopted, that the constitution of the Board should continue as it was?—Yes, that was a very sensible recommendation.

12323. You are not prepared to advise that we should depart from that?—No. I may mention one recommendation of theirs which is quite sufficient to characterise the whole lot. They recommended, and this was in 1893 or 1870, that there should be an education rate. Now, I do not think this committee is capable of doing that, even if it were within your terms of reference. By the way, nearly all the more reasonable Irish members of the Commission refused to sign the report in extenuis; it was mainly signed by a lot of Englishmen who paid but a short visit. Certainly Lord Morris and Mr. Wilson were very emphatic in their disapprobation of some of the recommendations, as being unsuitable to this country. I do not think appeals from teachers could possibly be heard by a committee of the whole Board, and there is nobody who knows better the merits of this committee than I do. Appeals from teachers are on all sorts of questions. As I have already stated, I myself get 950 of them every year. Appeals against the merits of the schools are by no means the most important. There are appeals of all kinds coming to me, appeals against managers, appeals against parents,

appeals of parents against teachers, appeals touching fixing of the salaries in 1900, involving pages of figures.

12324. Are you still receiving appeals about salaries fixed in 1901?—Yes. There are at least 5,000 of them. After investigating 10 or 12 of these, which were specially selected by the Teachers' Organisation, the accountant was so broken down that he told me he would resign if we sent him any more. If a committee of the Board, composed sometimes of distinguished and long men were to come and discuss whether second-class schools should have been marked "fair" or "good," or something of that kind, the result would be "advantageous results." Nothing would come of it; the whole thing would end in laughter. I do not know whether the people who attended or the people who stayed away would be more objectionable. Some of the distinguished lawyers on the Board, might not turn up at the meeting, and people would say, why was a decision come to in their absence? And, on the other hand, if they attended it is quite possible that we should never get home at all, because if they discussed one of these appeals at the same length as they discuss some of which has importance in the Poor Courts it might last three days.

12325. You are familiar with the subjects of an inquiry, and this is one of them, and we are desirous to see if there is a solution for it, and that is, "Whether there are due facilities for appeal and means of access to the Board?"—Well, so far as I know, the teachers in Ireland have more access to the Board than they have to the final authority in any other country that I know of. I recently went to the Education Office in England, and had a long talk with Mr. Dale about what was done with appeals in England, and I did not find, either in his office or in the Scottish office, that appeals against inspectors went to the highest authority as they do here now. I am the most important member of the Board, and its administrative head, and they come directly before me; I do not find that in the English Education Office they go to the minister or the permanent secretary.

12326. Mr. HANCOCK.—An appeal, if it is to be effective, is generally backed by the local authority, and you have got to local authority here?—My argument is an *a fortiori* one. Appeals in England, as Mr. Dale told me, are important only when they are backed by the local authority, and even when they are so backed they are dealt with by the assistant secretary.

12327. Mr. HANCOCK.—They very seldom go beyond the assistant secretary?—But in Ireland every appeal, small or great, comes to me, and there is no reason why I should not say that I have some claim to be an expert, although I dislike the term, and an expert who is administrative head of the system, and who has gone round the country and visited the schools, and seen much of the teachers.

12328. Mr. HENRY.—Of course, the appeal affects a teacher in Ireland in a different way from the way it affects a teacher in England?—It may affect him very seriously in England, since the English have a system of salaries and increments, just as we have in Ireland, with the difference that they are paid by the local authority.

12329. It is the local authority that awards the increments?—Yes.

12330. And it is not dependent on the report of the Government inspector?—Not strictly; but it may be. The opinion of His Majesty's inspector might have a great weight. Although by regulation it does not affect the increment, still it might in practice.

12331. If it is the opinion of the local authority that the inspector has given a just report the increment is awarded?—Yes.

12332. If we were to apply that standard to Ireland, in a great many instances the opinion of the school manager, who would be the local authority, would not correspond with that of the inspector?—If you go into this question, which, I am glad to say, is not within your terms of reference, I will tell you that appeals from Irish managers are often written by the teacher and signed by the manager. I have known a case of a long correspondence being carried on with the Board, ostensibly by the manager, but it turned out that the letter was suffering from paralysis of both hands, and

[19th June, 1913.]

Mr. W. J. M. STARRIE, M.A., Litt.D., LL.D., examined.

[Continued.]

had never even seen the letters which were signed with his name. An appeal in Ireland has not got the backing that it has in England, since it does not necessarily represent any more than the opinion of the teacher as to his own merits.

12373. Sir HERMAN WILKINSON.—Then there are some of these appeals, or some of the questions arising out of them, which are decided by you, and some which go before the Board?—Certainly. You have been told, many times, and I think everybody knows, that wherever a fine or dismissal is in question the case is decided by the Board; again, if, on appeal, the fine or dismissal is to be altered, this must be done by the Board.

12374. But the Board having decided on a fine, say, or a dismissal, and an appeal against that decision coming up, is it open to you to lay it before the Board or not to lay it before the Board?—Certainly. The practice in my office is pretty much that of all offices in which there is a delegation of authority. I can put on the agenda paper whatever I like. Of course, if I do not act in accordance with the regulations laid down in 1902, it is outside to be found out, so that apart from the question of honour it is my interest to act legitimately. Members of the Board consistently get letters from the teachers, and if there was any abuse in the details of administration, it could not be long concealed from the ears of the Commissioners. In the case of an appeal against a fine or dismissal, I read the papers and if I see any new fact in them which puts a new aspect on the case, I re-open it.

12375. But if not?—If not, not; otherwise, I should never get through my business. If there is no new fact in the appeal from the teacher, I do not generally bring it before the Board; but I sometimes do, in an important case, even when I believe myself that there is nothing new. The object of anybody in my position is to take as little responsibility as possible, consistently with the proper discharge of his duty. It is a delicate job enough to make distinctions between cases according to their importance, so as to bring an important one before the Board and decide on an unimportant one myself. My desire, at any rate, wherever there is a matter of controversy, is to get the Board to decide it.

12376. Mr. HENLEY.—There is a question I might ask you with reference to appeals under the rules for 1905-06. Rule 96 reads: "Should a teacher have any well-grounded cause of complaint against his manager, he may submit a statement of the case to the Inspector, who, after due enquiry if necessary, refers it to the Commissioners for their consideration. Should any teacher find himself aggrieved by the conduct of the Inspector, he can make his appeal through the manager of the school and it will receive attention from the Commissioners. If the matter of complaint should affect both the manager and the Inspector, the teacher might then submit his case in writing to the Commissioners, who, if necessary, direct one of the chief inspectors to inquire into and report on it for their information."—Yes.

12377. Now, in the present edition of the rules, that rule is cut down to this:—"Should a teacher have any well-grounded cause of complaint against his manager or the Inspector, he may submit the case in writing directly to the Commissioners for their consideration." So that all promise of redress of any kind has been taken away?—I believe that the teachers have such confidence in us that they do not require a promise. Those words were cut out of the rule by myself, simply because I thought they were surplusage. If you compare the various editions of the rules from 1903, you will see that there is a steady approach to absence of surplusage and verbiage. I struck my pen ruthlessly through all repetitions; when we provide for submitting anything to the Commissioners for their consideration it is implied that they will take proper steps to remedy it if there is any thing to remedy. You may take it from me that there has been no difference in practice.

12378. Sir HERMAN WILKINSON.—Mr. Dilworth said that he is responsible for that. Mr. Dilworth and I re-wrote the rules between us, so as to remove all the verbiage. We both might claim whatever flowers of style are in the code.

12379. Mr. HENLEY.—Mr. Dilworth said he had a great deal to say to it. (Reads evidence of Mr. Dilworth).—Mr. Dilworth cannot speak authoritatively on the question of policy. It is for me to speak on that; and I can tell you that there has been no difference either in intention or in practice, and that we never suspected for a moment that the omission of any reference to a chief inspector would be interpreted by anybody as depriving him of any privilege he had before. When we say that a matter will be submitted to the Commissioners for their consideration, I consider that nothing else is required.

12380. It seems to me that were I amongst the ranks of the teachers and had that rule before me?—You might become as suspicious as they are.

12381. No; but I would feel safer and more certain to get my case investigated under the rule as it was than with the rule as it is at present?—I do not think so. That is a hypothetical case.

12382. And we have this also, that I think it is unusual for people to make changes in rules, and to withdraw a promise to take certain circumstances into consideration, without having some reason for it?—There was a reason, namely, to improve the English which, to a man of my tastes, is the strongest of reasons.

12383. At the expense of withdrawing something?—We did not withdraw anything; we only withdrew a useless form of words. Surely you must see that if you are asked to submit something for the consideration of the Commissioners, the Commissioners are going to do something with it. They are not going to pigeon-hole it.

12384. Sir HERMAN WILKINSON.—I was trying to find out when such a letter was written whether it ever reached the Commissioners at all?—What letter.

12385. Such as is referred to in that rule. That is one of the points that we have got to elucidate. The rule says: "Should a teacher have any well-grounded cause of complaint against manager or inspector he may submit his case in writing directly to the Commissioners for their consideration." You see, in that case, the word "Board," that has led to some misapprehension, is not used, and the word "Commissioners" can only have one meaning, that is, to the Commissioners collectively?—I do not agree to that.

12386. You mean to say that writing a letter addressed directly to the Commissioners means writing directly to the Resident Commissioner?—Not at all; the letter would be addressed to the secretary; but there are 109,000 letters in a year addressed through the secretary to the Commissioners, and we could not possibly bring all of them before the Board.

12387. In other places the word "Board" is used and we had a discussion with regard to what "Board" meant there?—I do not know what the difference is. We do not make any difference between "Board" and "Commissioners." Sometimes "Board" sounds better, and sometimes Commissioners, as the use of "Board," which I never treat as a noun of multitude, involves using "it," which is not respectful of such an august body.

12388. You are so particular with regard to the English of that, that I perhaps might call attention to the fact that the word "Commissioners" can have no other meaning than "Commissioners," and does not mean any incorporate agent or any other person than the collective Commissioners?—Every letter that is issued from our office is issued in the name of the Commissioners.

12389. Or "Board"?—No; they begin in this way: "We are directed by the Commissioners of National Education." We do not use the word "Board" in our letters. Every single letter that is issued is issued in that form.

12390. And when we find in the rules the word "Commissioners," we are to understand that there is some limitation?—We cannot avoid using this formula; we cannot make a rule, as was once proposed at the Board, that no letters should be issued in the name of the Commissioners except those that had actually been before them. What would be the effect? The country would discriminate between them. Thus



If they got a letter commencing "We are directed," they might say: "We will pay no attention to that; it is only from a subordinate official." You could not carry on an office on these terms. The same thing occurs in Dublin Castle. "We are directed by the Lord Lieutenant," but the Lord Lieutenant does not see one-tenth of the letters that are issued in his name.

12391. Mr. KAVANAGH.—I think the general public know that very well?—The Commissioners are collectively responsible for every letter that leaves the office, but it does not follow that they have seen them; they must delegate their authority.

12392. Sir HIRSH WINKINS.—The point is not, of course, what the general public generally think, who are acquainted with the Board and what is done, or what conclusion they would draw from a rule of that sort; but I submit it to you, is it not reasonable to suppose that a teacher reading that rule, as it originally was, would come to the conclusion that the matter would come before the Board collectively?—No, Sir Hiram. It is not reasonable. The general idea all over the country is that every two-penny halfpenny case comes before the Board. I have already said that people constantly write to me in this way: "I hear that the case of my junior assistant mistress is to come before the Board at the next meeting, and I shall be very much obliged if you will see that justice is done to her." It depends upon the importance of cases whether they go before the Board or not. Some are so important that they inevitably go before the Board, while others are so unimportant that the Board would not listen to them, and would blame me if I brought them up. An appeal of a teacher against dismissal by a manager is invariably brought before the Board.

12393. There is one class of cases with regard to which it has not been clearly stated whether they come before the Board or not, that is, cases in which a teacher, being entitled to increment, so far as his service is concerned, does not obtain his increment by reason of the absence of a necessary mark given by the inspector. Would that go before the Board?—No, no case of that kind would ever go before the Board.

12394. That would not go before the Board?—No.

12395. The Board does not consider whether the officers of the Board have been right or wrong in coming to the conclusion that increment is not to be given?—A case of that kind could never come before the Board.

12396. The CHAIRMAN.—How many cases of increment would you have in the year?—80 per cent. of the teachers, as I told you, get their increments every three years.

12397. But there would be thousands?—Yes; thousands. Of course, thousands would not come under Sir Hiram's description, as being in danger of losing their increments.

12398. I am speaking of ordinary increments?—There would be thousands of cases. Mr. Wyse spends most of his time dealing with them.

12399. Sir HIRSH WINKINS.—But the language used with regard to the cases coming before the Board left one in doubt as to whether the absence of the award of any increment was included in the case of fines, but it is not?—No; it is not. According to the regulations of 1903, certain cases are reserved for me and certain cases are reserved for the Board. The Board is directly responsible for matters of principle, and the classes of cases to which the principles should be applied. Those go before the Board as a matter of course. The Board laid down the principles on which increments should be given; but the question whether an increment should be given in a particular case would be considered as a detail.

12400. Mr. HENRY.—May I ask you to state the principle exactly on which increment should be given—does it mean that the teacher should have a number of "very good" and "good"s?—Certainly; that was laid down.

12401. Of course, that is done on the suggestion of officials of the Board?—As a matter of fact, they did elaborate the scheme.

12402. They might elaborate it, but they would not think of devising it?—Do you mean that it is so laid?—12403. It is so complicated?—In cases of that kind the details are roughed in by the officials and the Board shapes them afterwards.

12404. The Board may criticise, but it does not, as a rule, originate things of that kind?—A Board is not generally an originating instrument.

12405. Sir HIRSH WINKINS.—There was one point that I wanted to ask you about. Under your constitution the Commissioners are not to change any fundamental rule without the express permission of His Excellency the Lord Lieutenant?—Yes.

12406. There was a little doubt as to what was a fundamental rule?—Well, Sir Hiram, if you have no doubt on the subject, you may take it that you are much wiser than I. A fundamental rule may not be altered without the consent of His Excellency, but it is nowhere defined what a fundamental rule is. That is a very 'cute' omission. This became a burning question about 10 years ago. Sir Antony MacDonnell, as you might guess, was rather anxious to extend the province of the fundamental rules, but the Board resisted him. It had a long argument with the Castle on the subject, and in the end it appeared that there was no fundamental rule, except that the system was unadmissional, and is the one rule that is invariably violated.

12407. There are several things laid down in the Stanley letter, and the correspondence from 1831 down to 1908 seemed to show that the details referred to in the letter created a good deal of discussion at the Board, and were treated as so far fundamental that they could not depart from any of the provisions (if you might so call them) in the Stanley letter, without the approval of Her Majesty's Government?—Yes.

12408. Are there any of these left now?—You might say that the first fifty years of the National Board were spent in quarrelling over the meaning of the word "unadmissional."

12409. Oh, yes?—The first fifty years were spent in discussing the Conscience Clause, whether, for instance, parents should give notification to the teachers that their children belonged to a certain denomination, so that they should not receive the religious instruction of any other denomination. The history of the system given in the report of the Peiris Commission is entirely a history of religious squabbles. At first the Catholics were the only people who approved of the system. The Church of Ireland did not accept it for a very long time, and some of their schools are coming in only now. The Presbyterians went so far as to found gun clubs to shoot the inspectors.

12410. The CHAIRMAN.—In what part of Ireland?—In the North of Ireland. The great question with the Presbyterians in those days (and there is a strange coincidence of it in the last week or two) was whether it was right, as they put it, "to edit the Holy Ghost." About that time Archbishop Whately, with the consent of Archbishop Murray and Mr. Carile, published Scripture lessons, in which he left out passages that were thought to be too controversial for general consumption in Ireland. I dare say Mr. Henry remembers them.

12411. Mr. HENRY.—I do. It is a very excellent little book. But the trouble was with regard to improvements in the Commendments?—That is a recent case of stumbling. Mr. Carile translated for general use in National schools the chapter in the old Testament containing the Commendments from the Hebrew text. He submitted his rendering to Archbishop Whately and Archbishop Murray, who approved it. It is not compulsory, but the managers are permitted to hang it up in National schools during secular instruction, and, so far as I know, no one objected to it for more than 10 years. But recently a Presbyterian clergyman started the bare that this was a brand new edition of the Ten Commendments published last week or the week before by the Commissioners, with the intimation of consolidating the Church of Rome. As far as I know, the great objection was that "grave image" was left out, and "grave thing" substituted for it.

13412. Mr. HIRSH WILKINSON.—On the question of appeals to the Board, you have told us that there are some matters which go before the Board and some which do not. I suppose we may take it that matters which involve the dismissal of a teacher or a fine imposed on a teacher would go before the Board; but a matter concerning the withholding of an increment would not go before the Board?—Quite so.

13413. If a teacher appealed against a mark which which deprived him of his increment that would come up eventually, I understand, to Mr. Wyse, after going through the office?—No. Do you say an appeal against a mark mark?

13414. An appeal against a mark mark which resulted in the withholding of an increment. I understand that Mr. Wyse has to decide, in the first instance, upon the reports which come before him whether a teacher is to get his increment or not to get his increment?—Yes.

13415. If a teacher says that the mark mark which deprived him of his increment was wrongly assigned, that would go to Mr. Wyse?—I do not think a case of that kind is likely to arise. The marks on which increments are given are well known to the teachers, and if a teacher in the crucial year is informed by the Board that he has got a mark which he knows will deprive him of an increment, he is very likely to appeal at once without waiting for the notification that he has not got his increment. An appeal of that kind would go to the examiners, and from the examiners to the inspector for his observations. It would then go to the secretary, and from the secretary to me. Mr. Wyse deals with the cases when they have reached the incremental stage, and he takes the marks as they are. For this reason he has nothing to say to appeals.

13416. Eventually such appeals would come to you?—Invariably.

13417. And the question whether the matter should be considered would depend upon your decision, which you had come to upon looking over the appeals?—It would depend entirely on my decision.

13418. You have no suggestion to make whether such an appeal might not be brought before the Board or before a Committee of the Board?—No; I do not think that would work. I am convinced it would not, as I can easily explain. The consideration of appeals is expert work, in which it is necessary to know a good deal about the schools and the ways of inspectors. One must allow for the personal equation of inspectors, who are well known to me. I think Mr. Coffey asked Mr. Wyse to draw up a list of inspectors according to the severity of their marking.

13419. Mr. CORRY.—I think you are not quite clear about that. Mr. Wyse, in reply to a question of Mr. Harrison, said he could make a tolerable statement of inspectors from "very bad" up to "very easy," and I said afterwards that I would be glad if he would supply us with it?—That is exactly what I said. I, however, do not intend to attempt it any more than Mr. Wyse did.

13420. I did not intend him to do it; as a matter of fact, it was for another purpose that I asked him the question?—I thought it would be of considerable interest.

13421. It was of interest to me at that time from another motive?—Without going into that question we all know that among 76 inspectors the personal equation counts for much. From going round the country I have a pretty good idea as to the ways of the various inspectors, and consequently an appeal against one inspector might strike me in a very different way from an appeal against another inspector. I think that goes without saying. Without making any reflection on anybody, I take all these things into account. In addition, I listen to what Mr. Wyse and Mr. Dilworth and Mr. Lemass and the chief inspectors have to say on the subject. I do not decide these things right off out of my head without consulting people. That is my way of dealing with appeals; but if such cases went before the Board, or a Committee of the Board, it is perfectly clear to everybody who knows the ways of an unpaid Board, that every Commissioner would come with a letter in his pocket from

the teacher, or friends of the teacher, which he would insist on reading. I am not speaking out of my head. I remember many such instances. For example, Dr. Traill used to be furnished with a lot of letters, which he brought out one after the other. In fact, he used to pay a great deal more attention to them than to the official reports. That is what I anticipate, a number of people coming from the country primed with documents from interested parties. Under such conditions the trial of an appeal would be a perfect bedlam. The Board is not fit for such work, and it knows it is not fit for it. My colleagues have such matters to me, in the belief that I am perfectly impartial, and that as long as justice is done, I do not care about anything. This grievance, or supposed grievance, that appeals do not go to the Board, I never heard of till this inquiry, and it must be remembered that the two petitions that largely led to the appointment of this Committee were tried not by me, but by the whole Board.

13422. Mr. HENLY.—The last one on your report?—Not so; as a matter of fact, my report touching the Tipperary district was not altogether favourable to Mr. Welby, and for that reason I thought it due to him that I should make representation to him this morning.

13423. Sir HIRSH WILKINSON.—Cases of reprimand do not come before you at all?—As a rule they do not. I won't say absolutely that there are not exceptions. Some cases of reprimand have been mentioned to me; in fact, one was brought up to me last week; but as a rule they do not come to me.

13424. The CHAIRMAN.—What sort of offences are reprimands given for?—A great deal of dust has been raised about reprimands, and I was prepared to go into the question.

13425. I have read Mr. Purcell's evidence, and it seems to me that from the natural infirmity to which we are all subject, he was rather inclined to magnify the importance of his office; he said some things here that I cannot subscribe to. First of all, that he exercises judicial functions. I think it was Mr. Kettle who got him to make that admission; but I hold that the examiners do not exercise judicial functions. They should act according to the instructions which I have drawn up for them. I am responsible for them, and I personally select them. They perform merely routine work. Any case of the slightest difficulty they should refer to a higher authority. Mr. Purcell also said he performed the duties of the old chiefs of inspection. Now, I deny that in toto. He performs the duties of the old chiefs of inspection so far as they were purely routine, but every duty of the old chiefs of inspection that was not of a routine character has been assigned to somebody else, to myself, to the secretaries, and to the chief inspectors. In less important cases the examiners refer matters to the chief inspectors, without going through me. In more difficult cases they must consult me. For instance, they cannot refer an appeal to the chief inspectors except when counter-signed by me. The firing and dismissing of teachers used to be done by the old chiefs of inspection without reference to the Board. They consequently had powers which at present are reserved for the whole Board. I do not know whether they rightly had those powers, but they exercised them, so that it was absurd for Mr. Purcell to say that he is performing the duties of the old chiefs of inspection. He is not.

13426. He said he sent out reprimands?—What are the reprimands? That is the point. It has been suggested to me to abolish them, and I do not care whether we do or not. I do not value very much the importance of reprimands or censures or admonitions, and from my knowledge of the English language I am not able to say that there should be a great distinction between them; but our practice is this. When a man goes wrong first he gets an admonition; when he gets worse he gets a censure, and when he gets still worse he gets a reprimand; the next step is a visit from the senior or chief inspector. The teachers know the steps on the road to ruin, and if you deprive them of these milestones on the "primrose path to the everlasting bonfire" it is not certain that they won't consider that they have been robbed of a privilege. Suppose that a man is inefficient, and that certain defects have been

17th June, 1918.]

Mr. W. J. M. STURGE, M.A., LL.D., examined.

[Continued.]

brought under his notice from year to year, how is he to know that these points are serious enough to bring down upon him a visit from the chief inspector next year to decide whether he can be retained in the service? But if he gets a reprimand he knows what the next stage will be. There is nothing new in these processes; they have descended from the old results system. In these days reprimands, etc., were drafted by the clerk of the chiefs of inspection, who was responsible for them, and he showed his responsibility by instilling them. The secretaries at present sign, and are responsible for the letters conveying the reprimands, etc., drafted by the examiners; but these reprimands, as I have said, do not involve any judicial functions on the part of the examiners. They follow directly (as I can show from the documents here) from the reports of the inspectors. For example, the inspector reports in a particular case that, say, the arithmetic is very feeble, or that there is no preparation for work, and that the general proficiency is low. In such a case it is the examiner's duty to request the manager to admonish caution, or reprimand the teacher on the low state of proficiency. There is nothing judicial here, as the action follows directly from the inspector's report; it is understood from long official routine that if a teacher neglects his work, and if the mark of the school is very low, he gets a warning that unless he improves serious action will have to be taken. The reprimand is the warning, and if we should it, as I am perfectly willing to do, we shall have to warn the teacher in some other way that he must improve the efficiency. The point of my argument is, that the examiner really does not exercise much discretion in these matters; I hold that firmly from looking over the documents.

12427. Sir HIRSH WILKINSON.—One point that struck me, and I believe it struck Mr. Harrison also, was what Mr. Purrell said in answer to the question: "But as a matter of fact, I understood you to state that censure or reprimand is endorsed on the inspector's recommendation?" To that he replied: "Frequently, I send a reprimand when there is no recommendation at all."—That is quite right; but it requires explanation. If you look into these reports, you will see that the inspector generally does not make a recommendation; he only draws attention to the shortcomings of the school. In fact, he is told in a note that he should not recommend official action unless when he feels it to be absolutely necessary, or when he cannot remedy the defects by his personal influence. I am told that this note descends from before 1900, and that at one time the inspectors were constantly recommending official action, reprimands and censures, in cases where we thought that they were not required. When Mr. Purrell says he sends reprimands, without a recommendation from the inspector, he means that under the head in the report containing these words: "Note what official action, if any, you consider necessary," the inspector very rarely makes any recommendation; hence the examiner takes action without it. Well, that is technically true, but it is not true that it is not based on facts communicated by the inspector. I will read one case, the case of a school marked "mildling." The inspector observes that the state of this school is only moderately satisfactory, that the work is not conducted with sufficient energy, and that little effective effort appears to be made to develop the intelligence of the pupil, and that Composition, Geography, History and Arithmetic are not altogether satisfactory. Mr. Dilworth writes, "Inform the manager that the report shows that the work of the teacher is of very little value, and is not increasing in efficiency. The Commissioners have had occasion in previous years to censure this" (that fact would not be known to the inspector, but to the examiner, who has got the previous action before him); "the Commissioners have had occasion in previous years to censure this unsatisfactory performance of duty. The manager will now reprimand Mr. ——— severely, and warn him that unless the state of the school shows considerable improvement on the next general inspection, serious action may have to be taken." That is based on what the inspector finds wrong in the school, and on previous censures, which are recorded on the report for the information of the examiner. I say again that

these censures, etc., were intended to be a warning to the teacher. Should you like to see these reports?

12428. If you please?—(Reports handed in). As I have said, these reprimands are of no serious importance to themselves. I am informed by Mr. Wyse, that when he recommends action with regard to a teacher it is on a scrutiny of the whole report, and not on the action of the examiner.

12429. The CHAIRMAN.—He would have regard to previous reprimands?—He would read the previous reports, and not merely the reprimands, recommended by the examiner upon the reports.

12430. Mr. CORRY.—But does not the examiner issue this censure without any reference to Mr. Wyse?—But what I mean is that such a censure in itself has no effect on the teacher.

12431. But it has?—What?

12432. Mr. HENRY.—Has it an effect on the teacher's professional reputation?—It is unknown to the district.

12433. But it is known?—Who tells it?

12434. I stated already in this Committee that I got one reprimand in my life upwards and I feel it keenly still?—I am sure it was not a very bad one.

12435. It was a most unjust one; it was simply for carrying out the directions of the head inspector; it was long before your time?—I won't go so far as to say that even still all the censures are absolutely just.

12436. They are shocking things to be heaping at teachers without good reason?—I have been dealing with this class of work for 15 years, and I never knew till the present moment that reprimands were generally known in the district. They are sent confidentially.

12437. Sir HIRSH WILKINSON.—But to the manager, not to the teacher himself?—Yes, to the manager. But by a recent change to the teacher also.

12438. But it is communicated to the manager, and it depends on the discretion of the manager?—Very often the manager does not administer it.

12439. Mr. HENRY.—I know one case where the manager refused to administer a reprimand, and he was threatened that the school would be removed from the list of recognised schools?—We don't treat managers in that way now; we are too much afraid of them.

12440. Sir HIRSH WILKINSON.—The removal of these censures from the chief inspectors to the examiners has been referred to, and one of the grounds given for the removal was that in the old times it was really the examiners who did it themselves?—There was no examiners then. You mean the clerks of the chief of inspection. For example, this report is in Mr. Purrell's writing. The essential point is that, in 1900 no vital change was really made with regard to dealing with these things. Before 1900 the chief inspectors were responsible for these reprimands; at present I hold the secretaries responsible, and not the examiners.

12441. The CHAIRMAN.—They are initiated by the secretaries before they take effect?—They have to be signed by them. You may ask how far does the secretary recognise his responsibility. Now, a question of that kind has a very wide bearing, as everybody knows who has experience of an office. You might also ask me how far I recognise my responsibility for signing money orders every year to the extent of £1,850,000. I am personally responsible for them, but how far do I recognise my responsibility. That is a sort of question that applies to every high official where there is a delegation of authority.

12442. Sir HIRSH WILKINSON.—But the secretaries could scarcely be expected personally to make themselves responsible for every censure, having so much under their signature, having so many other things to attend to?—Mr. Lumsden tells me that he always reads the reports, but whether he does or not, he is personally responsible.

12443. Read the reports?—Yes.

12444. It is satisfactory to hear that?—The reports are sent to the secretary with the proposed letters.

12445. I understood from the way you put it that you wished to suggest that there was so much work that it was analogous to your signing cheques with respect to which you must depend on your financial

17th June, 1918.]

Mr. W. J. M. STARRIE, M.A., LL.D., examined.

[Continued.]

secretary?—That is generally true, but from their long experience they are able to smell a rat; they know pretty well what sort of a letter is dangerous and what sort is not, and what sort of thing may be passed without consideration. For instance, with regard to a censure, based on something the inspector has found to be wrong in the school, it is possible that they might not go carefully into it, but Mr. Lemay says that he invariably reads through the inspector's report before he signs the letter. Mr. Dilworth was not quite so emphatic as that, but he said that he always kept an eye on letters conveying reprimands, etc., and recognised that he, and not the examiner, was responsible for them.

12446. I think you said that you yourself were placed at a disadvantage from want of attention being called to some letters?—Yes; I am let in sometimes, and I was let in very badly on that occasion. Without knowing, I initiated a letter that I did not approve of.

12447. The point was that the chief inspectors really trusted the examiners?—You mean their clerks; there were no examiners.

12448. But they subsequently became examiners, some of them; Mr. Percall was one?—But there is no connection between the offices. The chiefs of inspection had a clerk, and they depended on the clerk. I hear Mr. Frintell is going to give evidence before you; his evidence on this subject is as good as you could get, as he was clerk of the chiefs of inspection during my first years.

12449. Mr. HENRY.—I understood that Mr. Percall also was?—Yes, before my time. Mr. Frintell tells me that when in the office of the chiefs of inspection he used to draw up the most important orders, even dismissing teachers without consulting the chiefs of inspection at all; indeed, on one particular occasion, in a very difficult case, he did not like to draw up the usual order without consulting the chief of inspection, who shall be nameless, but all the thanks he got was an arid wiggling for not having written the order.

12450. Sir HENRY WATKINSON.—It seems that the relation of the chiefs of inspection to their clerks was pretty much the same as the relation of the examiners now to the other clerks?—I fancy the examiners would not assent to that.

12451. You are familiar with Mr. Cairns' evidence before the Civil Service Commission. This occurs in it. "Question 29809. (Mr. Bostwood) What do your three examiners do?—(Mr. Cairns) They deal with reports and correspondence. It is only subject to the final scrutiny of the secretary in cases where letters under his signature have to issue, but all correspondence of a routine character goes to the examiners. The examiners direct that such action is taken by the proper staff he taken. This action is taken by the second division clerks, and sometimes, when it is of a routine type, it goes out without being scrutinised by the secretary. 29810. They are really a superior correspondence staff?—They direct what form the correspondence is to take?—I see what you mean. That proves that the examiners have got clerks in their department. Of course they have.

12452. And that their clerks do what the chiefs of the chiefs of inspection did before?—Not nearly to the same extent. You must always judge a man's evidence by your idea of what he wants to prove. Mr. Cairns wished to show that the second division clerks in the Education Office ought to be paid as well as first division clerks, and so he did not minimise the importance of his duties.

12453. At any rate, these reprimands do not come before you?—No; I am perfectly willing to abolish them if it would give general satisfaction. They are a relic of the old system, and I do not like the old system, or even the relics of it. I never paid any particular attention to reprimands, because I never heard of teachers objecting to them, I mean objecting to the system, for, of course, they object to being reprimanded, as we all do, and as Mr. Henry did; but now that my attention is drawn to them, I am willing that what the inspector finds wrong in a school shall be communicated to the manager and nothing else, so that the examiners shall have no discretion in the

matter at all. I am perfectly willing to do that, but I do not know that the teachers will think it a great improvement.

12454. There is one point with regard to the practice of appeals which are finally decided by you, and that is the point of view you take with regard to when a reconsideration of the inspector's report should be granted. The inspector sends in his report stating that the merit mark is so-and-so. Mr. Wyse, on seeing that, decides that the increment should not be granted. The teacher intimates his disagreement with that decision?—I said before that the teacher's appeal would be at an earlier stage.

12455. You did, but the fact is that when he sees the merit mark that is granted to him, and has become aware of the consequences it would carry, he objects to the merit mark, and then his appeal, as it may be called, from the inspector's decision, comes before you?—Yes.

12456. And it is for you to decide whether any further action should be taken upon it?—Well, before it comes to me it is sent to the inspector for his observations.

12457. And it does not come to you until after that second report is made?—Certainly.

12458. And it is upon that second report that you decide or approve the decision that is suggested?—Yes.

12459. We mentioned this before, that the teacher does not get an opportunity of replying to that second statement of the inspector?—Not at that stage.

12460. And when the decision is communicated to him he may ask to have the decision reversed, I think you told me?—Certainly; all our decisions are open—asked, far too open—to being reversed.

12461. A very important point in the case for the teacher is the point of view which you take as to the general advisability of allowing appeals, and I think you intimated that you were very averse to allowing appeals, and you coupled that with a statement that you did your very best to make appeals from the inspectors unnecessary?—That represents my view exactly. I said that I thought it would be very injurious to the service to be constantly reversing an important inspector's judgments in a district. It places the inspector in an exceedingly unpleasant position to have his judgment reversed by another man, who, though older, is probably no better or wiser than himself. But though I am not favourable to appeals, I constantly grant them, when the reasons are sufficiently strong. I have got a list of appeals which I can give you if you like. During the years 1908 to 1912, that is five years, there were 108 cases of appeal. In 36 of these cases I referred the matter to an inspector of higher rank; in 94 cases no change was made in the mark; in six cases the mark was raised; in one case a further inspection was granted; in one case the manager was informed that if the mark reached "very good" at the next inspection the question of making it retrospective would be considered. I think I told you that I have made that action general, so that when a man loses his increment or promotion from a lowering of the mark in the third year, if it rises next year we may make it retrospective. For the last ten years past I have done that, where the mark has been reduced by a new inspector coming in. As it was represented to me by the Organisation that a new inspector was likely to take a hard view of a school, I directed that if the mark next year was to its usual level the low mark should be disregarded.

12462. Mr. HENRY.—How many marks were raised?—The mark was raised in six cases.

12463. Only in six cases?—The "only" was introduced by you, Mr. Henry. I have said more than once, we visited the inspectors to regard the character of the teacher and the permanent aspects of the school, and not to reduce the merit mark without giving the man a year's warning, that if things were not improved the mark would not be continued. Our object has been to make the mark as permanent as possible. I detect a varying mark, as I do not believe the teachers' capacity alters from year to year.

12464. Sir HENRY WILKINSON.—I think you mentioned also, or suggested a rule, that no merit mark should be reduced unless after a year's warning. Is it either that rightly?—Yes, that is my general idea, and I think it is implied in the 1911 circular.

12465. I am afraid that it has not been entirely taken up in that sense?—I think it is pretty generally understood now, as I made it very clear in my address to the senior inspectors in the Board-room in June, 1911, before we issued the "banc circular." On that occasion Mr. O'Connor, the present chief inspector, stood up and said that he had since been acting on that principle in the Cork district.

12466. Would there be any difficulty in making that a distinct order and communicating it to the teachers?—I do not think so; but we should have to allow for exceptions. It is possible to conceive a case where there might be a sudden change in the teacher, from taking to drink or something of that kind, or where the change in the school was so potent that it could not be overlooked.

12467. And, subject to such special cases as you mention, you think it would be well to establish that?—I should be very glad to make such a rule.

12468. And I suggest that if that rule had been in operation, we should have seen a great deal of the complaints that the usual drop in the merit mark was in the third year?—I do not believe there is any truth in that.

12469. It would prevent that allegation at any rate?—If teachers believed that inspectors were going to do that they would not tell them, as they invariably do, that it is their third year; why should the teachers cut their own throats by telling the inspectors?

12470. That argument might hold generally, but I think that we have in some of the cases that have come up a considerable number in which it was stated that they lost their increment by the particular inspector referred to coming into the district?—Yes.

12471. I am sure that the Committee will consider with very great pleasure the introduction of such a rule as that tending to secure the permanency which you desire?—My desire is clearly implied in the circular.

12472. There is a point to which it is necessary to refer again, I think, and that is the question of the Board being informed when there is a striking reduction in the value of the merit marks, and one cannot help suggesting that a great deal might have been brought to your knowledge if a very simple arrangement had been made, by which the examiners should have drawn up a table each year showing what the marks were and what the reductions were?—It is very easy to be wise after the event.

12473. I am putting it in that way?—Although I have long travelled about the country studying this very question, I had no intimation until the problems from Belfast and Tipperary came in, within a few months of each other, that there was any great attention in the merit marks anywhere.

12474. Have you given any orders that you are to be informed?—If I had had two satisfactory chief inspectors I should have been informed.

12475. But it occurs to me that the chief inspector is not really in a way to give you anything in the nature of statistics?—I do not think the examiner is so well situated as the chief inspector, because the latter has already got those lists in the circular. He has only to ask for them. When he visits the circuits and confers with the inspectors in a few minutes he can see the marks of the schools. I thought they were doing this all along. Don't imagine I knew that Mr. Purser was acting as chief inspector with absolute disregard of his duty. He told you that he never went into the question of uniformity, but I always thought that that was his chief occupation. If he wished to be loyal to our wishes all he had to do was to ask for the registers, or he might have questioned the senior inspector, "How do the marks compare with last year or the year before?" There seems to me to be the most perfect machinery if it were utilized; even as it was, you have no evidence of uniformity breaking down on any large scale, except in Belfast and Tipperary. As

early as 1906 Mr. Hynes did inform the Board that the marking in Belfast, in the district, but not in the city itself, was too high. With regard to Tipperary, I gave you reasons then showing why we were in the dock.

12476. But you have the machinery for obtaining reports?—As long as the officers do their duty. If they do not do their duty no machinery is of any use.

12477. If it was a part of their duty to furnish you with a return in writing?—The chief inspector?

12478. Argent?—The chief inspectors might easily have kept me well informed; and I intend to take measures that they shall.

12479. The CHAIRMAN.—It has not been prominently put before them as a most important part of their duty?—Yes. I have always done so.

12480. Sir HENRY WILKINSON.—That is uniformity?—Uniformity. Ten years I have been travelling about the country, and I have here in my bag the merit marks of every school I have been in, and when going round myself I always compare the marks as between one inspector and another. That is what I expected chief inspectors to do. As I said the first day, by a piece of bad luck I have been little in that Tipperary circuit. I certainly did not see more than five or six Tipperary schools until this trouble arose.

12481. Mr. KERR.—Is the duty of the senior inspector to hold conferences with the juniors of his district and furnish a formal report to the office?—In the case of an ordinary conference, the report goes to the chief inspector. Mr. Welby,\* however, did draw the attention of the Board to the remarkable state of things in his circuit. The senior inspectors have general directions to tell us everything which they think it important that we should know.

12482. I know the report was headed "Conference?"—He thought that of sufficient importance to be sent in to the secretary. Ordinary conferences deal with the merest details. But to return to my notebook. I have got here the marks of all the schools I have visited, and while I can compare one district with another, I cannot readily do so between the marks of successive inspectors in the same district. I expected the senior inspectors to do that. I held strongly that if Mr. Welby wished to reduce the marks in a wholesale way, it was his duty to notify the Board, as we could not allow such a change to be made without passing judgment on it. I thought him culpable for keeping us in the dark, and hence I expressed myself with regard to him at the Board in a way which possibly prejudiced his chances of promotion. That was a serious thing. As a matter of fact, as I said this morning, Mr. Welby acted irresponsibly. Before reducing the marks he wrote an important letter to the Board telling them what he intended to do. That is what he ought to have done, and it was for us to inquire whether he was justified in doing so or not. The fact that this report never came before us was the source of all the trouble.

12483. The CHAIRMAN.—Did Mr. Welby ever express astonishment that no notice was taken of the report?—No doubt he thought silence gave consent.

12484. For two or three years no notice is taken?—No. In his report on the grievances of the teachers he does not say, "I wrote a report two years ago, telling the Board what I was doing, and I assumed, as the Board said nothing, that I had its approval."

12485. Mr. KERR.—He does not say in that report that he was actually reducing or had reduced?—But he meant that. I consider that passage a very serious one where he says that "very good" and "good" were being given for work that nowhere else would get a "good" report.

12486. Mr. KAVANAGH.—Would you not notice that there would be a reduction in the marks from the falling away of increments?—No, these were always dealt with as isolated cases.

12487. By Mr. WYSE?—He brings them to me as isolated cases, but I did not see them as a whole at all. In the absence of information from the chief inspectors, the only way I can possibly tell how things are going on is by my journeys about the country. I can give you a correct idea of the marking in every part of Ireland. I can tell you from my notebook what counties are marked high and what counties are

\* Vide Appendix XXXIII. (2).

17th June, 1915.]

Mr. W. J. M. STARRIS, M.A., LL.D., LL.D., examined.

[Continued.]

marked low, and not only that, but what parts of counties. Take Cork, for instance. The general average in Co. Cork, which is not particularly high, would give a false impression as to the efficiency of certain parts of the country. For instance, there are splendid schools in West Cork, while for some reason the Kinsale schools are as bad as in any part of Ireland, and I would say the same of Midleton. The difference is not due to the character of the inspectors, as Kinsale has the same inspector as West Cork.

12488. Sir HERMAN WILKINSON.—The rule with regard to the striking of the merit mark without the approval of the senior inspector might, I suggest to you, have an objectionable effect on the teacher in this way. We know that they complain that a great number of the marks have been lowered?—You mean in the one district?

12489. In the one district; and if they cannot be restored to their former position without the concurrence of the two inspectors, that rule, which was intended for the protection of the teachers, might operate to their detriment?—I observed that, and we issued a further order that it had come to our notice that some junior inspectors were not inclined to raise the mark on their own judgment on account of the fact that the cases would have to be referred to the senior inspector. I heard of a few cases; a teacher near Dublin told me that the inspector had said to him, "I am not going to bother going to the senior inspector with regard to raising the mark of your school; you must be satisfied with the mark you have got." The story may be exaggerated, but I look upon it as one, as I always do when I consider there is a possible danger, and issued a circular that junior inspectors are expected to act on their own judgment consistently with the 1911 circular; although the cases must be referred to the senior inspector, they are reminded that in case of a difference the chief inspector should be called in. I do not know whether you have got this circular. It was issued this year.

12490. The CHAIRMAN.—No, we have not got that?—The result of that will be (at least we hope so), that the junior inspector will act on his own judgment, and if, after full discussion, he differs from the senior inspector he will stick to his judgment and go to a higher authority. I might say that the rule in the "two circular" was made in consequence of the representations of the teachers. I got resolutions from the North of Ireland against young inspectors lowering the mark of a school.

12491. Sir HERMAN WILKINSON.—And you think it would not be wise to limit it to the lowering?—I do not think it would be wise to separate the two.

12492. You might have another rule, that in the case of a mark having been lowered the senior inspector should join with the junior inspector on the next occasion in seeing whether it could not be raised?—Though we might give wind to an inspector to do that sort of thing, it does not look well to draw up a rule ostensibly that the teacher should get as much money as possible, even when he does not deserve it. You must have the appearance of holding the balance evenly. One is safe in trusting the humanity of the inspector, since it is not his interest to deprive the teachers of their money, nor is it the interest of the Commissioners to have a large surplus on the vote. If we could divide up our savings among ourselves, it would be a different thing, but we cannot.

12493. Your answer suggests another question, and that is with regard to the merit marks, and the consequences of receiving particular merit marks. Do you fix them in conjunction with the Treasury?—The merit marks?

12494. The merit marks?—The Treasury, I am glad to say, know nothing about merit marks, but one of the evil results of this Committee is that they will get to know them. You see the effect. The teachers know them, but neither the Treasury nor Audit Department knows of them. The result of the Audit Department's seeing these rules will be that they will insist on their being rigidly carried out and it is a very doubtful thing whether I shall be allowed to use the principle of compensation, as I have been doing. These

particular rules have never been submitted to the Treasury, only the general rule, that increments should be given on merit and promotion on length of service, etc. That is very vague, and we are allowed to use our discretion in interpreting it, that is within limits. For instance, if the Audit Department saw us giving increments automatically they would probably interfere, but so long as we award them for marks, we are held to carry out the rule that merit is required; but now if our rules are formulated in the report of this Committee, they will make it one of their chief duties in future to insist that they shall be carried out as strictly as the rules of average attendance. Mr. Wyse and Mr. Wood will tell you that it is my practice, and I say this with the fear of the Treasury before my eyes, to interpret them with considerable laxity and invariably in the teachers' interest.

12495. May I suggest that your proviso with regard to the application of these rules is as much part and parcel of these rules as the rules themselves, and the Treasury must take cognizance of that as well?—There is no doubt they will insist on these rules being carried out like any other rules in the code in fact, they will insist on their being put in the code.

12496. The merit marks?—Yes. The only way to counter the Treasury is to proceed at once to abolish the marks, and to substitute something else that has not come before the Committee.

12497. You mean that the publication of all these might have the effect of stiffening the whole system?—Most seriously.

12498. It may be harder on the teachers?—It could not be easier on the teachers. Remember how the Treasury interpreted the rules of average before the "savings" came in. Suppose an unfortunate assistant teacher in a school with an average of 50. If the average dropped to 49.4, he would be dismissed after two or four quarters, no matter what the reason was. It might be an epidemic. Take the principle of compensation.

12499. Do you think the Treasury will not allow that?—I am perfectly certain they won't.

12500. Do you think that you can anticipate the Treasury action?—That I can anticipate it?

12501. Yes?—In general, possibly, as a most gratuitous form of folly; but I am willing to prophesy here. Now that they know the merit marks, the only thing to do is to abolish them.

12502. That brings us to the point I want to put to you, and that is that the merit marks may come for the information of managers and others?—They certainly do.

12503. That is as to the grade of their schools and promotion and increment. You think that that could be done without reference to these particular six merit marks?—As I said before, some of the inspectors see very food of these six merit marks. For instance, when Mr. O'Connor excited your hopes by saying that he had, in consultation with Mr. McNeill, thought out a modification of the merit marks, it turned out that his plan was to make them seven, to add "very fair." Is not that so?

12504. Well, the point was increment and promotion for the teachers, and I think that that could be put in a way that would appeal to the Treasury. The Treasury could scarcely expect that the teachers ought to be subjected to any greater strain with regard to their promotion or increment than members of the Civil Service. Now, Mr. Leman seemed to be under some misapprehension with regard to what the requirement was?—Efficiency, is it not?

12505. That is what the Treasury rule is. It is an Order in Council\* of the 10th January, 1910, and Clause 18 says that increment of salary shall not be allowed to any officer at the date at which it would in ordinary course become due without a certificate from his immediate superior, countersigned by the head of the department, or such person as he may designate for the purpose, to the effect that the services of such officer, during the year preceding the date of such certificate, has been approved of; and then it goes on to make provision for that case that

\* Vide Appendix XXVI. (5).

you refer to, in which when a bad merit mark had been given, and a subsequent merit mark attained, the benefit of the subsequent merit mark was ante-dated. It says—"Provided that if, at the date when the increment should in ordinary course become due, the certificate cannot be given, the head of the department may specify a period, from the expiration of which, if the officer's service in the meantime has been approved, increment may be allowed, and may from time to time extend the period so fixed. If the officer's service after the grant of the deferred increment shall continue satisfactory the head of the department may give, and, when he thinks fit, increase the salary to an amount not exceeding that at which it would have stood if no increment had been withheld or deferred, and every such increment shall be reported to the Comptroller and the Auditor-General." Do you see any difficulty in applying a rule framed generally upon the basis of that Order in Council?—I do not think so, but it will lead, of course, to the increment being given on a system such as I have said I am willing to adopt, and that is to divide the schools, so far as circumstances are concerned, into satisfactory and unsatisfactory, or efficient and inefficient. I think satisfactory and unsatisfactory would be better, and to give the increment to the school marked "satisfactory."

12508. You think that that would be the proper solution?—I do. I do not, however, accept the analogy between the Civil Service and the teachers, because in the Civil Service there is very considerable supervision, which does not exist in the case of the teachers.

12509. Well, you have the supervision of the Inspector?—But that is very slight compared with the supervision of an office, which is exercised every hour of the day.

12508. Well, the Treasury would be appealed to, I think, more by the Order in Council than they would be by the rule, for instance of the London County Council, but the rule of the County Council is more favourable still. In a handbook, containing general information with regard to the teachers and the system of instruction in the London Public Elementary Schools, paragraph 106, it is stated that annual increments of salary according to scale are allowed for each year for satisfactory service, and then paragraph 107 says that satisfactory service means service for a period of twelve months, during which the teacher has not been guilty of any grave misconduct?—That does not seem to relate to the teaching at all.

12509. The CHAIRMAN.—No, merely to moral conditions?—If you had a rule in the Civil Service that every man should get an increment who had not been in good during the preceding twelve months, you would soon have a poorer staff, would you not?

12510. Sir HERMAN WILKINSON.—But perhaps you would take the general rule of the Civil Service and not this rule of the London County Council?—I should much prefer what you read from the Order in Council.

12511. The CHAIRMAN.—The one is positive and the other is negative?—I should very much prefer it.

12512. Sir HERMAN WILKINSON.—Under the London County Council the teachers could obtain their increments with greater ease than the Order in Council would give?—But I may point out a very important difference. As the London County Council has control of all the schools, it is not necessary that there should be any stringent rules about inefficiency or efficiency, because there are ample means of rewarding efficiency and of punishing inefficiency of a more effective and less invidious kind than we can adopt. It can appoint a good teacher to a good school, and if a man is doing bad work in one place, it can send him to Limerick, without its appearing that he is actually punished; but we have no similar power in Ireland. Suppose a teacher is doing admirable work in a wretched school on the top of a mountain, I cannot take him and say, "You are such a good man that I will make you principal of a big school in Belfast." He likes to "dree his sair word" where he is. If he is an ambitious man, he will have to be like Bellerophon, "to eat his

heart out, avoiding the pelles of men." One of the main weaknesses of our system is that the schools are isolated, and, on account of religious differences, wretchedly small. In the case of our model schools, however, we can do something. If a man is doing very good work in, say, Kinnosorthy, we can send him to Belfast, where he will have a bigger sphere of influence. On the other hand, if the head master of a model school is doing very poor work, we might make him an assistant in another school. That would be a very serious punishment, as he might lose half his salary. If, in general, we could treat teachers like that, the awarding of increments might largely depend on whether they were guilty of inefficiency or not.

12513. And you see no great difficulty in abolishing the present rule with regard to merit marks and introducing that rule?—Yes; but, as I have already said, any unsatisfactory report would be regarded very much as a "fair" report of present, and would lead to a much friction between the inspectors and the teachers.

12514. You say 80 per cent. of the teachers at present get their increments?—I am informed that 80 per cent. of the teachers get their increments. I want, however, to inquire again whether this means 80 per cent. of those eligible by average attendance, etc.

12514. You said on the last day 80 per cent. of the whole?—I gave you last day the words that were actually put into my mouth that morning. If I was correct, the number refused their increments would be still smaller, that is, on grounds of inefficiency.

12515. Mr. HANLY.—I think there must be some error about the 80 per cent. The number of teachers is 12,037, and 80 per cent. of that would be 9,630. Then if they were to get their increments regularly there would be 3,400 increments due every year, that is the third?—Yes.

12516. Well, the increments would be in every third year?—1903, 1905, 1909, and 1912 would be the years in which the great majority of the increments would fall due.

12517. Taking the increments on the returns here, we get 5,037 one year, 1,035 the next, and 1,645 the next. Then there were 162, and 187, and 329 who got promotion, which I will count as equivalent to increment. That makes 708 more, and the total is 5,045, and the third of that would be for the average 3,446, while there are 3,440 teachers who would be entitled if there were 80 per cent. and, therefore there is a shortage?—My informant was Mr. Wynne, so I had better get further information from him on the subject.

12518. The CHAIRMAN.—Would not this question of paying increments on another plan by the introduction of a new system of merit marks involve a far-reaching inquiry?—Giving increments on a different merit mark would not involve an inquiry.

12519. Would it not?—I think not; as it is only a change of words. As I have said before, I doubt very much the new proposal would increase the number of increments. From what I know of the schools in Ireland, I should certainly say that 20 per cent. of the schools were unsatisfactory. I said on the last day that, roughly speaking, 15 to 20 per cent. of the teachers in Ireland are inefficient, and, however you alter the standard, this number will fail to get increments. What the Inspector considers is not so much the merit mark itself, but whether or not the teacher deserves an increment; thus, if the increment is given on "good" in the third year, the Inspector will give the teacher "good" if he thinks he deserves his increment. If the increment is given on "fair," the "goods" will become less numerous; in fact "fair" would take the place of "good"; so if we divide the schools into satisfactory and unsatisfactory, and an unsatisfactory teacher does not get his increment, the unsatisfactory schools would be very much what the "fair" school at present is.

12520. Mr. HANLY.—You stated, and it has been stated here before, that Inspectors do not know when the teacher is in the third year?—So far as I know, he does not, except from the teacher.

1915 June, 1915.]

Mr. W. J. M. STARKIE, M.A., Litt.D., LL.D., examined.

[Continued.]

12521. There is a circular here of 1906, and that circular, after giving the conditions about the averages and other things, says: "Subject to the foregoing, you are at liberty to recommend deserving principal teachers in your report, whose efficiency, judged by the work done in the schools, by the general condition of the school-house and out-offices," as regards hygiene and so on; and a teacher in the third grade should not be promoted to the second grade unless the last three annual reports made upon his school, etc.; so that they must know?—They know what marks the increments and promotions are given on, but whether a particular teacher is in his third year or not they do not know. After the marks have been given to the schools, they get this circular, saying: "You are at liberty to recommend deserving teachers"; but when they are giving the marks they do not know. However, as I say, they are generally told.

12522. You say that these marks are all in the district register book?—So I am told. What they are in the register is a long succession of "very good" and "good," but it is not so easy to divide these into groups of threes. From what I know of the inspectors, they would not take the trouble, but the teacher volunteers the information. They may say: "In 1912 this teacher got his increment, and consequently in 1915 he will be looking for it again," but that would give some trouble which they are unlikely to take.

12523. Sir HIRSH WHITFIELD.—I may refer to what Mr. Dewar said:—"My reports on these schools are in the Education Office. I may say that in assigning a merit mark to a school I did not take into consideration whether the particular mark would disturb any arrangement as to the number of 'fides,' 'goods,' and 'very goods'?"—I infer from that that Mr. Dewar had not much liking for the system of merit marks.

12524. You think that the matter of "satisfactory" or "unsatisfactory" could be arranged?—Yes, as to increments, but the question of promotion remains.

12525. And that really the difficulty there is whether you are going to have special promotion or not?—No, there is the same difficulty in the case of ordinary promotion; in fact, if we do not require a higher degree of merit for promotion than for the increment, we shall have to revise the whole system of paying salaries. I would ask how you are going to select the teachers for promotion. The Chairman says Mr. Dale is against selection and in favour of rejection, and I agree with him. But when you have only a limited number of places in the higher grades, how are you going to get Cork against Antrim? We are doing it at present in a very rough way by giving the same value to a "good" in Antrim as we give to it in Cork. There is an appearance of accuracy about this which does not correspond with the facts. You may have "good" in a school in Cork, and "good" in a school in Antrim, which has the appearance of the simple equation  $8=8$ , but that is the folly of mathematics. Except in the abstract  $8$  does not equal  $8$ ; it depends entirely on what  $8$  represents. Thus, you cannot be perfectly certain that "good" represents the same thing in Antrim as it does in Cork. How can you? That is an objection to the present system; but what are you going to put in its place? How are you going to compare a meritorious teacher in Cork with a meritorious teacher in Antrim?

12526. Well, if the present system does not assist you in that, I take it that it is of very small assistance?—Well, the seeming mathematical accuracy of the system of marks has the merit of satisfying the public. But if you abolish them, how are you going to give promotion?

12527. That is, if you consider it necessary to give special promotion?—But this is promotion of any kind.

12528. Promotion of any kind would be just the same as in the matter of increments?—You would promote a man from the third to the second grade simply on the ground of being satisfactory?

12529. Yes?—A system like that would destroy efficiency and increase the grant by at least £20,000 a year. There is no doubt about that. I have gone into it.

12530. You would have the standard numbers there again?—Then, if you keep the standard numbers and promote merely on seniority, the senior teacher will go up when there is a vacancy in the upper grades. The Treasury would not object to that, but you will ruin efficiency; and consider the dissatisfaction you will create in the minds of good teachers, who will say: "The only thing we are expected to do for promotion is to grow old." I will tell you what you might do. It would be very ludicrous, but I think you could do it, that is, divide up the places in the higher grades, and assign a certain number to each county, and then ask the inspector (it will be selection all the same) to select the best men in the county. I think they could probably do so, as that is what is done in the awarding of the Carille and Blake premiums. Don't we assign a certain number to each county?

12531. Mr. HENRY.—To each group of districts?—Yes; district will suit me just as well. You might assign a certain number of the higher places according to the population of each; but that would be an awful injustice in some districts where good teachers happen to be collected. There is no doubt that in Antrim, West Cork, Clare, and in some parts of Kerry, there is a most admirable lot of teachers, and if you abolish merit, how are you going to satisfy women, who are excellent everywhere? I will give a general testimonial to the efficiency of Irish women. When I say that over 60 per cent of the Irish women are efficient I am not exaggerating. I have rarely gone into a school taught by a woman that is not a better school than a school taught by a man.

12532. Is it not a peculiar thing that while the women are so efficient, the men have fairly succeeded in filling the higher places, but the women have not?—What do you mean by the higher places?

12533. The higher grades?—You mean that the higher grades are not filled by women yet.

12534. Yes?—They are going up as hard as ever they can, and highest grade will be filled before the end of next year.

12535. It is taking them a long time?—If they were not highly classed in the days of the examinations, which they were much too sensible to care about; every inspector will tell you they are more efficient than the men.

12536. The CHAIRMAN.—You were speaking of injustice to teachers?—In certain counties there are good teachers, and in other counties not. I could prove this from my note-books. I do not know whether it would be dangerous to say what parts of the country the good teachers frequent.

12537. I think it is not wise?—At any rate, it is the fact that in some districts there is an enormous number of very good teachers, and in other districts on enormous number of very bad teachers. It is not altogether a case of county against county or of circuit against circuit. As I said, there are certain parts of Cork in which there are splendid teachers, and there are other parts of Cork where they are very poor indeed.

12538. If you divide promotion according to population all over the country, you do an injustice to really good districts?—That is the objection, you are promoting the really good districts. But, of course, it is a possibility which is worth considering.

12539. If you abolish the merit marks, you think it is worth considering?—It is. In the case of the scholarships possessed by Mr. Birrell a certain number was to be assigned to each county, according to population; if you can do that in the case of scholarships, there is no reason why you could not do it in the case of promotion, and it is a conceivable way of giving promotion.

12540. The selection to be made by the inspector?—The selection would then have to be made by the inspector, who would have a personal knowledge of the teachers. It could not be made by anybody in the office, however experienced he might be; he would never be able to discover from the reports, which are fictitious things, what the real merits of a teacher are; he would have to see them at work. The only man who is a judge of the merits of the teacher is the man who has seen him at work.



12541. And those promotions would be made on the selection of the inspector?—Yes; but, like Mr. Dale, I object to selection.

12542. And that is where he would be posted?—Yes; we cannot get an Omnicenter being to come down and tell us who is the best, and we cannot cast lots.

12543. I dare say there would be some criticism of that?—Yes; there would be plenty of criticism.

12544. The Bureau of Ross.—You would have more friction under the new method than under the old?—It that were possible.

12545. Because the men would be next to one another and they would be measuring themselves against one another?—It would be competition between men of a limited district.

12546. And a selection is made of these on the judgment of the inspector?—Yes.

12547. I think you would have much more friction than you have at present?—The question of promotion in a centralised system like ours is a most difficult one. In England there are local authorities, who can distribute the teachers according to their merits in various places and remove them from one school to another, so that there is not very much friction; but here we should have to give prizes involving an increase of £20, or £30, or £40, or £50 a year, on what an enemy would say to the impression of the Inspector.

12548. The CHAIRMAN.—I am afraid you would have as much criticism under that as under the old system?—Yes, but where is your remedy? I have been thinking over these things, and I fancy every scheme that could be invented must have passed through my mind at some time or other, since I have had the pleasure of being constantly on the firing line. My only alleviation of torture has been the occasional change of torturers.

12549. Sir HIRSH WILKINSON.—At the present time, what is really done in the matter of giving promotion?—Promotion at present to second grade is simple enough; there is no competition, and every teacher who gets three "goods," and is eligible by his average attendance, gets his step, provided he has been three years at the top of the grade. There is special promotion besides. If a teacher has got three "very good" reports, and the school is large enough, he can get into the second grade in three years; for a smaller number he can get into the second grade in six years. There is no block to promotion in the case of the second grade; but when you reach the first grade there is no such thing as special promotion. We had arranged that a man should get into the first grade in twelve years; but as it is now full we are not allowed to carry out our intentions in the case of men. Even ordinary promotion is delayed, as they have to wait for a vacancy. It is given in a mechanical way. If the inspector awards a sufficient number of "very good," and Mr. Wyse sees that the conditions have been fulfilled, he brings me the docket of recommendation, which I initial and place before the Board.

12550. And the merit mark scale is used for that purpose?—Certainly.

12551. The CHAIRMAN.—A man gets into the first of first with three "very good" reports?—Yes, with a certain amount of compensation. If he misses one of the "very good" and subsequently gets an "excellent," this makes up for it.

12552. Mr. HENRY.—The number of male teachers in the first of first grade is given in the return of 1911 as 325, and Mr. Dilworth has given the maximum number allowed in the grade as 340. How does the difference arise?—Where did you get the 325?

12553. It has been given us here in a return from the office?—Is it in the appendix?

12554. Yes?—What is the date of it?

12555. 1911?—I thought 340 was the number.

12556. 340 is given by Mr. Dilworth as the maximum allowed in the grade?—Yes.

12557. But then the grade is represented as being full?—For men. For a few months in each year the grade is not actually full; but we fill it up as fast as possible. There is no doubt that it is usually full, as we have a hundred people waiting for promotion to second of first and first of first.

12558. Second of first was reported as having 470, but the number allowed is 500?—That must have been for that moment. It is unavoidable that there should be delays, as we cannot be certain that a vacancy has really occurred for some time. A teacher may drop out of a grade through absence or illness. We cannot fill up his place until we are quite certain that he won't return.

12559. And there were only 1,000 women in the second grade, while there are 2,000 allowed?—Yes; the second grade is not nearly full, but that does not matter. I dare say you have been told that we are willing to surrender a number of places in the second place in lieu of places in the first grade, and the Treasury would not agree to it.

12560. Sir HIRSH WILKINSON.—Now, with regard to the question of publicity of your rules, there are two aspects of it. There is, in the first place, the aspect of the publication of new rules. The Public Commission recommended that the only precedent that they could follow in those days should be followed by the Board, that is, that the rules should be laid on the table of the House of Commons for a certain time, but there has since been an Act of Parliament relating to Statutory rules, which does not apply to the Board, but I ask you whether it could be followed. An objection has been made in Mr. Dilworth's memorandum to publishing the rules, I think, by saying that certain things have to be conducted strictly confidentially between the Treasury and the Board?—Yes, that is quite true.

12561. Well, the same occurs in the case of the Civil Service Commission. In reading over their reports, one finds confidential correspondence between the different departments of the Treasury and the Commission, and then when those are settled statutory action is given. The question would, of course, arise that if the Treasury and the Civil Service Commission, and, say, the Home Office, have decided that a certain rule should be followed, there would be very little use in anybody putting in any objection to it; but still there the statutory provision is made that before these rules come into effect, any objection made in a proper way shall receive consideration, and, no doubt, if representations were made to the Treasury with regard to certain things they might contrive the rule so that the mere fact of having to conduct confidential correspondence previously does not interfere with the application of such a system?—If you ask me whether the same thing could be applied to our Board I can only make the same answer as I made before. If there is Home Rule next year, with a Minister of Education no doubt the rules (I won't call them our rules, because I don't suppose we shall be in existence) will be on the table of the House for a certain time, and it will be the duty of the Education Minister responsible for them to defend them; but what would happen under the present system? If we publish a new rule, or a certain number of new rules, and they lie on the table of the House, a single Irish member would be able to block them; we had experience of that on the Intermediate Board in a case where, after the Government had actually sanctioned our rules, a single member blocked them for a year, and we had to go back on the old rule.

12562. The CHAIRMAN.—We had to run through the old rules in about a week?—In order to carry on the system at all we had to insist on two languages being obligatory in every school contrary to our own policy; now, what would happen with regard to the National Board? Unless you changed the system in such a way as to deprive the country of what the Archbishop of Dublin once called the only specimen of Home Rule we have got. What would happen? We should be brought under the thumb of an English Minister. Every new rule would have to be subject to his approval, and his attitude towards the rules would not be influenced by their merits, but by some secret interview which he has had with a few discontented people. That is exactly what happened with regard to the Intermediate Board. All the rules of the Intermediate Board have to be sanctioned by the Lord Lieutenant; but the sanction is often given, not on their merits, but on the representations of members of either political party, according to their influence at the moment. Whether a rule should pass or not depends largely on which day is uppermost at the time. Your proposal

17th June, 1918.]

Mr. W. J. M. BRIDGES, M.A., Litt.D., LL.D., examined.

[Continued.]

is that we should surrender our present independence, which you should be proud of (for, after all, had we our reputation is, we are Irishmen), in exchange for subjection to an English Minister who cares nothing for us. You may not like Home Rule in those matters as much as I do, but I assert, with the Archbishop of Dublin, that the National Board is a specimen of Home Rule under which we maintain our own views so far as we may without interference or dictation.

12568. Sir HIRSH WILKINSON.—These are the objections that occur to you?—I could mention many others too, but I won't.

12569. Now, there was one rule you made which was objected to; you made the maternity rule?—Yes, a most admirable rule.

12570. And on reconsideration you did not adhere to it?—It was not on our reconsideration.

12571. You did not recede from it, but you resisted its application, I think?—Yes.

12572. And if notice of the rule had been given you would have had an opportunity of reconsidering it before it had been applied? It would never have been applied at all. Whether you consider that an advantage in another matter.

12573. I understood that certain women had been called on to pay for substitutes, but that was not persisted in?—Certainly, because the Government threw us over. The Government highly approved of the rule at first, but they saw reasons subsequently to change their opinion.

12574. So that more publication beforehand would not have affected the result?—Not a bit, Mr. Bridges said that most people in Ireland thought it an excellent rule. He said that in the House of Commons; afterwards he changed his view and said it involved a monstrous injustice.

12575. The objection was that it applied to persons already in the service, and imposed a financial burden on them?—When they were casting about for reasons I believe that did occur to them. They could have easily got over the difficulty by saying, "We will pay for the substitute, or pay half of the cost," that is what we asked for.

12576. Who?—The Government. They started this question of vested interests on the spur of the moment as being much less expensive than paying the substitutes, as we had proposed. In many places in England they won't allow married women at all, and in other places they insist that they shall resign within three months of their marriage. In Scotland they are not allowed, so Sir John Strathairn told me, but here in Ireland a school must be penalised every year, sometimes for 12 or 14 years, by a married woman who is not able to do her work for four or five months of the year. I say that would not be tolerated in any other country.

12577. I am not wanting to raise the question of the desirability of the rule, but I merely mention it as a rule which I understood had been reconsidered?—I know, but what happened with regard to this rule is exactly what might happen with regard to any other rule. The Irish Government would give in for sufficient reasons. You may not be aware of the fact, but the Irish Government is a bit painted to look like iron, and the painting is deplorably done.

12578. Mr. HENRY.—They are paying women under these conditions?—That is what we wanted them to do. It would only cost £4,000 or £5,000 a year.

12579. The CHAIRMAN.—So much as that?—Yes, the cases are very numerous.

12580. Sir HIRSH WILKINSON.—There is one thing you mentioned with regard to fallacies of numbers, and there was a point to which our attention was called by Mr. Forth. That was some fallacy with regard to the averages of attendance. It seems to me that it must be a fallacy from the way it worked out, and as put by him it was this, that by keeping open a school for a certain time they reduced the average and deprived themselves of the benefit of grants.

Well, you have a rule with regard to the average of attendance in a school, the average daily attendance. The total number of complete attendances is to be divided by the number of school days, and two half attendances are to count as one complete attendance. Then in order to meet certain difficulties you say the number of pupils present must be recorded every day, and when owing to the severity of the weather, or other exceptional cause, the number of pupils in attendance any day or days is under one-third of the average attendance for the month in which the day or days occur, the description of such day or days may be excluded from the calculation of the average attendance, but the name of such low attendance in each case shall be recorded in the daily report book. Now, a school has to be in operation for at least 300 days, and excluded days cannot be counted as part of the required minimum of 300 days. Well, if a school is in operation for 325 days, say, and on 25 of those days there was a very low attendance, and yet not so low as to come within this rule of the one-third, still they would bring down the average very considerably. The question is suggested whether, when the attendance exceeds the 300 days which are compulsory, the low days might not be taken out?—I once proposed to the Treasury, in my desire to increase the number of school days in the year, or rather to encourage the teacher to keep open the schools for more than 300 days, that the teacher should be allowed to select the 300 best days, but the Treasury would not agree to it, as it would cost some money. I think it is reasonable and right to encourage the teachers to keep open the schools as long as they possibly can, and it would be an encouragement if they were allowed to select the best days, but they were not allowed to do so.

12581. I am sorry the Treasury did not agree to your recommendation?—Yes, in the interests of education it was desirable.

12582. It would be in the interests of the teacher really to discourage the pupils coming or shut up the school on fair days?—They always do shut.

12583. Not always?—I mean when the children are in danger from the cattle.

12584. Yes?—They often used to shut them even so far as twenty miles from a fair, but we put a stop to that; there must be a reasonable danger. I once found near Bantry a school shut because of a fair twenty miles away, but that was because the parents went to the fair and the children had to mind the house.

12585. Well, in your next assault on the Treasury perhaps you would include that?—Our assaults on the Treasury and on the Government have become so serious that the Government now refuse to publish our annual reports. That channel of communication with the country has been blocked. They also expressed my speech on continuation schools, and my innocent speech on libraries.

12586. The CHAIRMAN.—How could they do that?—They won't allow us to print them for circulation among the teachers.

12587. But are they not in print already?—8,000 copies have been printed of the speech on continuation schools. I wanted to enlighten the National teachers as to the financial prospects of education in the future, but they refused to allow them to be circulated even to the members of this Committee. The refusal to circulate my speech on the libraries is still more curious. I did not make an assault on anybody except the Kora and Robert Browning. In 1903 our annual report was suppressed, although Home Rule was not mentioned in it, because we made some comments on Mr. Wyndham's stopping of the building grant. Mr. Wyndham stopped the building grant as long as he was in Ireland.

12588. Sir HIRSH WILKINSON.—Exercising the same powers as you exercise in the case of inspectors' reports?—We did not suppress inspectors' reports.

12589. I thought you did in 1906?—Yes, the chief inspectors' reports were suppressed in 1906; you have me there.

# TWENTY-EIGHTH DAY.—WEDNESDAY, JUNE 18TH, 1913.

At 23, Kildare-street, Dublin.

Present:—**SIR SAMUEL DILL, M.A., LL.D., LL.D. (Chairman);** The Most Rev. **DENIS KELLY, D.D., Bishop of Ross;** **SIR HERAM SHAW WILKINSON, LL.D.;** **MR. JOHN COPPEY;** **MR. HENRAGE E. B. HARRISON, B.A.;** **MR. JEREMIAH HENLY;** **MR. WALTER MCMURROUGH KAVANAGH, B.L.;** **MR. THOMAS MICHAEL KITTLE, B.L.;** and

**MR. ARTHUR J. DONNELLY, M.A., B.Sc., Secretary.**

**DR. STARRIS, Resident Commissioner of National Education, further examination.**

**12585. Sir HERAM WILKINSON.**—You wish to refer to the question of the percentage of teachers who get increments?—I want to clear up a misapprehension about this 80 per cent. that Mr. Henly spoke of yesterday. I am not quite clear whether I told 80 per cent. of the teachers could get or did get increments.

**12587. That they got increments?**—Then the mistake was mine. What I was told was that 80 per cent. of the teachers got "good," and I have all along been treating that mark as qualifying for increments. Hence the confusion. The truth is that about 80 per cent. of the teachers are eligible for increments on educational grounds.

**12588. Can you tell us what proportion of the teachers who are qualified otherwise than by merit marks get increments?**—I think I may be able to get you that information before you are done with me, as I see from the *Evening Herald* that I am to go on to the end of the week.

**12589. You furnished us with a memorandum\* concerning the re-organisation of the system of payment of salaries to the teaching staff of National schools in which the suggestion or the proposal is that the salaries should have annual increments. We know that annual increments were not finally decided upon, and it would be of assistance to us I am quite sure if you could furnish us with the further correspondence showing the reasons why the annual increment was abandoned and the trifling increment settled?—No doubt, you are referring to what is called the Resident Commissioner's memorandum of 1899. I know the document well. I stated in my direct evidence that annual increments were abandoned in consequence of the Government's failure to amend the fourth Schedule of the 1892 Act. The Bill to amend this Schedule was opposed by Mr. Lecky, and as it was brought in as a non-contentious measure it had to be dropped. We had thus to carry on the payment of the school grant rendered obligatory by the schedule. In my proposals in the aforesaid memorandum we had balked this grant with the salaries; but when we had to pay it separately at the end of the year we were obliged to deduct the requisite sum from the money set aside for annual increments. Hence, trifling increments had to be adopted as being cheaper. I am doubtful whether there was any correspondence with the Treasury on the subject, because it became patent to us at once when we had to take this quarter of a million out of the salaries that we could not pay annual increments. The money may not have come from the Treasury, but they were responsible all the same, as they indicated that the new system should not cost more than the old system. Thus we were obliged to cut our cost according to the debt. I have already stated that in 1903, when Mr. Asquith, as Chancellor of the Exchequer, promised us an additional grant to increase the salaries of Irish teachers by something between £25,000 and £100,000, we drew up a scheme for the spending of this, which provided for annual increments (I do not know whether this has been handled in), costing something like £70,000. Having rejected this scheme on the ground of expense, the Treasury had subsequently to sanction one costing £114,000 a year, which threw into the shade the celebrated story of the Shiplyn books.**

**12590. That £114,000 having been paid would therefore probably render possible the reconsideration of the**

question whether increments could be annual or not. I don't think so. If we had been asked to provide annual increments out of the £114,000 we could have done it; but now that it has been added to the grade salary, it seems to me that it could not be diverted to other purposes unless we got the consent of every teacher that his salary should be reduced by the amount of the Birrell Grant, and that that sum should be available for annual increments. Personally, I should welcome a change of this kind, as the mode adopted by the Government to spend the £114,000, for which we were not responsible, was nothing less than a public scandal, as we stated at the time in our annual report.

**12591. Will you kindly develop that?**—Yes. Our idea was that the £114,000, in addition to increasing the salaries, should provide bonuses for teachers of large schools. I may remark that the fundamental weakness of our scheme of salaries is that teachers in large and small schools are treated almost practically as identical fashions; that is roughly true. In England the principal of a large school like Rutland Street School, Dublin, where there are 1,000 children, might be paid £400 or £500 a year.

**12592. Mr. HARRISON.**—That is a very, very unusual number. I do not know of one of that size?—But a man with even a smaller school than that might get £400 or £500.

**12593. The CHAIRMAN.**—I think in the highest grade school in Manchester they are getting £600?—But this is an ordinary elementary school under the Irish system. It is possible for a man to be appointed principal of that school, and to get less than £100 a year if he is a young man. Well we provided in 1907 bonuses up to £50 or £40 a year for teachers of schools according to the size. If the school was over 70 the principal got so much additional; if it was over 50 he got so much more, up to a maximum of about £20 or £40. We considered that in that way we remedied one of the fundamental weaknesses in the present scheme.

**12594. For what numbers in a school would the £50 or £40 be given?**—I am not quite certain of the exact figure, but in Ireland, where the schools are very small, we generally treat a school of 80 as the maximum. Probably a man with a school of 85 would have got the £50. The weakness I speak of is a case of tremendous disinclination in our system. A teacher fresh from the Training College cannot get into one of these big schools unless he has given five years' service. Supposing a young man of 27 or 28 is appointed to a school where his predecessor may have had £120 a year, and finds he is only given £90 a year, he will be very dissatisfied because he may be doing much better work. We tried to get over that by means of these bonuses. They were accepted by Mr. Birrell, who, however, at the last moment, without ever consulting us, threw us over and adopted the views of the representatives of the Teachers' Organisation. The majority of the Organisation, having the divine light to crush the minority, were little interested in the big schools, which are comparatively few, and they persuaded Mr. Birrell to give up the bonuses, which were to cost £11,000, and to substitute therefore a £1 addition to the *new grant* in the Third Grade. Now we viewed the change you may see from a passage (which I do not mind saying I drafted myself) in the annual report for 1908, where we complained that, although under Mr. Staley's

\* Vide Appendix XXX.

38th June, 1918.]

Mr. W. J. M. STANLEY, M.A., LL.D., LL.B., examined.

[Continued.]

lector we were supposed to have absolute control of our funds, the Executive had stepped in, and had overridden the reasoned proposals of the Board, which would have removed a fatal blot in our system, only in favour of a small addition to the salaries of the most inferior teachers in the country. If the houses had been instituted we should have had prizes in the profession. As you know, people are attracted to a calling, not because the general salaries are comparatively high, but because there are openings for ambitious men. Take the case of the Bar, men adopt that profession, not on account of ordinary pickings and savings, but because however moderate their salaries are, they may hope to end up as Lord Chancellors. You understand by this what I meant by saying that the rejection of our proposals in 1908 was a public scandal?

12905. Mr. HENRY.—Is it not strange that in some cases you pay assistants higher than principals?—That is an accident of the system; that is one of the anomalies. The assistant can get a bonus under the 1892 Act which may raise him above the maximum of the third grade, and consequently he may have a higher salary than the principal who is not eligible for that bonus. That is perfectly true, but it is due, as you see, to the fact that Mr. Lecky blocked our Bill.

12906. And then if you promote the assistant to a large school you give him the same salary as principal that he had as assistant?—For a time. But that was to be removed by means of these bonuses. I consider it to be one of the fundamental weaknesses of the system that there are no real prizes. There is only a dead level of uniformity.

12907. The CHAIRMAN.—That is what Mr. Dale criticised in his report?—Yes.

12908. Sir HIRAM WILKINSON.—We discussed a question yesterday with regard to public notice of the rules, and you mentioned an objection to the placing of the rules on the table of the House of Commons; but there is another way of doing it, and that is, following the analogy of the Act of Parliament, to give notice to the public. The notice not being placed on the table of the House of Commons does not come within any rule as to blocking, and it would be possible to meet your views in this way, I think?—I do not think that the Board would object to disseminating with representatives of the teachers early in the year lines of policy, but we could not consent to formulate the rules, and then to submit them to any other body. We could not do that, but we are perfectly ready to consult anybody who is willing to approach us, and to listen to their criticisms, and to give full weight to them. But you must leave the final power to us.

12909. Under the Act of Parliament the final power is left to you?—But it must be really left to us. It is possible to leave final power to a person while you cut the ground from under his feet, so that he has nothing left to stand on.

12910. But there is no question of that being done by giving publicity to the rules?—If you give it publicity you enable every interested person to go round and get articles written in the newspapers about it, and that is what I meant by cutting the ground from under a man's feet. But we have not the least objection to hearing representatives of the teachers in the Board-room, and discussing new lines of policy with them. Anybody who knows this country would agree with me that if a body like the National Board say that it is going to do anything, it is perfectly certain that everybody else will say, "We won't let them do it." Hence, with regard to policy, it is our practice not to let our left hand know what our right hand is doing. That is the peculiarity of the situation.

12911. It is rather odd that it should be so, because you will agree with the general proposition that when a system which is found applicable to nearly every other body in the kingdom is not followed, a doubt is created as to the wisdom of its not being followed?—No doubt; but we are not responsible for the unwisdom. We did not create ourselves; we are a very unpopular body, but we know perfectly well that our unpopularity, like a lot of other things in this country, is a sham, and if anybody attempted to put his hand on us his

late would be that of the person who put his hand on the Ark of the Covenant. Mr. Birrell himself admitted this when he said in the House of Commons that he was giving Mr. Dillon good advice when he hoped that under the new Irish Government an Education Bill would be one of the very last Bills that he would attempt to put on the table of the House.

12912. It might be inexpedient that notice should be given to the public of the rules, but it is desirable that notice or intimation, or whatever it may be, should be given to as many bodies as would be affected by the operation of the rules. You have the teachers and you have the managers?—Well, we are delighted to have consultations with both of them; in fact in recent years managers have come to us on deputations, and we have listened to them, and the teachers have also come, and in many ways they have influenced our decisions. That is an excellent thing, and I only desire that it should be extended.

12913. Mr. CORRY.—But these consultations are private?—So far as the members keep them private. I objected strongly on the first day to the fact that some of my consultations with the teachers had not been kept private.

12914. Sir HIRAM WILKINSON.—From what you said at the beginning of your answer, might I understand that your proposal with regard to this would not be to draft a rule and send it to them?—No; it is to have an interview with them, say, in January every year, and to discuss with them certain aspects of education before the new edition of the rules is published. Take the Maternity Bill, for instance. Suppose the managers came to us, and we put before them the objections to married women in schools in certain situations, and the practice of other departments in their regard, I should probably find that there was an absolute unanimity between us on that question. Then suppose we had a deputation of the teachers, and put the same point of view before them. The result would be that we should find that they took an entirely opposite view, and that we were at open war on the question. That is my opinion as to what would happen on that particular question. Then, having given full weight to the attitude of both teachers and managers, the Board would proceed to decide what it would do. I fancy our decision would be that this was a very desirable rule, but that in order to remove the main objection of the teachers, we should try to get the money out of the Treasury, as, in fact, we did try.

12915. But that is the furthest that you think it would be right in the interests of education to go?—At present.

12916. With regard to appeals I did not quite understand what position it was proposed that the divisional inspectors should occupy?—But you remember that in my direct examination I said I did not much approve of these four divisional inspectors, that we asked for them simply because they were cheap. If the Committee is going to take up that question, I expect it to do something very much better. I do not expect you to recommend a thing simply on account of its cheapness. It was otherwise with us, because we did not think that we could get anything else. We proposed four, who were to be taken out of the present staff of senior inspectors, and were to have certain duties in addition to their present work. I said I did not think that that would be a satisfactory arrangement. Presumably the senior inspectors are fully occupied at present, and we could not, without injuring their efficiency, impose duties of wider supervision upon them. What I would much prefer would be to have two additional men called assistant chief inspectors, one in Belfast, we will say, and one in Cork. In this way a great deal of the work done at present by the present chief inspectors, with regard to the important districts of Cork and Belfast, would be assigned to the assistant chief inspectors. That would increase the efficiency of the chief inspectors and lighten their work. I do not care whether you would call them divisional inspectors or assistant chief inspectors, but my point is that they must be additional to the staff.

12917. They must be additional to the staff, and they must be, I take it from the fact that you name

18th June, 1912.]

Mr. W. J. M. SKEWER, M.A., Litt.D., LL.D., examined.

[Continued.]

them as assistant chief inspectors, under the control of the chief inspectors?—Yes, that is so.

12608. There is one point which I did not quite understand, and that is whether they were proposed with a view to appeals coming from teachers?—No; Mr. Dilworth said that, but on questions of policy the Secretary cannot be taken as a safe guide. On principle I am opposed to appeals, and consequently I do not look upon the adjudication of appeals as the main part of these gentlemen's work. Of course, there will be appeals. "Scandals must come." The value of the assistant chief inspectors would be as follows. First, they would carry out many of the investigations at present assigned to the chief inspectors. Secondly, they would be able to do a large amount of supervision of the work of inspectors, which the chief inspectors have not sufficient time for. In that way they would be very valuable, indeed. They would hold consultations and conferences. I need not particularise further. In a word, they would carry out all over the country more efficiently than is done at present the policy of the Board. The present senior inspectors are very important men, but they are wholly immersed in their own districts, and we should like to have more men to take a view of the country as a whole.

12609. When you mentioned just now the senior inspectors you did not mention anything about the time that the inspectors remain in their districts. It has been suggested that if the inspectors remained in one place they would know their district better, and they would know its requirements, and would know the teachers and managers better, and knowing the same men for a long time they would have more sympathy with them, and they would feel a greater responsibility for the state of education in their district. That is what we come to, of course, in the end?—Very well; suppose I begin then by keeping Mr. Wely in Tipperary for a long succession of years?

12610. It has been suggested, as you know, that you should remove him, and you insist on keeping him there?—I do so for very good reasons. I am sorry to have mentioned his name jealously, but I am not making any reflection on him, but all the same, this illustration brings out my point of view exactly. If the inspector is a person whom the teachers like very much, they want to keep him as long as they can, but if he is a person whom they dislike, they approve of the Office removing him. There, again, you are up against the personal equation. As a matter of fact, my principle is to leave a man in a district as long as I can. But inspectors often ask to be transferred; certain parts of Ireland are more pleasant to live in than others, and afford greater facilities for the education of one's children. It is reasonable to desire to be appointed to places where the schools are good and cheap. I have to consider the interests of the inspectors as well as those of the teachers, but my idea is to keep a man in a district as long as I can. I have already quoted a letter from Mr. Birrell: "The one cure for the complaints of teachers about inspectors is to change them as frequently as you can."

12611. Of course, you could answer Mr. Birrell with regard to that?—But I can answer you too.

12612. I quite admit your ability to do that?—But as a matter of fact I largely agree with you, and my policy is what you advocate, but I have to consider the convenience of the inspectors.

12613. You see in taking the evidence of other people than yourself, we have only to judge of what is the policy of the Board, which is the same as your policy, of course?—Well, in this matter it is mine. The Board has nothing whatsoever to say to the transfer of inspectors. That is my business.

12614. But the evidence that we have had has shown a very rapid transfer of inspectors?—In some places.

12615. And the inference that we should naturally draw from that would be that there was an intention to do that?—Quite the opposite.

12616. And one object stated in the evidence (though I cannot refer to the particular witness who said it), one object in moving them from time to time was that different ideas with regard to standard should be

applied in so many different places as by that means to secure as far as possible uniformity?—Ah, you are referring really to the year 1901. When we were first establishing the circuits the idea of the Board (I cannot say it was mine, because I had very little experience at the time, and did not think myself qualified to judge), was that before an increment was added to a man we should have the opinion of at least two inspectors or three. Hence it was proposed that in each district the inspector should take one set of schools one year, a different set in the second year, and still another in the third year. I explained the system on the first day of my direct evidence. In the way we were enabled to provide a remedy for an unwise judgment of a school, and perhaps to diminish the chance of the teachers' making complaints at their schools being unfounded. But, on the other hand, we were depriving the inspectors of the great advantage, which I quite appreciate, of knowing his schools. As you know, we soon abandoned the system of residence in a single center, and substituted the practice which you are advocating, of retaining the inspector in a district as long as we can. Since 1906 I have rarely removed an inspector from a district except for the reasons I have stated above. There are exceptions; for instance, we removed an inspector in 1906 from near Belfast because Mr. Hynes thought his marking was too soft. This gentleman had come from the district, where he had been a National teacher himself, and as he had a number of friends among them, he was placed in a position of great difficulty. If a man is in the West of Ireland, where there are few facilities for education, he always asks to be sent to either Cork or Dublin, or some other place where he can get education for his children. Thus there is constant pressure on me.

12617. No one would suggest for a moment that the rule should be made binding on you with regard to the time for which inspectors continued?—I leave them as long as I can. It does not do for a man to be sent in a district, that is to say, if he has been there seven or eight years I think it is desirable to remove him.

12618. I will give you an instance which we have had before us of the changes that have taken place to illustrate the point. Take 1904?—That was before we adopted our present system.

12619. There is nothing here to prevent us giving the names of the inspectors. There was Mr. Chambers, followed in 1906 by Mr. O'Connor and in 1907 by Mr. Fenou, in 1908 by Mr. Dewar, in 1909 by Mr. Kelly, in 1910 by Miss Barker, in 1911 by Mr. Hume, and in 1912 by Miss Kelly. I need not point out that you are not asked about each of these different inspectors, but they varied, and gave rise to considerable dissatisfaction. When there are instances of that sort you need not be surprised that the conclusion that was drawn was, that there had not been, at my risk, care taken to keep the inspector long in the place?—Without further inquiry it is impossible for me to explain this instance; but you may take it from me that my policy is to keep a man as long in a district as he is willing to remain.

12620. Can you enunciate it in such a way that the inspectors themselves would understand that?—That the inspectors should understand that I want to keep them as long as possible in a district?

12621. Yes?—But they know my desire; and yet I am constantly getting applications from them to be removed from a district, and I write back to say that I cannot do it, but that I will keep their applications in view.

12622. Could you add another circular to inspectors pointing out the desirability that they should assume all responsibility for the state of education in their districts, and that therefore it is desirable that they should feel that responsibility, and that when the question of their removal came up that consideration should necessarily have great weight with you?—I can tell the chief inspector or my private secretary to write a letter to that effect.

12623. Yes, I suggest that it would be desirable that the teachers themselves and everyone should know that was your policy?—Yes.

12634. So that the teacher should not acquire the feeling which has been created by such a frequent change of inspectors as is there illustrated, a feeling that it did not matter what they did, for there would be some new inspector next year, and what the present inspector said was really of no use?—I think in England the changes are not so frequent.

12635. Mr. HARRISON.—I stayed 28 years?—As I have said, the absence of facilities for education is a very serious problem in Ireland, especially for Protestants in the southern districts. There are many places where an inspector has no means of educating his children.

12636. I think no one knowing the conditions of Ireland would suggest that an inspector should be kept 28 years in one district. Well that is very different from changing every year, and the school receiving a different inspector every year, and I suggest to you whether it would not be possible for you to devise some means by which it would be understood that the inspectors in going to a certain district became responsible not merely for finding faults, but for the education of the district?—I think they have been told that so often that I could hardly venture to tell them so again.

12637. I not only wish them to learn that which they have been told, but that they should also understand that really they are responsible in a measure for the education of the district in the sense that they ought to endeavour, by their communication with the teachers, to make the teachers more expert, so that education would improve under them, and that a new inspector going in would be able to say, "My predecessor has evidently worked well, and kept the district up to a high mark"?—Constitutionally I have a great objection to lecturing inspectors on their duties, but I think they ought to know without being told the general policy of the Board. In fact it has been pointed out to me, and I think justifiably, that some of our clericals are rather offensive to the inspectors, in constantly harping on the note that they should behave as perfect gentlemen in the schools.

12638. The CHAIRMAN.—That was a very remarkable instance which has just been given of the change of inspectors?—I might say this sometimes happens in Belfast.

12639. Was there not something exceptional in that district that would lead to this very startling succession of inspectors?—I should have to inquire into that; it is quite exceptional.

12640. Sir HIRSH WILKINSON.—In the course of evidence given by managers, they told us that the changes of inspectors were more frequent than they considered good, with the proviso that when they got a bad inspector they were always glad to see the lot of him?—I may point out that the shuffling of inspectors is often caused by promotions, which are fairly frequent. For instance, there are vacancies almost every year among the senior inspectors, and these lead to district inspectors being promoted. The promoted inspectors are put in charge of circuits, and that may mean a complete change of inspectors. Every vacancy causes two promotions, each of which involves a shift of inspectors. These are unavoidable, but no inspector is changed simply for the love of change. It is always due to the promotion of somebody else or his own promotion or his own expressed desire to go to some other district.

12641. Of course, the changes will be more or less frequent, according to the weight given to the consideration that it is desirable that they should remain in the place?—I have that view very strongly. In fact, I rarely initiate a change myself; it is usually forced on me by the necessity of the case.

12642. That suggests the question of relations of the inspectors and the teachers. You have made it as clear as it is possible, I think, for circumspection to make it, that you desire that the relations between inspectors and teachers should be as cordial as possible?—Yes.

12643. And it is for the interests of education that the should be. Now, notwithstanding that, there have been unsatisfactory incidents. I need not refer to the particular inspector who used the phrase "Subalternus" when he referred to the teachers?—Is that in a published document?

12644. It is, and I do not wish to go further into it, but I only wish to show from you what I know would be your entire dissent from that view?—The relations between inspectors and teachers are not those of subordination; they are both labouring in the same field.

12645. The CHAIRMAN.—By a rule of the Board they are expressly forbidden to show anything like dictation?—Yes, they cannot give orders; they are only advisers.

12646. Sir HIRSH WILKINSON.—The relations between inspector and teachers would be greatly improved if the responsibility of the inspectors for the improvement of the teachers were removed. I think we have arrived at that conclusion?—As I said, the inspectors of the Intermediate Board are extremely popular; they are pleasant guests at luncheon on certain days of the year, and as their advice need never be followed, there is nothing to diminish their popularity except a double dose of original sin.

12647. The CHAIRMAN.—And not a shilling depends on them?—The nearer you approach to that condition of things in the case of the officials of the National Board the better it will be for their popularity, but the question is, how far can you do that consistently with maintaining the efficiency of the schools?

12648. You have pointed out to us that it is not quite the same as in England?—Well, in many ways I am very glad that we differ from England. I wish this Committee, without extending their inquiries too far, could ascertain what the feelings of the teachers in England are towards the local inspectors on whom their increments depend.

12649. We are told that they do not?—Yes, the increments depend on the inspectors of the local authority.

12650. Mr. HENRY.—My son is working in Kilburn, near London, and he tells me that he has no difficulty at all in getting his increments?—I am perfectly certain, Mr. Henry, if you were a teacher under the National Board you, too, would have no difficulty in getting your increments.

12651. Sir HIRSH WILKINSON.—What I read out yesterday about the relations of the London County Council referred to their own inspectors?—That is quite so. I quite agree.

12652. And from the memorandum furnished to us by Mr. Blair, it appears that the increments are refused in very, very few cases?—I know, but as I pointed out yesterday, the Committee of Education have the teacher under their thumb in other ways; there are other ways of rewarding and punishing a man besides awarding and refusing his increments.

12653. What are these other ways?—They can promote him while we can not; that is, they can promote him from one school to another.

12654. The CHAIRMAN.—Or they can send him down to a small school?—To a smaller school or smaller position.

12655. That is a great difference really. The local Board have a number of schools of varying salaries under their command?—In like manner we have got the model schools in Ireland under our control, and I do not know of a single teacher in the model schools not getting his increment. If a man is doing very good work in one part of the country we can send him elsewhere, and that prospect is probably a stronger stimulus to a man than an increment. At any rate, in the case of these schools, except for one teacher whom I need not mention, I do not know that for the last ten years there has been a case of real inefficiency. And yet these teachers do not now differ from the ordinary teachers; they are not a special class. So far as I know, they are all doing good work, and getting their increments as a matter of course. They are, however, specially selected, and are subject to the constant supervision. On the other hand, in the country places in Ireland a very large proportion of teachers are not subject to any supervision at all except that exercised by the inspectors at occasional visits; and they have nothing in their surroundings to keep them up to the mark, they are living in a country

18th June, 1913.]

Mr. W. J. M. STANKE, M.A., LL.D., examined.

[Continued.]

village in a district where it is always raining, and there are no consultations except those they would be better without. I remember saying to a farmer once, "What on earth has a man to console himself with in this village?" and he said, "Nothing but the bottle."

12640. Sir HERMAN WILKINSON.—I thought the managers were able to exercise a considerable influence?—That depends on the individual manager. Some do it admirably, and others do not do it so admirably.

12641. But the superiors of those managers exercise great influence over them?—Certainly. Take the case of a great friend of mine, Most Rev. Dr. Foley. He takes the greatest interest in the schools, and I may say that the consequence is that the average attendance in Carlow is 82 per cent., which is higher than in any other part of Ireland. Personal influence means everything, but there are parts of Ireland where the condition of the schools is such that little interest is taken in them. Like the rest of us managers get old. When I come across a school which looks very deserted, and the teacher extremely hattered, I very often find on inquiry that the manager is a very old man and bedridden. But when I see a good school and the teacher up to the mark, in many cases out of ten I find that he has a very good manager. Obvious duties are occasionally neglected; again, schools, you must remember, are sometimes situated in extremely out-of-the-way parts of the country, and far away from the manager, so that he cannot often visit them. Sometimes it is difficult to get to a school; one has to go across fields and climb stone walls, as I have done myself, and on a wet day that is very uncomfortable.

12642. I think you will agree that the relations between teachers and inspectors might be greatly improved if the inspectors' responsibility for increments were removed?—No doubt; I have said that many a time; even the National Board would suddenly become popular if increments were given automatically, and it was understood that as in the case of the Quarter-mast did not count.

12643. We do not contemplate any such state of affairs, but I suggest that the relations would be improved if notice were given of the annual visit, though, no doubt, there ought to be surprise visits also?—Well, Sir Herman, I will answer that at once by quoting Mr. Dale. We are always attacking Englishmen in Ireland, although when an Englishman speaks we say, "Let no dog bark." Mr. Dale has stated that the chief hindrance to progress in Ireland was insisting on an annual examination. The proposal you make with regard to it is to go even farther than we were doing in Mr. Dale's time. We held an annual inspection then, but we did not give notice of it; if you give notice of inspections, in my opinion the whole game is up. What book is ever inspected on a fixed day, on a day known to the manager of the book?

12644. I think that I might be able to tell you about places where the time of inspection is known beforehand?—There is nothing in the world that I am more strongly convinced of than that if you introduce inspection on a fixed day in Ireland you will ruin the system. First of all you will have to increase my staff.

12645. I do not suggest it on a fixed date?—Well, on notice.

12646. It is a question of the amount of notice?—If you want to ascertain the effect of notice, look at the difference between an Irishman on an ordinary day and when he is going to Mass on Sunday; he is a very different person, possibly even in character. If I go into a school and see everything extraordinarily neat; the floors brushed within the last three hours, and the children with new ribbons and clean bits, I say to the teacher, "How did you know I was about?" and she, or he (generally she, because the men-teachers have not yet got sufficient sense to take advantage of the knowledge), the woman teacher invariably says, "I heard it at Mass on Sunday." I never think of asking whether she has heard, but I merely ask her where she heard it.

12647. You have heard, of course, of the difficulty with regard to the managers being present at the inspection?—I know that it is an advantage to have them.

12648. It is quite true that if you gave three days' notice or two days' notice?—The game would be up.

12649. If you gave three days' notice you would have the floor brushed?—But if there was a danger of turning up, at any time, like a thief in the night, it would be brushed the whole year round. When travelling with Mr. Dale I found that the out-offices of schools in Cork were in a scandalous condition; but after that a notice was always put in the Cork papers, where they are very clever people, to say that the Resident Commissioner was in such a district, and I wrote afterwards that the out-offices out of order. I have never since seen the out-offices in the state they were in 1903.

12650. The CHAIRMAN.—Then you notice that your coming has had a very permanent effect?—I see the point of your question. A permanent improvement was the effect of the notice of my visits in the Cork papers; but if the Inspector gives three days' notice of his visits there will be a decline immediately afterwards.

12651. Sir HERMAN WILKINSON.—But the Inspector has to come at two other occasions in the year, and his report on the school would be made up on those two visits as well as the final visit. Now we have been hearing, even from Mr. Dalr, of the tremendous power of inspectors to weigh things and judge things, and that they can make allowance for anything that occurs?—If inspectors claim that, they are claiming what no other person would think of claiming. It is much more difficult to be a successful Inspector than a successful Prime Minister.

12652. It may be, and I fancy that the standard that you put forward for that is obtainable in the one case as easily as in the other, but there are things that an Inspector has got to examine at the annual inspection which he has not got to examine at the other inspections. He arrives at a time when by accident he is placed in an extreme difficulty as to judging the merits of the school, and we have heard in these cases that have come before us, that he complained that the teacher did not tell him so-and-so and so-and-so and so-and-so that were disadvantages at the moment that there was a fair score way off, and that the boys were away, and so on?—Teachers are generally communicative enough.

12653. Mr. Dale recommends in his report with regard to secondary schools (this is from Dale and Stevens' report) that there should be three inspections, that two of the inspections should be surprise visits, and that notice should be given of the annual inspection. We had Mr. Dale here, and he drew a distinction between primary and secondary schools?—They are entirely different.

12654. But the remarks at my table, I may say at once, were not extremely convincing as to the distinction between the two?—I hope I will make them more convincing.

12655. If so, we will be very glad to hear you on that point?—I went round with Mr. Dale and Mr. Stevens to the secondary schools in Ireland, and I know a great deal about them, and I happen to be on the Board which controls them. I doubt very much whether, in respect of buildings and material conditions, the secondary schools in Ireland are equalled in any part of Europe. Nobody could possibly suspect the Catholic schools in Ireland of being regardless of sanitation and cleanliness. They are spacious buildings, beautiful to look at. Take the convent schools, even under the National Board, they are models to everybody who sees them. Again, the Protestant secondary schools in Ireland, in the great majority of cases are respectable institutions, which are very well kept, and nobody could find fault with them on the ground of sanitation or cleanliness.

12656. The CHAIRMAN.—Except Dr. Mahaffy, our colleague, on a well-known occasion?—Yes, I know there are exceptions.

18th June, 1913.]

Mr. W. J. M. STARKIE, M.A., LL.D., LL.B., examined.

[Continued.]

12663. I am not sharing his view?—I myself visited some of which I had not a high opinion. I remember on one occasion going into a school which was kept behind a pawn-office by a man who said he had been a teacher in a secondary school in England, and I did not find it necessary to ask him why he left it, because he bore the reasons on his nose. That sort of school which occurs sporadically requires surprise inspection, but with regard to the ordinary secondary schools in Ireland you may give them as much notice as you like, and they won't get in a classroom on the morning of the inspection to clean the out-offices, or make any change at all, or the only change will be that they will have a very satisfactory luncheon prepared for the inspector. I speak from experience. But in the case of many primary schools in out-of-the-way parts of the country, if you give notice things will be cleaned and brushed up into some appearance of decency, while if one visits them by surprise, they will be found hardly fit for legs. As long as that state of things continues, visits on notice will only be throwing dust in the eyes of the public. If the schools were all like convent schools or a great majority of town schools, a notice would not do much harm, but as long as there are thousands of schools in the country subject to very little supervision, where the buildings are bad, and where the teachers are slack, to see them in holiday dress is a very poor advantage. There is a satisfaction in having the manager present. Possibly the managers, and some of the inspectors, too, miss the pleasant festivities they enjoyed under the old system. Irishmen are the most hospitable people in the world, and it is a pity, by means of regulations, to check this most admirable of Irish qualities. But I may point out that the teachers often viewed with suspicion the cordial relations between the manager and the inspector. I remember once reading an appeal from a teacher who reported that during the early hours of the inspection the manner of the inspector was everything that could be desired, but after lunching with the manager his face was a red as fire, and he roged through the school like a configuration through a virgin forest! There was a great deal of pleasantness in that annual visit with the manager present, but there were considerable drawbacks. At present we give them as much notice as we can safely do.

12664. For many years you have been giving prizes in your schools for temperance, and all that, and do you not think that there has been a considerable change in the ideas of hospitality on that point?—No; the last thing an Irishman loses is his regard for hospitality, and I should be very sorry that he should lose it.

12665. But on the particular subject of red noses?—But I do not see many of them.

12666. But you have not met the other point?—Many things that appear in rules are unfortunately not always carried out. There was always a rule to have three inspections in the year, even when the methods of inspection were far more laborious than at present. Even at present, Mr. Dale pointed out, and it was stated by the Manual Instruction Commission, that there was very little time for incidental visits, but the three visits are not always carried out.

12667. The state of affairs referred to by the Manual Instruction Commission and the state of affairs of the present time are quite distinct?—I do not think they are.

12668. Because they referred to the results examinations, and the annual inspection, which may be omitted altogether in some cases where the schools are good, won't take as long as under the results system?—I know that very well. Mr. Henderson raised this point the other day, and if I were perfectly certain that the managers would not, out of kindness to me, go straight to the teachers when they get notice that the inspection was going to be held, I should be very glad to let them know, but I am perfectly certain that the great majority of them would.

12669. I mention the presence of the manager first, as it is obvious that there are advantages in having him present, but there are other advantages of having the inspection known, not very long beforehand, but sufficiently long. You may call it an advantage to the

teacher and an advantage to the school, and at any rate I believe it is an advantage to the inspector himself, that so many of the pupils should be present as possible, and therefore that those visits should not take place on a day when, by accident or otherwise, the number of the pupils would be reduced abnormally?—If you get rid of the objectionable feature of making so much money dependent on the inspection, that grievance would be largely removed. If a very great deal did not depend on inspection, it would not matter so much if the school was not so full on that day as it would be under normal circumstances. Is not that so?

12670. But the inspectors would have more time now than under the results system, and there is a greater opportunity of their going to schools where the improvements that you mention have not been as great as in others. They would have the opportunity of going and finding whether the state of affairs is the same on other occasions as one would naturally expect to find on those of which two or three days' notice is given. I am pressing this because, as I know very well, you can infer from my going on with it that I feel very strongly upon this question, and I know that unless you are convinced no recommendation on the subject will be of any use?—I have been thinking over this for very many years, and I have never seen any reason yet (and the Board is at one with me on that, so far as I know) which would convince me that in the circumstances of Ireland it would be desirable to give notice. If the inspectors could make a choice between the schools, and give notice where they thought notice would do no harm, some good effects would result, but it is a dangerous thing to pick and choose.

12671. One would not suggest that that distinction should be made, because we all know that if schools were treated differently in respect of that, there would be an outcry?—Yes.

12672. The Chairman.—Are you trying to convince Dr. Starkie that that is the opinion of this Committee?

12673. Sir HENRY WHELAN.—No, I am trying to convince him that that is the right way, and I am afterwards going to try to convince you. I have not said a single word to lead Dr. Starkie to believe that I was expressing the opinion of the Committee—I always like to go on for in agreeing with anybody as I can, and I might say that as long as people go to Mass on Sunday even my visits are often tedious. Conversations after Mass are like sending round the ferry cross, but an inspector in general has only a horse and car, which must be ordered beforehand at the hotel, and the people there know perfectly well for whom and for what purpose they are wanted. Hence by some means or other (I do not know how) the news is spread about the country towns, inspectors have told me they are so well known that if they show their noses in, say, Tralee, every teacher within ten miles knows of it. Every school looks upon itself as a possible victim, so that in spite of all we can do to keep our movements quiet we are anticipated. I first stayed for a night in Glenties in 1903, and I went next morning over the mountains through the tunnel. In the first school I visited I saw at once that the teacher knew I was coming, and I said to him, "How did you know I was in the neighbourhood?" He replied, "My daughter, who is in the office at Eccles Hotel, sent word to me last night across the mountains that you were there."

12674. That does not apply to schools within ten miles of the inspector's residence?—The cases I speak of were not near the inspectors' private residences, but where they happened to be staying for the night.

12675. But there are schools within ten miles of an inspector's residence, and no notice is then possible, because if he starts out he gets to the school before it is possible for any fiery cross to get ahead of him. But you say you have been considering this for three years?—For more; thirteen years.

12676. And perhaps you might consider it again. Now we tried yesterday to come to some idea with regard to what should be done in the matter of giving or withholding increments. Might it be laid down that



18th June, 1915.]

Mr. W. J. M. STARKER, M.A., LL.D., examined.

[Continued]

no increment should be withheld unless on the report of two inspectors, and that their reports should be transmitted to you for consideration. The suggestion is made to meet the objection, in which anyone can see there is a great deal of force—namely, that increment should not be withheld unless you sent another man to re-inspect?—I have not a large enough staff for that. I could not do it.

12677. But you have two inspectors on the spot in all three places at the present time?—Three, but they have different districts.

12678. What suggested it was the rule with regard to the alteration of the merit mark, that the merit mark should not be raised or lowered without the concurrence of the senior inspector?—Yes, in that case you have two opinions.

12679. Well I suggest for consideration a rule something to this effect, that increment should be given unless the senior inspector and his junior recommend that it should not be given?—The senior inspector is asked at present whether he recommends that the increment should be withheld, and I do not see, considering that the senior inspector is the superior officer, how you can bring in his subordinate.

12680. It is the subordinate who will be examining the school?—Yes, and he gets the fiat of the senior inspector.

12681. What occurs to me is, that the junior inspector going round would give his fiat to his senior, showing all the teachers who ought to receive their increment and those to whom he considers increment ought not to be given, and then his senior would verify his opinion on the subject?—Does he not do that at present?—

12682. But the difference is this, that at the present time it is done with regard to the merit mark, but it is suggested that it should not depend on merit marks?—I thought there was going to be some sort of merit marks, that you were going to abolish the existing merit marks, but to introduce them under a different name, "satisfactory" and "unsatisfactory." After all "satisfactory" is a merit mark, is it not?

12683. I thought you seemed to adopt the rule with regard to that laid down in the Order in Council, that there was not to be a question of whether nice distinctions were to be made between "Excellent," "Very Good," "Good," and "Fair," but that the teacher should get his increment on continued good service?—That is what we call it, "Continued good service salary."

12684. Then my suggestion was with regard to the giving of this continued good service salary upon the reports of inspectors, it should be done in some such way as this?—In the case of a school examined by the senior inspector in his fifth of his district, it would be a question of whether he could get the assistance of anybody else. That is a difficulty, perhaps, but in the case of inspection by a junior inspector, I suggest that the junior inspector should report to his senior inspector too about "Fair" and "Good," but should say that in his opinion the increment should be given or should be stopped, because, in the words of the regulation, there has not been continued good service?—Yes; but what do you propose should be done? There is no difficulty in that.

12685. That the senior inspector should then satisfy himself by inspection?—But supposing he knows the teacher already, and is perfectly certain that the man does not deserve the increment, would it be necessary for him to go to inspect the school?

12686. It depends on how he has inspected it?—That, after all, is the present system.

12687. That raises a point of importance, that some teachers are in doubt as to what is meant by a senior inspector approving or disapproving?—The senior has to consult his own conscience. We do not like to make the rule too definite by saying that he must visit the school. If the senior inspector can satisfy his own conscience that he knows enough of a school to justify him in approving the mark of his subordinate,

he need not visit the school. It is conceivable that from the notes of the district inspector it would be obvious without a visit that the teacher was a bad lot. That is a conceivable case, but I find, in general, that where the senior inspector does not visit the school subsequently to the subordinate's report, it is because he had visited it already sufficiently recently to satisfy his conscience as to its condition.

12688. Well, if he had visited it sufficiently recently to satisfy his conscience one would scarcely object to his acting on the district inspector's opinion, but if it was merely a case of looking at the district inspector's notes, and then arriving at a conclusion, I do not think that that would satisfy the opinion of the teachers?—There is a good deal in what you say.

12689. We have in the case of our administration not only to do what is right, but to convince people that we are doing what is right?—That may be an impossibility.

12690. I know it is difficult always to carry conviction to some people's minds in that way?—I have already said that among the many difficulties in the way of making the rule absolute would be the fact that the schools are often in such out-of-the-way parts of the country, that the senior inspector might possibly lose two days in going to satisfy his mind as to the marking of the school, and (with a limited staff) one has to think of considerations of that kind.

12691. You were under the impression that 80 per cent. got 47-50 per cent. get "good."

12692. If they get "good," they ought to get their increment?—In the first of that grade a "very good" is required, and then a number of teachers who are at the top of the grade do not get increments, and other teachers are excluded by average attendance; but in general, excluding such obvious considerations, the teacher who gets "good" gets an increment. That is roughly true.

12693. I raised that point merely for the purpose of showing that the number of cases in which the senior inspector would be called upon to confirm the junior inspector would be a very small proportion of the whole cases?—I see no insuperable objection to making the rule absolute. Possibly "may" is not strong enough, and I am inclined to make it absolute; but there are difficulties which I have no doubt were considered when the rule was made. My impression is that I tried to make the rule absolute, so that when the mark is reduced or raised the school should be visited by the senior inspector; but I found that there were administrative difficulties.

12694. The suggestion, of course, is that the teachers should get their increments unless on the report of two inspectors, subject to such rules as you make with regard to visiting?—But supposing there are hardy men who never get an increment, would you insist that the senior inspector should waste time in personally inspecting them?

12695. We have not had those cases?—I have come across many such in my visits. I know several teachers who never in their lives got more than "fair."

12696. I suggest that that could be met very easily by providing for the case where a man had been reported twice?—I dare say it could be met quite easily. I will consider your proposal; I agree with you. It would be desirable to make the rule more absolute than at present.

12697. It seems to me that if such a rule were made it would be a practicable rule, that it would do justice and convince the teachers as far as people are capable of being convinced, that justice was being done to them?—Yes.

12698. And I was going to ask whether you see any objection to this, that if on the report of two inspectors you considered that increment should be withheld, that should go forward as a provisional Order just as if it were the case of a fine?—I do not think there is very much difficulty in the way of that. I do not think so.

12699. You can understand that when a teacher is told that it ends with you there is no use in his

18th June, 1913.]

Mr. W. J. M. STANLEY, M.A., LL.D., LL.D., *examined*.

[Continued.]

troubling any more?—He has a much better chance with me, I may tell you, than with the whole Board.

12700. That may be?—A man may do many things in his individual capacity which he would hesitate to propose when he is acting with a big body, especially if a judge is present. I do not think there is much administrative difficulty in the way of what you propose.

12701. Then the other point with regard to increment was the one that I raised yesterday with you, that was that the effect of the refusal of the increment should not extend beyond the year in which it is refused. That is the rule in the London County Council Schools, and provision is made for it in the Order in Council, and seeing what the result of allowing the effect to extend beyond the year would be, and the amount of money that would be involved in it, I would suggest that it is desirable that the effect should not extend beyond that period?—We consider a teacher's claim to increment every year. If he moves it one year the case comes up year by year until he gets it.

12702. Yes; but if he gets it then it is postponed?—He loses the year before, no doubt.

12703. But you will reconsider it, and that reconsideration might have some effect; but the ordinary effect of the losing of the increment is such as I read out yesterday. No doubt if it is reconsidered every year afterwards the effect of it might be minimised; but I suggest that the rule should be that it should not extend beyond the one year?—How would that be brought about—I do not quite understand?

12704. Suppose that a man is in the year 1913 entitled to increment and does not get it?—Yes.

12705. You postpone his case of triennial increment for four years instead of three years?—Yes.

12706. I suggest that at the end of the first year that increment should be suspended?—I see.

12707. And you might take the next increment date from the third year?—So that he would only lose 47 or 48.

12708. Yes, for one year?—Yes. Of course, getting the increment in regular order he could get it in 1903, 1906, and 1909. If he loses it in 1903 he gets it in 1904, and the second increment will be in 1907, and the next in 1910, and the next in 1913. Is not that what you mean?

12709. Yes?—Then if he loses his increment in 1903, and gets it in 1904, he should get his next in 1907?

12710. Yes?—As far as I am concerned, that would be a great improvement, but you are up at once against the ancient enemy.

12711. I think you have got the argument that in the whole Civil Service that is the rule?—But is there not a certain impudence in using arguments with the Treasury? I think I have somewhere observed that the Treasury recognise no argument but force.

12712. I used a potent argument on one occasion. I asked them to refer a matter to the Law Officers of the Crown, and they were so convinced that they were right, and the Law Officers wrong, that they declined to refer it to them; so that I perfectly appreciate the difficulty with the Treasury; but one must try to do the best?—But you must remember that you made some other excellent proposals involving application to the Treasury, indeed one of them might cost £30,000 or £35,000 a year.

12713. What is that?—Giving increments almost universally.

12714. You informed us that there would be no difficulty in that?—Not the slightest from my point of view. I am prepared to spend £90,000 or £100,000 more if you give it to me. I can do it with the greatest ease.

12715. But that is a matter in which you could not anticipate Treasury objections as much as you might with regard to some other things?—At any rate, I agree to the suggestion.

12716. There has been some misapprehension with regard to really what this increment means. I think

Mr. Lumsden is inclined to look upon it as a gratuity which a man would be very lucky, indeed, if he were to get at the end of three years, and to consider that the man must not in any way think himself entitled to it, and he refers to some Treasury view with regard to that; but as you have just mentioned, it is really a case of continued good service?—I do not agree with Mr. Lumsden if you repeat him correctly. There is no doubt that for teachers who have joined since 1890 the increment is quite a different thing from what it is in the case of teachers who were in the service before that. In the case of a large number of teachers who were in the service before 1890, the continued good service salary is a gratuity to which they had no claim, because, having obtained their full salaries under the old system, they found in 1890 that they were going to get in addition good service salary which they had never expected. Mr. Lumsden's feeling with regard to these might be justifiable; but in the case of those who joined since 1890 as a low figure, in the expectation that the small initial salary would be made up to them by subsequent good service salary, the state of affairs is entirely different. They have, in my opinion, a very much stronger claim to these additions than the other teachers have.

12717. But the nature of it is the same?—It is the same.

12718. And it was held out that it was one of the things that they might get?—I quite agree with you.

12719. In dealing with the question of moving the merit mark one difficulty came out, and that was the question of promotion; but you have recently, I believe, matured a scheme by which a teacher could get a special certificate?—Yes, a higher certificate.

12720. Could the question of promotion not be arranged with a view to these certificates?—No, I am afraid not. You do not get rid of the main difficulty, because the higher certificate itself implies the existence of the merit marks.

12721. But if the merit marks were abolished something equivalent for the purpose of the higher certificates alone could be devised?—After thinking over it for years, I do not see any possibility of getting away from this difficulty so long as there is a centralised system. I do not see how, when there are 18,000 teachers, and there is only a certain number of places in the highest grade for them, you are going to distribute these places without going minutely into the merits of the schools.

12722. Well, the merits of the schools and of the teachers?—Yes, minutely into the merits of the teachers.

12723. Of course, they may be different?—Yes. So long as there is a centralised system these higher places are prizes which we have to distribute. We cannot look after a man, as we do in the schools under our own management, by promoting him from one school to another.

12724. The difficulty is there. It is the same as if every man could get his salary automatically?—No; if we abolish the difference between the grades and allow men to go up on satisfactory reports or by seniority the difficulty would disappear, but we cannot do that.

12725. Not without the approval of the Treasury?—No. I do not know whether there is in England any system of promotion. English teachers begin with a fairly high salary, and have comparatively low increments, and reach their maximum fairly early, is not that so?

12726. Mr. HANMER.—Well, it is different in different places?—Men are not suddenly stopped in England, as here, and told "you must not go any further unless something else happens."

12727. I think so?—You think they are?

12728. Oh, yes; in most cases there is a letter indicating the class of schools; schools are classified A, B, C. One will have £250 as a maximum, another £280, another £300?—But on his way to £250 a man starting at £150 is not suddenly stopped at £180 and told "at present you cannot go further."

18th June, 1913.]

Mr. W. J. M. SPARKIE, M.A., LL.D., LL.D., examined.

[Continued.]

12730. No, he is stopped at 2280?—That is very different from our system.

12731. Mr. HENLY.—There are cases where a man entering the service can only rise to a certain stage, unless he shows at that stage he has certain additional qualifications?—Is that so in England?

12732. Yes?—But there is no competition?—He shows he has certain qualifications and he gets his increase of salary. If our system were like that in England, a man would show his qualifications and receive his promotion; but our promotions are prizes which are not numerous enough to go round among those eligible to receive them.

Mr. HANDESEN.—It is not possibly a very clear analogy.

12733. Mr. HENLY.—But still you had in Ireland a system in which that was accomplished without much difficulty, where, in addition to the school, you required an examination to be passed?—You mean (under the old system) classification.

12734. And I think you threw out a suggestion yourself which, perhaps, contained the germ of a working scheme, and that was that those places should be awarded to the different districts in proportion to the population?—But the Bishop, on the other hand, raised the objection that he did not wish to see his diocese turned into an arena of strife. If a certain number of these prizes were fixed for Cork, this would be known to the teachers, and this would occasion the most frightful jealousy.

12735. Mr. CORRY.—I do not think there would be any room for jealousy?—I made the suggestion, and I am not anxious to raise objections to my own suggestion.

12736. I do not think there would be any sympathy with their objections or their jealousy?—If the present system were abolished, you could divide the number of prizes according to the population of the various districts. As the area would be much smaller than at present, the competition between teachers claiming promotion would be easily made. But the process would be one of selection, and on the inspector would be thrown the onus of making it.

Mr. CORRY.—I think it is quite right that the onus should be thrown on the inspector.

The Bishop of Ross.—I think the smaller you make the area the more jealousy there will be and the more difficulty there will be.

Mr. CORRY.—I think it will be a fine example for the whole district, as in the case of the Castle and Bisha premiums.

12737. Mr. HENLY.—And then it would have another tendency that would be beneficial, a tendency to get some of the best teachers allocated to these areas?—I wonder whether that would be so. If you divide up these places in the higher grades equally according to the population, the result might be that many teachers, though comparatively inefficient, would be certain of their promotion as long as they were better than the other teachers in the district.

12738. Sir HERMAN WILKINSON.—Unless there is a proviso such as we have in many other cases, provided that in that district they showed themselves entitled to promotion?—But there is nothing easier than for an inspector to become used to bad teachers. For example, when I visit a bad district I find that for the first day I think the state of things is intolerable, but before the end of the week my palate has been attuned to what I meet, and in the second week it does not strike me as at all extraordinary.

12739. The CHAIRMAN.—Just as when one is examining bad classical papers one is thankful for the smallest mistakes?—Yes, we are all human, and we like to live in harmony with our surroundings. There is nothing more unhappy than for a man to live among people who do not sympathise with him, and who do not care twopence about him, even if they are very inferior people.

12740. Sir HERMAN WILKINSON.—With regard to circulars, you referred yesterday to the instructions contained in the circulars that 336 had turned to the

inspectors. I suggest that they might be codified in such?—We are doing that; we are printing them in the form of a book.

12741. That is good; and the next point that I would suggest would be, that unless there is some reason to the contrary, they should be communicated to the teachers?—One does not care to communicate book numbers. Many of these circulars are out of date.

12742. But if you are codifying them, not merely reprinting them?—Yes, I see. You mean to codify those that are actually in operation. I have no objection to communicate them to the teachers.

12743. And that might correct misapprehensions?—Yes.

12744. And instead of having a misapprehension from the first part, and then a correction of that misapprehension, there would be the advantage of having them codified?—Yes, I do not think that there is any objection to that.

12745. And you see no objection to communicating them to the teachers? With regard to the appointment of inspectors, that does not bear upon our instructions directly, but it does rather indirectly, and what I was going to suggest with regard to the particular form of appointment, is whether the inspectors could not be appointed according to the system which is marked by the Civil Service Commissioners "Limited Competition," and that if that system was adopted no nomination should be given to a man who, if he were appointed, would not be likely to be a success, and that having given a nomination to those men, their places at the examination, on subjects which they ought to know, should decide whether they should be appointed or not?—I am sorry to say I could not agree to that for these reasons, I have got nineteen colleagues, and I know from past experience that if it is merely a question of nomination, every one of them would nominate his own man. Under the old system they used to interview the candidates, and I myself was present in my first year at some of these interviews, and it was perfectly wonderful, when a man came in and his despatch was known to the members of the Board, what remarkable advantages he possessed in the opinion of those of his own despatch. For instance, if he was a Methodist, it was wonderful how high that man stood in the opinion of those who were interested in a Methodist appointment (I only mention Methodist by way of illustration). It was obvious to us from long experience that we could not possibly exclude candidates from the examination on the ground that they would not make satisfactory inspectors. I am informed that before 1906 everybody was admitted who presented himself. Of those that I myself saw interviewed some were, in my opinion, eminently unfit, but they were admitted to the examination because somebody at the Board took an interest in them. If you could find one man who would act automatically, and could not be attacked in Parliament or attacked in the country, and if he had triple bars round his chest, you might give him the power of selecting men on the ground that they would make good inspectors; but I do not know anybody on my Board whom that description would suit.

12746. I am speaking of a limited competition. Of course, if it were to be an open competition, our quite recognises the fact that that would not be suitable for your purpose?—We had once what was practically an open competition.

12747. The nomination would be a mere farce?—Yes, it was a farce. Some of the most unsatisfactory men we have got were admitted in that way, very often on distinguished answers in the examination. As I said before, to be a good inspector depends not so much on what a man knows as on his character and temperament.

12748. Sir HERMAN WILKINSON.—It is quite clear that for inspectors you cannot simply have an open competition?—No.

12749. What do you think of the present system?—I think it works very well. What we do at present is this. We advertise the post, and when we get in the

qualifications of the candidates we go through them. I pick out perhaps 25 of those that appear to be the best. Some of them I know, and others I do not know. I examine their University degrees and everything of that kind, and I give the preference to teachers, so far as I can get them. In fact, I never summon before the Board anybody who is not a teacher, but when I say I give preference to teachers, I mean teachers of primary schools. Some of the 25 candidates may be ladies. One reason for which I give preference to teachers of National Schools is that however high a candidate's attainments are in French and German, Latin and Greek, if he cannot examine in arithmetic, he is of no use; we often find in the case of University candidates that they do not know the ordinary subjects taught in elementary schools, however high their distinctions are in French and German. They are not able even to add up account books. Hence we think it advisable to hold a qualifying examination in such subjects as English, Irish, drawing, elementary science, English composition, and in the case of ladies, cookery and laundry work.

12749. And music?—And music. The selected candidates appear on a certain day, before a Committee of the Board, and we select the most suitable of them, after a conversation with them, and a scrutiny of their marks. That system has worked very well, and it has resulted in the appointment of a large number of National teachers.

12750. The CHAIRMAN.—Do you not find sometimes that a good National teacher won't accept the position?—A very highly paid National teacher won't, on account of the small initial salary, which is only £150. We asked our ancestral enemy for £250, but it has been refused. There is all the difference between £250 and £150; £150 is hardly a living wage, and some of our best National teachers have refused it.

12751. Sir HIRAM WILKINSON.—Reference has been made to the Board's Order of 1909\* in Mr. Leman's statement of evidence. He says the relations between the secretaries and chief inspectors were laid down in a Board's Order of 1902, and repeated in 1904†—Not the whole of them. Well, I can tell you, if you wish, what amendments were made in 1904.†

12752. Yes, that would be well, because we have been speaking of the Board's Order as applying at the present time?—The Board's Order of 1902 includes many things; for example, the relations between the Resident Commissioner and the Board; but if you want to limit it merely to the question of the relations between the secretaries and the chief inspectors, I will confine my answer to them.

12753. It is not intended by the statement "repeated in 1904" to convey that the whole of the Board's Order was repeated?—No. The facts are these. In the reconstitution of the Office, approved by the Board in 1900 and 1901, the chief inspectors were made the most highly paid officers under the Board. At that time the salaries of the Secretaries were reduced from £1,500 and £800 respectively, to £700, and the salaries of the chief inspectors were fixed at £800, so that they were paid £100 a year more than the secretaries; the object being, of course, to break the nexus between the inspection staff and the secretaries. The Commissioners, who were unwilling that the inspectors should be brought any longer into the office, wished to diminish the strong feeling that might be entertained by the inspectors of being deprived of positions of £800 and £1,000 a year. These benevolent intentions, I might say, failed lamentably. The inspectors were not in the least mollified. For some years the secretaries remained at the figure of £700. So far as the Board's Order of 1902 concerned them, it was intended to remedy some difficulties which had occurred between the secretaries and the chief inspectors. A chief inspector alleged that the secretaries were using over him the authority of which they had been deprived in 1900. Personally I may say that I had a very strong objection to the extension of the inspectors' totally from the post of secretary. I always thought it desirable that at least one of them should have a considerable knowledge of the schools. I was not personally responsible for the change in 1900 which excluded the inspectors.

In fact, in 1903 I actually proposed some of the inspectors to be secretaries in place of Mr. Hamilton, and I may say that one of them was Mr. Purser.

12754. The CHAIRMAN.—In 1903?—In 1905, when Mr. Hamilton retired, I actually proposed Mr. Purser to be secretary. Though rejecting my nomination at the time, the Board was moved by my arguments in favour of having one inspector among the secretaries, and subsequently passed a resolution that the salaries and positions of the secretaries should be restored to their original rank. That is the Order of 1904 which Mr. Leman mentioned. But the Treasury stepped in and negatived our proposal, although they allowed the secretary's salary to be raised to £800. That remained till about two years ago, when the salary of the senior secretary was raised to the old figure, £1,500. The relations between the secretary and the chief inspector have since 1904 been restored to what they were before 1900, so that, as representing the Commissioners, they have authority over the chief inspectors, who are not now considered as being of as high a rank as the secretaries.

12755. But the other relations, between the secretary and yourself were not touched?—Not at all.

12756. Mention was made this morning of a new scheme. You have issued a circular, have you, with regard to higher certificates for teachers?—I cannot say whether we have actually issued a circular or not, although I know we have drawn up a scheme which will appear in the Code.

12757. I believe you have, and perhaps we could be supplied with a copy?—I know of the issue of the circular, but I cannot say how far it has reached. It was issued to the Training Colleges; Professor Hanly may have seen it.

12758. Mr. HENRY.—I did not?—I do not know whether it went to every teacher; I know it went to the Training Colleges.

12759. Sir HIRAM WILKINSON.—We were speaking about the divisional inspectors. You made a proposal with regard to that?—Yes.

12760. It was not proposed that they should be appointed with regard to the investigation of appeals?—For the maintenance of uniformity and general supervision, but not specially for appeals. I have told you that in spite of my objection to appeals, I granted 36 appeals out of the 108 sent to us during the last five years. Most of them were sent to the chief inspectors.

12761. A point has come up with regard to the difference in the practice of the inspectors with reference to examination, and inspection as distinct from examination. Would it be possible to assist the inspectors towards uniformity in that matter, because teachers have complained, and we have had it from the managers that some teachers complained that some of the inspectors hold examinations, and that some of the inspectors held examinations, and we have had it from one of the inspectors himself that ten minutes would be sufficient for him to form an opinion on a school, but it is justice to him to say that he told us that he would have his impression confirmed?—It seems to be the general practice of our inspectors to examine a great deal. You may notice that in the petition from the Belfast teachers, or rather from some teachers in the Belfast circuit, there was considerable unanimity that the inspectors in Belfast were examining too much; Mr. Thompson was very strong on that.

12762. The CHAIRMAN.—They said they were examining them in the old style?—Yes; and in the petition from the Tipperary teachers they say the same thing. I also saw a circular sent round collecting evidence for the Inquiry, in which it was implied that the inspectors examined according to the old system; in fact, one of the queries was, "Does the inspector examine according to the old results system?" This over-examining was one of the reasons why we issued the circular of 1911. I cannot say how far the change is true, but the inspectors present, like Mr. Dewar, denied it. Be that as it may, we said in our circular that the inspectors should take broader views; we did not wish them to confine themselves to examination, which in its

\* Vide Appendix XI. (3).

† Vide Appendix XXXIV.

† Vide Appendix XI. (4).

proper place is right enough, but the danger is that it excludes consideration of things which we consider quite as important.

12765. One can see very well that if the practice is different it will give rise to complaint?—On the other hand, is there not a great danger in making the methods of the inspectors mechanical? I do not like to dictate to inspectors, who are supposed to know their business, how they are to judge a school. One likes to leave as much latitude as possible to a man's own methods, whether he is an inspector or a teacher.

12764. An endeavour, naturally, has been made to secure uniformity of standard?—Yes; I hate the word uniformity myself I may tell you. Life is extremely dull if it is uniform.

12763. I merely put the suggestion now, whether by conferences among the inspectors themselves they could not arrive at something like uniformity?—I think a conference would be an excellent thing. I tried three conferences, you may remember, in the early years. Some more might have been tried with advantage, only that the inspectors who come up to Dublin are not particularly anxious to cut short their visits. It seems to be impossible for them to come to any conclusion on any subject as less than a fortnight; and meanwhile their circuits are left derelict.

12766. Sir HENRY WILKINSON.—And I might assist them in arriving at some decision with regard to the merit marks if they took example from England. It was said on one occasion that in England they did not appear to have been any more successful than the inspectors here in arriving at uniformity?—They never admit their faults in England with the extraordinary candour which we employ over here.

12767. A fair school was described as a school in the first class in which the children would be able to read a page of natural history about an elephant, a cotton tree, or a crocodile, with tolerable fluency and with scarcely a mistake, and would answer collateral questions introduced not well, but not preposterously ill?—Is that out of a programme?

12768. That is from the report of the Board of Education for the year 1886?—Is that from the report on a lunatic asylum?

12769. No; it is the report of the Board, in which they give the history of education, and this is assigned to an inspector in the year 1886. He says the pupils would have a general knowledge of the distribution of land and water on the surface of the globe?—What class of pupils?

12770. The first class. A fair school is described, and they say the children should work a sum in compound addition, two-thirds of them, without mistake, and they would write out a short account of any object named to them which they had seen or read about, as an animal, a tree, a flower, intelligently and not without thought and observation, but with trifling errors of grammar and spelling?—They do not appear to have troubled much about grammar and spelling.

12771. Yes, and in such a school the remaining four or five classes would show attainments proportionately graduated from that which he had represented as usually belonging to the first. It is only right that the efforts of the English inspectors should be compared with the efforts of our own. "With a view to securing uniformity of inspection an agreement should be arrived at as to the meaning of 'very good,' 'good,' 'fair,' 'middling,' and 'bad,' and also as to 'highly efficient'?"—Yes; that is from the 1908 Conference.

12772. There was one thing with regard to circulars which was mentioned by Mr. Dilworth. We were asking him with regard to the issue of circulars, and he said that circulars were issued without reference to the Commissioners?—Certainly, some of them.

12773. Are they brought before the Commissioners again?—Not necessarily. It depends on the class of circular. It is like any other sort of business. If it is important enough it is brought before the Commissioners, if not, not. For instance, I glanced at the evidence in the first volume, and I think there was some question about a circular explaining another circular, and Mr. Dilworth was asked if it was brought before the Board, and he said not. That was only an

explanatory circular. When it is a question of policy a circular comes before the Board according to the regulations, but there was no question of policy in that circular.

12774. There is one thing with respect to the Commissioners which seems an anomaly, and that is the sending of appeals to individual Commissioners?—Yes.

12775. It seems that the idea would be that if an individual Commissioner could be appealed to the collective Commissioners might be appealed to?—It is quite improper to appeal to an individual Commissioner, but I cannot stop it.

12776. That is your view?—Teachers have been forbidden by the Board to send appeals to individual Commissioners; but if individual Commissioners consent to receive them, who is going to stop them? They make regulations themselves, and at once proceed to break them. There is a regulation of the Commissioners which they have reiterated at least ten times, and every time I bring it before them they say, "We will pass it again," and that is that an individual Commissioner must be sanctioned. I am rather chary of repeating the Board's Orders, but that has been sent out to all the members of the Board at least ten times since 1875.

The CHAIRMAN.—Mr. Ward said he got 3,050 letters in a year.

12777. Mr. COFFEY.—Those would not be the canvassing Dr. Starke refers to?—The Board has tried to put down everything of that kind.

12778. Those would be complaints?—I spoke mainly of canvassing. It is most remarkable how collectively the Board has forbidden canvassing while individually they encourage it as hard as they can. It is natural that Mr. Ward should get a very large number of letters; but I think since his attempt to do me justice in the recent Cleland case they have dropped off to about half a dozen.

12779. The CHAIRMAN.—He told us that he worked harder now than when he was a schoolmaster?—That is very probable, but if things were conducted properly all these matters would be sent to the secretaries, in accordance with the rule that all communications to the Commissioners must be addressed to the secretaries. But how are you going to stop the present practice when members of the Board are not unwilling to receive communications? Of course, if permitted, teachers will persist in trying to get Commissioners to use their influence with the Board or myself. Mr. Ward gets a very large number of these communications, and so did the Archbishop of Dublin when he was on the Board. He was very much bothered with them; his practice was to select some and send them, just as Mr. Ward does, to me. In some ways this practice is not objectionable, because it shows that there is no such thing as hogger-magger in the department. There is no such thing as secrecy; irrespectively of honor, it would be impossible for any subordinate officer to suppress anything, for he would be found out.

12780. One Commissioner told us just what you are talking of, that when he got a letter of complaint he went to the proper official and asked for an explanation?—Yes, but he ought to go to the secretary; he ought not to go to a subordinate official on a business of that nature.

12781. I think it was to the secretary he said he went?—I have a great objection to the chief inspectors being approached, because, as inspectors, they have to deal judicially with the cases themselves, and it is a very objectionable thing for individual members of the Board to go to them on a particular case which they may have to adjudicate on.

12782. But you do not object to the Commissioners receiving letters from teachers and then going to the secretaries?—I think in a properly organised system it would not be right, but personally I do not object to it, because it creates confidence in the administration. In addition to official information filtered through the secretaries, people generally like to have some channels of independent information. Thus I think there are some advantages in methods which have, on occasions, been known to degenerate into jobbery and intrigue.

Although injurious to consistent administration, they are advantageous in the confidence which they inspire, at any rate, in the members of the Board.

12783. Sir HENRY WILKINSON.—I think if I recollect rightly that that was put forward as one of the advantages which the teachers had in the matter of access to the Board?—They certainly have access in that way.

12784. There was one point that struck me on reading the memorandum sent in by the Belfast teachers with which you furnished us, and it was this, that the complaints were received entirely as complaints against the inspectors, and that the Board, having considered that the inspectors were not to blame, no further action was necessary. Now, it suggested itself to me that there was another aspect of the question, that was that it was not only a complaint against the inspectors, but a claim for redress, and that there were 111 schools mentioned, and that if there was anything wrong, none of those 111 schools got any redress. Well, you say the Board came to the conclusion, on full consideration, and after receiving the report of the chief inspector, that there was nothing wrong?—I must qualify that, as I think I did qualify it. Let me put it in this way, that so far as the information went that reached them through the usual channels, that is through the chief inspectors who were appointed by them to investigate the grievances of the teachers, they were not substantial. The chief inspectors, as you know from their report, were satisfied that there was nothing wrong, but as standing above ordinary channels of information they did not satisfy me. Neither the Board nor I was pleased with the report of the chief inspectors. I myself stigmatised it in very strong language, and, as you know, it led to my going down in person to Tipperary. However, looking at the grievances of the Belfast teachers from the legal point of view the case was proved against them. The chief inspectors, as chief advisers of the Board, white-washed the inspectors. But, again, there is the question as to redress. It was impossible, as we pointed out, to restore the condition of things five years previously; we could not say what the condition of things was in 1908; we could not even say what it was in the previous year. That was our difficulty, and that I say is one of the strongest arguments in favour of getting rid of a system which leads to such embarrassments.

12785. Quite so, and if that system were got rid of that question would not arise?—Unless the new system which you introduce is equally objectionable.

12786. Mr. COWEN.—Dr. Stanké, there are five or six points that stand out prominently to my mind in your evidence. One of them is a very gratifying point to me, perhaps more than one, but you will say one at present, and that is that I think you recognise that the time has come when the system of merit marking may with advantage be discarded?—Yes, I have often said so, and I may say that I thought so from the beginning. I told Mr. Dale it was impossible more than ten years ago.

12787. And that for the better working of the system, and better relations which ought to prevail between inspectors and teachers, it is desirable to have no more of these merit marks?—Well, to get rid of them as far as possible.

12788. But do you not think it is possible to get rid of them altogether?—I should like to hear from you some suggestions as to how we could do that, and then I could express my opinion better.

12789. Well, I do not think it is for me to express an opinion; it is for the Board, once you say it is desirable to get rid of the merit marks, to determine in what way it should be done?—I thought you wanted an answer now; if you do, you must tell me what is in your mind.

12790. If you desire to know what is in the back of my head I think I may tell you at once that I think it is quite within the power of your inspectors, of whom I have a very high opinion as a rule, to make their reports to your Board without beholding the school either as satisfactory or unsatisfactory, reports which would enable your experienced official in the office to determine whether those reports were

satisfactory or not, for I think you will always have trouble as long as you put a label on a school?—But the managers like it.

12791. But it is not a question of what the managers like, it is a question of what is good for education?—I do not say it is impossible, but people who have to deal with a very large number of cases have a busy tendency to depend on labels.

12792. I know?—I can give you an instance now of what I mean with regard to examinations. A Fellow of Trinity College who was our examiner in history used to set a very large number of questions, but he put a note at the top of the paper that marks were taken off for all conjectures. The questions were of a cut and dried description, so that the answer admitted only of being right or wrong. Those he got through his papers in 25 per cent. of the time of the other people, because there were no guesses, and the answers were mostly "yes" or "no." In like manner there is a tendency on the part of officials to adopt mechanical short-cuts. I agree that it would be better for education if the inspector could send in general reports, and it would be possible for us in the office, I daresay, to classify schools according to them. I think, however, it would be better to have a recommendation from the inspector as to whether the teacher deserved his promotion and increments or not.

12793. I do not mind that so long as you do not label the school?—I am perfectly willing to get rid of the label if you allow me the recommendation from the inspector.

12794. I do not see any great objection to it, for you must have machinery?—Very well.

12795. Certainly, I think that is quite right; I think you must trust your local officials?—After all, the strength of a chain is the strength of its weakest link, and the most important though not the strongest, link is the inspector. Everything depends on the inspector's opinion. You may discuss the question as long as you like, but in the end it is the inspector's opinion which governs everything.

12796. It has been suggested, and it has been talked of here, and I do not think you are very averse to it (though I may say myself that I do not go quite so far as that), that increments should be automatic?—I did not say that; I said as far as possible automatic, I do not think there is any difference between us in that connection.

12797. Not?—We must exclude inefficient schools; in fact increments must be given whenever they are recommended by the inspector.

12798. I pass by that and come to another point. I was glad to hear you express an opinion so strongly on the circular of 1884 with regard to the liberty of teachers?—I only saw it once in my life, in some school or other, and I read it in the Appendix to your report. It has relevance, of course, to a former state of things. No doubt Sir Patrick Keenan thought it very desirable; but the world has advanced—I do not say advanced, but it has advanced very much since 1884, and what was desirable in the way of checking the expression of opinion in 1884 is not possible nowadays. At any rate, it is not in force.

12799. I may take it that that circular is no longer in operation?—I do not know that it ever was. I think it was a counsel of perfection.

12800. You do not know that it ever was, but might be definitely from you, because it is a very important point, and, in fact, the qualifying word "especially" or "particularly" was introduced into our terms of reference, to report as to whether the liberty of the teachers had been unduly restricted?—Certainly, that circular is not in operation.

12801. Am I to take it that it is what we call a dead letter?—That circular is a dead letter.

12802. Now will you tell the Committee what are your primary functions as Resident Commissioner?—Your primary functions as Resident Commissioner?—I was never told my functions; I was appointed as a member of the Board, and by a special letter Resident Commissioner. The Board laid down what my authority is in the regulations of 1902.

18th June, 1918.]

Mr. W. J. M. STARRIS, M.A., Litt.D., LL.D., examined.

[Continued.]

12808. I will come to that later; but apart from those regulations of 1902, antecedent to that, will you tell me kindly what are your functions?—Up to that, I was a committee of the Board; I was the Finance Committee and the Office Committee, an executive Committee, as I said before, with a quorum of one, which reported to the Board, and had certain delegated authority.

12809. You told us, I think, and I will ask you some questions on it later, about that committee; but as you talk of delegation at the present time, I understood that there was no new delegation in 1902?—No, I think not; I do not think so. Certainly not with regard to details. It is questionable whether I had previously the power to retire officials over 60 years of age. I remember some of the lawyers discussing the point, whether, as the Executive Committee of the Board, I had not that power. In the end they said: "We will give it to you if you have not got it already." As that is subject to an appeal to the Board, I have not got absolute power to retire anybody at any time. As my action would have to be debated on appeal at the Board, it is fairly accurate to say that those regulations did not, in effect, extend my power.

12810. You have 22 senior inspectors, and you have two chief inspectors, and how many district inspectors?—We originally provided for 44 junior inspectors under the senior inspectors, but they have been added to since. I think six or seven have been added, and I think we have 72 now altogether, or it may be 74. It is something like that, between 72 and 76.

12811. You told us in your direct evidence, that a senior inspector might visit any school within his circuit?—Yes.

12812. And that if he found the marking of one of his sectional inspectors too high or too low, he could report it to the Board?—No; I did not say that. That would be very unusual.

12813. That it would not be his duty to do that, but that there would be nothing wrong in doing it?—I remember someone asking me whether that would be reported to the Board, and I said "Certainly not." The senior inspector's business is to make the marking uniform in his circuit. If he reported divergences to the Board, our duty would be to send the report back to him for inquiries. Now, what would be the good of doing that? As the senior inspector is responsible for the marking, there is no point in his sending a report on the subject to the Board in order that it might be referred back to him again.

12814. But if he found that one of his sectional inspectors had given such a mark notwithstanding some expression of opinion from him?—You mean, if he refused to adopt it?

12815. If he refused to adopt the standard of the senior inspector?—Then he should report to the Board. Certainly, he would have to do it. That would be a case of, I will not say exactly of insubordination, but of serious want of harmony. It is already provided that if the district inspector and the senior differ about marks, the question is referred to the chief inspector.

12816. Do you regard all your inspectors as capable and competent judges of the tone and proficiency of a school?—I would not say that of any class of men. I would not say that the whole of my inspectors are competent judges of geography.

12817. Of geography?—Of anything.

12818. Are they competent to judge a school?—When I mean to say is that I should hesitate to say of any body of men that as a whole class they were either competent or incompetent. There are so many grades of competency and incompetency that there is no inspector in the service whom I consider entirely ideal, and I need not say that there is no inspector whom I consider entirely incompetent, because in that case I should try to get rid of him. For instance, I see nothing in "tone" that any inspector in my service is not competent to judge.

12819. I do not think there is any difficulty about an individual forming a judgment on tone, but I think there is an immense difficulty in 76 different men doing it?—Forming a correct judgment.

12820. Yes?—But you must remember that I said I did not think that absolute uniformity was even desirable, considering what one has to pay for it.

12821. But apart from the competency of inspectors, would you class them all as efficient officers?—All the inspectors?

12822. Yes?—All efficient?

12823. Yes?—Moderately. As I say, they differ.

12824. The CHAIRMAN.—If they were inefficient you would get rid of them?—Yes, sufficiently inefficient. I should try to, but I do not say that I should succeed, because I did not succeed in the past.

12825. Mr. COFFEY.—How many of them would you class as inefficient?—No, thank you, Mr. Coffey.

12826. How many have through their inefficiency lost their increments?—That is a fact I can answer. A man loses his increment for various things. It may be for inefficiency; it may be for inattention; it may be for taking too much strong drink. There might be various reasons. As a matter of fact, amongst the present inspectors, I doubt very much whether more than one has lost his increments.

12827. The CHAIRMAN.—It is not common?—Very uncommon. That quite agrees with Sir Hiram's experience of the Civil Service; very few of them lose their increments.

12828. Mr. COFFEY.—Although you cannot say that all your inspectors are competent or all your inspectors are efficient, there is only one that has lost his increment?—Yes, certainly. As Hamlet says somewhere or other, if we all got our deserts, who would escape a whipping?

12829. But the fact remains that only one of the present inspectors has lost his increment?—There may possibly be another. I think some men lost his increments for not answering letters for a long time. He lost it for a time, as it was deferred. At any rate, it is very rare. But when I am talking of competency, I am talking of very high competency. Increments are given in the Civil Service to a man who just jogs along.

12830. Yes, but my difficulty at once comes up, that you won't say your inspectors are competent and you won't say they are all efficient, and still we have the point that men who are inefficient have got increments?—Yes, I certainly admit that men who are not efficient in that sense do get their increments. In the Civil Service it is the practice to give an increment unless there is some very strong reason against it.

12831. There is a very general idea among the teachers, and I am afraid it is among a considerable number of your inspectors, that so far as your influence goes as Resident Commissioner, it has been directed towards the promotion of junior inspectors to the rank of senior inspectors of men whom you regard as the most severe markers?—I never heard that charge before the present moment.

12832. I do not suggest that the idea is well grounded; but I think it is well to give you an opportunity of removing it if you can?—I am much obliged. Mr. McNeill was one of the persons who were promoted on my recommendation, and is he called a very hard marker?

12833. Well, I won't go into the question of individuals?—Mr. O'Connor is another.

12834. I will just say at the moment that I think, perhaps, that of all your staff you could not get any two men more suitable for the office they hold than Mr. McNeill and Mr. O'Connor?—I am responsible for the promotion of both of them to the chief inspectorship. Well, unfortunately, as we all know, in this country, millions of lies are flying about seeking whom they may devour. One of the weaknesses of my position is that I have no buffer between myself and the country. I am responsible for the administration of the National Board, and I have not got any defender, I occupy a position such as no other member of the Civil Service in the British Empire occupies. Whatever is done is attributed to me, if it is bad; if it is good somebody else gets credit for it. As I say, I have no defenders; everybody who wants to have a knock at the National system says: "Let us

go for the Resident Commissioner." If anybody is promoted for efficiency over the heads of others, it is said that that is done because he marked the schools severely. For instance, Mr. Marshall said Mr. Welply was promoted because he was very severe. In fact, that he was carrying out a policy of severity in his inspection in order to become chief inspector. He was kind enough to say that the Resident Commissioner made magnificent speeches, while he gave private instructions to his inspectors not to carry out the views which he expressed in public. You remember that.

12830. I cannot say that I do?—Now, how can I in my position deal with people who are capable of believing with regard to any gentleman that he acts on these principles? That is my answer. Let me be judged by my public utterances. Quote a single passage from any address I have ever given, or from my evidence here, which points to the fact that I encourage undue severity. Let me be judged by my public utterances.

12831. Do not take me as wanting to say anything of the kind. I am only asking a question arising from what is said?—I know what is said. Ask those people for an instance, and they will say, "He promoted Mr. Welply." I do not say I was the cause of his promotion, because promotion is done by the Board, but I have had a hand in promoting a number of gentlemen in the last 15 years, and I cannot say that I ever heard of any of them as being remarkable for under-marking or over-marking before being promoted; all the senior inspectors were promoted in my presence, I won't say on my recommendation, and some of them are hard, or are said to be hard, and others are said to be easy. Consequently, as I have had to do with the promotion of all, it cannot be said that I promoted men because they were hard markers.

12832. Is it the fact that during your tenure of office as Resident Commissioner, 28 of the inspectors against whom no irregularity whatever has been charged, have been passed over for promotion?—I do not know what the numbers are; but all I know is that we promote at present, and the whole Board is with me on that, largely on merit. Whenever there is a vacancy six or eight inspectors are brought up before the Board, and I have got no more voice, as far as voting is concerned, in the promotion of three gentlemen than any other member of the Board.

12833. The CHAIRMAN.—On whose judgment of the merit do you rest?—The records in the office.

12834. But the chief inspectors have a voice in the promotion?—Not so far as the Board is concerned. The chief inspectors usually make recommendations to me.

12835. That is what I mean?—That is what is done.

12836. Mr. HENLEY.—What records do you refer to?—Every inspector has got a file, where the recording agent puts down everything he does.

12837. Mr. CORREY.—Does it not rest with you more than that?—Not necessarily.

12838. Do you not call up the six or eight men that you think ought to be promoted?—No, that is not the correct way of putting it. I call up many men who, in my opinion, ought not to be promoted. I call up every man whom any Commissioner asks me to call up. They often write beforehand and say, "I wish So-and-So to be summoned." Every member of the Board has a right of nominating a man to come up, and it is quite incorrect to say that I go by my own judgment. I do not.

12839. The CHAIRMAN.—Has each member of the Board the right of naming one candidate?—He may nominate as many as he likes. The same thing is done on the Intermediate Board.

12840. Mr. CORREY.—On your coming into office, you found the vicious system of payment by results in operation?—Yes.

12841. That system, with all its viciousness, was lauded for 90 years by the most experienced of the inspectors of the National Board?—I never knew any system of education since the world began that was

not for a time considered to be "the greatest birth of time."

12842. But it was lauded by your inspectors?—I do not know. I have not read the reports, but I have seen it stated here that the system suited the time, and it did a lot of good in its way.

12843. Your inspectors are precluded (and as an official myself, I should say rightly precluded) from expressing any opinion adverse to the policy of the Board?—Yes, directly adverse; but they are not prevented from expressing an opinion on the success or ill success of a certain subject within the policy of the Board. Indirectly, they might attack the Board in that way. They are not precluded from that.

12844. We had it from Mr. Downing in his evidence that in the instructions for the preparation of a report for the Parliamentary Blue-book, he was to confine his expression of judgment to the success of the system?—That is untrue.

12845. Is it true?—Not at all. He got what every inspector gets, a certain agenda paper. That is sent out every year, consisting, for instance, of the following heads:—The managerial system, arithmetic, reading, and so on.

12846. This letter issued by Mr. Lamont, the Secretary, to Mr. Downing, makes it quite clear that he was to say nothing of the shortcomings of the system?—I should like to see the letter. (Document handed to witness.)

Mr. CORREY.—He was to confine himself to an expression of his judgment on the success of the system.

12847. The CHAIRMAN.—What is the date of this?—Twelve years ago.

12848. 1901?—The letter, as far as I can understand it, means nothing more than that the remarks should be in harmony with the educational policy of the Commissioners. This was the first year of the new system.

12849. Mr. CORREY.—But you note there that he was to confine his expression to the success of the system?—The words are: "You are to avoid the expression of any opinion adverse to the policy of the Board, as indicated by their rules and regulations, and by the revised programme of instruction, and confine yourself, in forming a judgment, so far as the reports of the inspectors and other available sources enable you, to the success which has attended its policy, so far"—It does not seem to me to be that he is directed to confine himself to the success of the system. What he is to do is this. He is to say, as far as he can gather from the sources of information at his disposal, the reports of the inspectors, how the new policy has succeeded so far, and the prospective effect of the action of the Commissioners. You must take the word "confine" with the rest of the clause to the end. No doubt he is to confine himself to telling how far the system has succeeded, but under the head of "prospective effect," he would be able to bring in his own opinions as to the possible failure of the system.

12850. I do not think an inspector, if he is a wise inspector will do that?—I cannot deal with you there.

12851. In the face of that, would they be likely to say anything of the failure?—In the first year of the system it would be rather a ridiculous thing to talk of its failure; in 1901 the system was hardly started, and naturally, being only human, we should have been rather annoyed if, after having passed this big system, we were told by the inspectors that it was a gigantic failure.

12852. Would it not be as ridiculous to refer to it as a gigantic success?—Who said that?

12853. We will come to it a little later. There was another point in Mr. Downing's evidence which you had before you, which you intentionally or unintentionally avoided?—I have not answered Mr. Downing. I am handing in a reply, so far as he deserves one, to be put in the Appendix.

12854. Is it true, as he states, that on the 18th of November, 1902, you wrote him this letter:—"Dear Mr. Downing—I have been reading a paragraph in your annual report concerning the managers, and I am afraid



18th June, 1915.]

Mr. W. J. M. STANLEY, M.A., LL.D., examined.

[Continued.]

I cannot agree with your view that it would be unaccountably agreed that they deserved well of their country. I have read all the reports of 1903 lately, and I have noted many passages in which the inspectors criticised the managers adversely. I send you proofs of the appendix to my address, in which I quote passages which, so far as your part of Ireland is concerned, ought to be included among your extracts?"—Certainly.

12864. Do you not think that that was a most extraordinary position for you to take up. Mr. Downing having praised the discharge of their duty by the managers, you want him to support you in your attack on the managers?—Not at all; I did not want him to support me in my attack on the managers. I may remind you of his instructions, which he had not carried out. He was directed to give his opinion with regard to certain facts, based upon the evidence supplied from reports of the inspectors. My charge against him was that he took no notice of the reports of the inspectors, and put in a judgment on the managers out of his own head. He was directed by the Board to quote passages from the inspectors' reports. He was told to draw up a general report on the lines of the English chief inspectors' report. If you look at the English chief inspectors' report you will find that it is based on quotations from the inspectors.

12865. We are not in England at present, and we are dealing with Ireland, which is very different?—But I am telling you his instructions.

12867. The point is that you asked your chief inspector, who had expressed opinions favourable to the managers, to embody in his report other men's opinions, which were unfavourable to the managers?—No.

12868. But what is the meaning of this?—I never asked him to alter his own opinion. He could put his own opinion in any way he liked, but the Board was determined that the inspectors' opinions should be given. He was asked to base his opinion on the inspectors' reports, but he deliberately left them out.

12869. And did he put them in?—Yes, later on, in consequence of my remonstrance. What I wrote on the 4th of September, 1911, is this:—"Mr. Downing said he was required to blame the managers in his report on the state of education for 1901. He was not asked to do so, but merely to include the opinions of the inspectors with regard to the neglect by managers of their school. Instead of giving the statements of the inspectors, on which his report should have been based, he omitted all unfavourable criticism, and gave a statement which was not justified by the evidence in his possession." That is what the Board found fault with.

12870. You were not allowing him freedom to express his own opinion?—He could express any opinion he liked. He could say: "I entirely dissent from the opinion of the inspectors," and nobody could quarrel with him. He could have said: "I quote the opinions of the inspectors, as directed by the Board, but from my experience of Ireland, I have come to an entirely opposite conclusion, and I am saying that the managers never neglect their schools," and so on. But what I did say was that he had no right, in a report which was to be based on the evidence at his disposal, to leave out that evidence altogether, and put in an opinion of his own. There is no question about that. Otherwise the report would give an entirely wrong view to the country. It was known that he had got directions that his report should be largely based on the evidence at his disposal, and if he left out all the evidence at his disposal, the report would not be worth anything except as his individual opinion.

12871. How had he the evidence at his disposal when it became necessary for him to send extracts?—But he had his extracts himself. He had all the reports of the inspectors.

12872. And why was it necessary for you to send them?—It was not necessary for me to send them. You must remember that the appendix to my speech was inserted in consequence of a promise I made to the Bishop of Limerick, who had written to me and asked me what evidence I had for certain statements, and I said: "When you get the published edition

of my speech you will see quotations from the inspectors' published reports, on which I based my judgment." Mr. Downing, then, proceeded contrary to the instructions he got from the Board, to present a report based, not on the inspectors' reports, which he had totally excluded, but in his own private judgment, for which he offered no evidence. I could not permit this, as it was contrary to his instructions, and, besides, it involved a direct violation of my promise to the Bishop of Limerick, inasmuch as I should not have been able to publish (in the appendix to my speech) extracts from the reports unless the public were in possession of the reports themselves. Again, I did not ask Mr. Downing to confine himself to these extracts. What I asked him to do, and what he and Mr. Purser did in the end, was to put in every extract, to put in the inspectors' reports in extenso. That was the only fair thing to do.

12873. I cannot understand how Mr. Downing had those extracts, as your private secretary wrote to him later, sending him further extracts?—He had them all. I can tell you, and you can take it from me officially, that in those days the chief inspectors were furnished with the full reports; they had all the district inspectors' reports. There is no doubt about that, and if he did not pay attention to them, it was natural for my private secretary to write and say: "You may not be aware that you have omitted these passages."

12874. Here are the terms of the private secretary's letter:—"Dear Sir:—The Resident Commissioner requests me to write to you to say that he would wish you to furnish your general report for 1901 immediately. He also asks me to forward you the enclosed copy of his Belfast address, with appendix (confidential at present), and says that there are some additional extracts from the inspectors' reports included that you may not be aware of."—Certainly, he might not be aware of them.

12875. I thought that I understood from you that he had all the inspectors' reports?—He had all of them, but he might not have read them.

12876. And if he had them all, what was the need of sending him the extracts?—I cannot understand why he was not aware of them, but he apparently was not. What I say is that he had them all. You may take that from me officially. As Mr. Downing had been asked to put in the reports, to put them all in, and as he had not done so, it was natural for me to say: "Here are some more that you may not be aware of." But he had them in his keeping; there is no doubt about that.

12877. Dr. Sturges, I observe from our interchange with you at this inquiry in the last few days, that in addition to a good deal of what I may call the official element, you have a great deal of the human element in you?—Perhaps too much.

12878. Were you rather amused by the ease with which the inspectors of the National Board changed their educational opinions immediately on your appointment as Resident Commissioner?—Well, it is a very remarkable tribute to my character, is it not, that before many of them had seen me they at once said: "This is a man who must be obeyed," and that although I had just come, as a perfectly unknown and comparatively innocent person, from the remotest West of Ireland to Dublin?

12879. If you like to take it in that way I am quite satisfied?—But, on the other hand, I may say that I pointed out yesterday (though I was possibly destroying the edifice of my own fame) that I had nothing whatever to say to the introduction of the new system, except so far as I had to devise the administrative machinery, and that I had to bear most of the kicks. As you know, the Archbishop of Dublin and Professor George Fitzgerald and the Lord Chief Baron were the three persons responsible, and the whole plan was on paper (as the documents in your possession prove) before I ever heard that the Commission of Manual Instruction had held any sittings. That was in November, before I was appointed.

12880. Mr. Dalton, one of your senior inspectors, held most pronounced opinions on the necessity for individual examination?—Did he?

12881. But on your appointment as Resident Com-

18th June, 1918.]

Mr. W. J. M. STAMER, M.A., LL.D., LL.D., examined.

[Continued.]

missioner he made a change, and in the Blue-book of 1900, he says: "The teachers have shaken themselves free from the mechanical lifelessness of the past"—That is fine. Mr. Deillon is a great rhetorician.

12872. Mr. Wyse, your private secretary, was even more sweeping in his praise of the results system in 1899, and he supported his evidence in favour of individual examination by a quotation from the evidence of Sir Joshua Fitch?—Poor old Sir Joshua.

12873. But in 1900 he reported that "The fermentation, so to speak, has begun to show results in more generally laying stress on correct methods rather than the peaceful accomplishment of work"—That is certainly saying a good deal of a baby, which had seen the light that very year. In fact, the new system was not really introduced until 1902.

12874. I am quite alive to the necessity that there was for a change in the system in 1900, but do you not think that the change was too sudden and too sweeping—and Mr. Padov, one of your senior inspectors, writing in the Blue-book of 1900, says: "Radical changes in the programme should not be so quickly made, bewildering teachers and managers alike. Do you consider that that was a desirable thing to bring about in the educational atmosphere of the country?—I fancy that the Manual Instruction Commission was in a bit of a hurry, and I do not mind criticising it, as I had nothing to say to it.

12875. But you had to say to the introduction of this system?—Not a bit. Possibly it would be well to qualify this. What I mean is this, that the whole policy was devised before I came on the Board at all, the whole programme and all its essentials were prepared, all its ideas were hatched in November, 1898.

12876. The ideas may have been prepared, but the new system had not taken any form?—I can tell you that they had taken the form of a printed pamphlet of several pages, which you have got. You remember the organisms of manual instruction, elementary science, drawing and music who were to scour the country. It was devised before I was appointed at all. It was even arranged who the most important organisms were to be. They were to be Mr. Heller and Mr. Davis. I had really nothing to say to it.

12877. Will you kindly tell the Committee whether you are responsible for the following proposal in the scheme? submitted to the Commissioners in 1902. Here it is:—"The scheme best suited to the majority of the Irish schools is one in which every child should be under instruction in the same subject at the same time"—I had nothing to say to it.

12878. "For example, take the case of a teacher with a school, say, of 25 pupils, ranging from 5 to 15 years of age. Of course, these children would have different degrees of proficiency; but a skilful teacher could instruct the whole school, formed into one class, for reading at the same time. If he commenced with the most junior, he could ask the seniors to explain the difficulties in spelling experienced by the junior, and when he came to the seniors one of the more advanced pupils could instruct the juniors." Do you accept responsibility for that?—Indeed, I do not.

12879. What?—No, I never wrote a word of that.

12880. Did you submit it to the Commissioners?—It was in a document submitted to the Commissioners; but there was no proposal on the head of that particular passage.

12881. It was printed?—Certainly, it was printed. It appeared in a document explanatory of certain resolutions that I proposed to the Board, but those resolutions were mainly financial, and were not concerned with the organisation of National Schools.

12882. Who was responsible for that?—I cannot tell you.

12883. What?—I won't tell you.

12884. The *Banner* or *Post*.—You never wrote a line of it?—Not a line. At that time, you must remember, with the modesty that is appropriate in a person who had only just been appointed, I was not inclined to express any opinion on the organisation of a National School before I knew anything about

it. Why should I? If you asked me now to organise a school of 40 or 50 under one teacher, I should tell you that I was entirely unqualified to do the task. The system of organisation you are attacking is just about as impossible as almost any that you could devise. It is perfectly ridiculous. You could not carry it out. No master how skilful the teacher was it could not be done, although I know that attempts have been made in Germany at carrying it out. I could produce several of them; but I quite agree with you that it would not work at all.

12885. I have not expressed any opinion as to?—I am only judging by our expressions.

Mr. COOPER.—Well, my opinion is that a more ridiculous proposal was never submitted. I am expressing an opinion now on it.

12886. Mr. HENRY.—I think Mr. Lemass said you were the author of the document?—I do not think he could have done so, as he is a veracious man. I never wrote a word of it, you may take that from me. I should like to see that in Mr. Lemass's evidence.

12887. I think you will find it?—I have not seen Mr. Lemass's evidence; but there is not a word of truth in it, I don't care who said it.

12888. The CHAIRMAN.—It was a mistake of Mr. Lemass?—I am not accusing Mr. Lemass of anything, but what I say is that I did not write a line of it.

12889. Mr. HENRY.—Mr. Lemass told us that you undertook the preparation of that document in April?—That is an entirely different statement. What I undertook in April was to bring certain resolutions before the Commissioners, and I did do that.

12890. But not just this particular thing?—What I undertook was to prepare a series of financial proposals, based on certain documents that were prepared long before I went to the office. My memorandum was intended to be explanatory of these proposals; but if you ask me about the authorship of that memorandum, all I can say is that I am quite as unable to answer as if you asked me about the authorship of the poems of Keats. At least 80 people were working on it. The Archbishop of Dublin himself wrote some of it; Professor Fitzgerald wrote some more; Mr. Dowden wrote some also.

12891. Mr. COOPER.—Do you say that the Archbishop of Dublin wrote some of that particular paragraph?—I do not. I am talking of the whole pamphlet. I say that it passed through 80 hands.

12892. But you can't say, or you won't, rather, who wrote it?—If you ask me who wrote that paragraph, I cannot tell, as Mr. Lemass said he did not write it. I thought he was the author.

12893. Mr. HENRY.—He said he was responsible for the financial part, and that you wrote the rest?—I should like to have some better authority than your recollection of his evidence, because until the present moment I believed that Mr. Lemass was responsible for it. At any rate, I can give my affidavit that I did not write a word of it, and touching the organisation of National Schools at that period of my career, I would not have even expressed an opinion. If you want to find out what my considered opinions were at a later period about organisation you will find them in the introduction to the programme published in 1900. I did not write a word or a line on the subject in the document of 1899, and as Mr. Lemass says he did not write it, I don't know who did.

12894. Mr. COOPER.—I think you will find in his evidence that he said that he did not write it, and that you wrote it?—But you say you "think," and you are putting your "I think" against my affirmation. I will tell you further, there is very little of that document which I did write. It was largely written by Mr. Lemass himself, as I could show from his own handwriting.

12895. At any rate, you now regard it, with your experience, as impossible?—It is impossible.

12896. Mr. Downing in his evidence has described it as amazingly absurd?—I would not go so far as that. I should not care to adopt any language used by Mr. Downing.

\* Vide Appendix XXX.

18th June, 1913.]

Mr. W. J. M. STANNIE, M.A., LL.D., LL.B., examined.

[Continued.]

12987. His criticism of that document is that it was preposterous and impossible. It was submitted to Mr. Downing for his criticism or expression of his view?—No, never.

12988. We have had it in evidence from him that it was?—Your having it in evidence from him that it was is presumptive evidence that it was not.

12989. As all events, he did criticise it?—I do not think so, except so far as the financial arrangement with regard to his own salary was concerned. That is the only thing he ever touched, I think, so far as I remember. It is ten years ago since I saw his letter.

12990. On the 29th March, 1900, he got this letter from Mr. Seymour, the Secretary:—"I am directed by the Resident Commissioner to inform you that in consequence of your letters to the secretaries of the 24th inst. on the new scheme of administration of this department, the terms of which he considers to be insubordinate and subversive of office discipline, you are suspended from your functions as chief of inspection from this date, pending the further consideration of this case."—Certainly. In answer to question 4629 Mr. Downing said that he was suspended simply for criticising a document, and in reply to the questions following, he gives the Committee to understand that his offence was a reasoned criticism of a number of proposals in connection with the new scheme, but in neither of his letters of the 24th and 29th March, 1900, is there any reasoned or detailed or other criticism of any of the proposals (with one exception) in the memorandum referred to. Two or three answering references to the presumed author of the memorandum alone appear as criticism of the other details. The whole purpose of his letters was to protest against the proposal to change his status from that of chief of inspection to inspector, a proposal which had been adopted by the Board some months previously. Mr. Downing was never asked for any criticism or observations on the document. It was given to him by me for his information. The Board fully sided with me in my dissatisfaction with Mr. Downing's conduct, and it was not until he tendered me an "unreserved apology" that they consented to the removal of the suspension.

12991. The suspension of an officer of high rank, such as a chief of inspection, was a matter for serious attention, was it not?—Yes.

12992. It was not in any case, or under any circumstances, to be considered as a routine or formal matter?—It depends entirely on what you mean by suspension.

12993. I am asking you are we to consider the suspension of an officer like a chief of inspection or chief inspector as being a formal or routine matter?—Again, I ask, what do you mean by suspension? Do you mean the suspension of Mr. Downing by the Board, or his suspension by me pending the consideration of the Board, for suspension by me, if the Board does not support me, would not amount to suspension at all; it could never be recorded against him as a penalty. It is what I call a Provisional Order now. It has no validity apart from the decision of the Board. If the Board on that occasion did not take my view of the matter, and if I were asked afterwards, or if anybody was asked afterwards, if Mr. Downing had ever been suspended, it would have been correct to say that he never had. It was only a suspension pending the consideration of the Board.

12994. Was there any precedent for the suspension of an inspector by the Resident Commissioner?—There is no difference between an inspector and any other officer, indoor or outdoor. They are all equal as regards the power of the Resident Commissioner. The Resident Commissioner is the head of the administration, both indoor and outdoor, and he would have no right to make distinctions in rank, and there is no difference between the chairman and the chief inspector in that respect. The Resident Commissioner is responsible for the discipline of all in the service.

12995. But what I asked you was a different question, namely, was there any precedent for that suspension of a chief inspector?—I think not. Suspensions of persons of the rank of chief inspectors are fortunately rare in the service.

12996. Your action, then, in suspending the chief inspector raises at once the large question of any exceptional powers which you as a Commissioner may claim outside the other Commissioners?—But I have exceptional powers.

12997. Would it be open to any other Commissioner to suspend a chief inspector?—Indeed, it certainly would not.

12998. Under what do you claim that power?—I claim that power as being the Executive Office Commissioner.

12999. Do not take me for a moment in any questions which I ask you as having the smallest desire to curtail your power. As a matter of fact, I want to make it quite clear that what I would desire would be, perhaps, to enlarge your power?—I quite understand that. I do not want to suggest that you have any desire to curtail it.

13000. And it would be, perhaps, more satisfactory altogether to make you solely responsible to the country for the administration of the system without the help of nineteen other Commissioners?—Who, perhaps, you think are not a help.

13001. Well, I do not say that, but who do not take a very active part in it. I will leave you to say that?—But I have said nothing.

13002. But under the Charters of the National Board of 1864 and 1861 has not each Commissioner the same rights and power in the administration of primary education?—Well, as I said some time ago to Mr. Kettle, according to the British Constitution the Prime Minister has got no power at all more than his colleagues.

13003. We will get away from the Prime Minister. We will say something about him later, as there is one little question that I want to ask you when he comes in, but my present question is this, under the Charters has not each Commissioner the same power?—As Sir Hiram Wilkinson said about the Charter today, it is the most jejune document I ever read.

13004. Sir HIRAM WILKINSON.—I hope you do not quote me as saying that?—I am only paraphrasing it. Didn't you say that you read the Charter and you could not see much in it?

13005. I was speaking of the powers of the Commissioners?—I put your idea in my own more picturesque language when I said it was jejune.

13006. The Charter is a necessary document, because it gives the Commissioners power to hold lands which they otherwise could not have?—Quite so.

13007. Mr. CORRY.—But under the Charter which we are dealing with at present has not each Commissioner the same right and power in the administration of primary education?—I really do not know whether he has or not. It is a more ridiculous document than I thought it was if he has.

13008. Then can you refer the Committee to any specific document defining your powers at all?—No, and, as I said before, in those days I did not know what my powers were. But the Government appointed me with a separate letter, and so I think you had better refer to them. If the Government literally followed the Charter when I was appointed I should have only the same powers as any other Commissioner has under his letter of appointment, but I got two letters of appointment, one as Commissioner and the other as Resident Commissioner. This seems to show that, as my title, in the opinion of the Government I do occupy an exceptional position; but under the Charter I admit that possibly I have no right to exist at all.

13009. Then the other letters that you got in do say defined your duties?—No; it is the Board which arranges how much to delegate to me.

13010. It is no way defined your duties?—It is entirely a matter for the Board. The Board can give me as much power as it pleases to give me.

13011. But apart from the special powers, or any special powers conferred on you under the arrangement of 1902, can you tell the Committee any special

authority you have?—I carefully explained before Lord Macdonell's Commission on the Civil Service what before 1902 was the position of the Resident Commissioner. He was the Executive Committee of the Board, and the lawyers on the Board have always held that the Executive Committee of the Board had the right, pending the meeting of the Board, to suspend any officer.

1923. Is there any Order to that effect?—There is no Order.

1924. Any resolution?—No, I do not think so; but the question was raised by Mr. Downing when I suspended him pending the consideration of the Board, and his letter was considered by the Board, which held there was nothing in the contention that I had no right to suspend him pending the consideration of the Board. This was a matter between myself and the Board, and if I exceeded my powers it was for the Board to tell me that I had done so.

1924. But I rather desire to get a little nearer to it in that case. Did they at that time put in writing that you had a power to suspend?—No, they said it was ridiculous to question it.

1925. Was that in writing?—No, it is not, but why should it be in writing? What was done was this. Mr. Downing's letter, appealing against what he called the unauthorized suspension by me, was read to the Board, which decided to fiat my suspension. That implied that I was right in my procedure; otherwise I cannot conceive that the Board, which at that time included the Chief Baron and some other judges, would have flouted my action.

1926. Well, it would not quite imply that, because the Board, having before them at the time the criticism of Mr. Downing, might think that they had sufficient before them without your suspension at all?—In that case they would have suspended Mr. Downing, but the Order was that the Board approved of my action, and I do not see how a Board containing lawyers would have approved of my action if they thought that it was ultra vires. It was a power which I never heard questioned. Sir Patrick Keenan suspended some officials. Mr. Leman goes so far as to say that in my absence he, as being Secretary, and consequently the man responsible for the staff, has power to do it. I am not going to enter into that, because that might be an open question, but, at any rate, the Executive Committee of the Board has always been held by the Board to have that power. As to Mr. Leman's contention. If I were away in the country where he could telegraph to me I should think it ultra vires for him to suspend anybody, pending the consideration of the Board, when he could communicate with me; but I never heard anybody but Mr. Downing question the power of the Resident Commissioner to suspend an official pending the consideration of the Board.

1927. Passing away from this question, have not the Commissioners reason to think likely that they had made a rule which would not stand in law?—Yes. A rule that would not stand before some lawyers. I object very much to your talking of law, as if law was like morality. As distinguished from morality, I generally find that it means the view of the particular lawyer you are talking to.

1928. Yes, that is very interesting?—And it is true.

1929. And true, perhaps, too; but, at all events, notwithstanding the fact that the Commissioners' rules are fortified by judges, had they not recently reason to think that they had made a rule which could not stand in a Court if it were brought to the Courts by the teachers?—I do not think that quite represents the case. I remember the case quite well.

1930. That was the maternity rule?—Yes. What happened was this, the lawyers on the Board thought the rule was quite sound. It was referred to Counsel, and so far as I could understand his opinion, it was that the rule was all right in law, but that judges could not be depended on to decide in accordance with the law. That is the way it was put. Thus the case was one of equity rather than legality. The Council thought it was such a hardship to leave to have to pay for their absence from school that the judges

could not be depended upon not to yield to that view of the case. We were unable not to feel the weight of Counsel's opinion, as we had intended that the Treasury should pay for the teachers' absence. As to the question whether we were influenced more by the fact that the presumption on which we had made the rule did not materialize, or whether we were afraid of judges deciding against us on the question of equity. Mr. Birrell, like ourselves, had approved of the rule, but he threw it over when he failed to get the money out of the Treasury to pay for the substitutes. Thus, apart from the question of legality, it was extremely probable that we should have altered the rule.

1931. Were you not told that the rule was harsh and arbitrary?—It was; that was what occurred to Mr. Birrell after a year's thinking over it.

1932. But it did not occur to Counsel to whom you submitted the case?—I thought you were quoting Mr. Birrell; possibly Counsel did use those words; he used words like those, but what I do say is that he did not say it was illegal.

1933. But that he did not think it would stand?—That is another matter; that has nothing to do with legality.

1934. Are you acquainted with the terms of the original letter?—Stanley's letter?

1935. The letter dated the 26th of April, 1909, requesting the Lord Lieutenant to sanction the appointment of two paid Commissioners, to devote themselves mainly, if not exclusively, to the administration of Primary Education. You never saw that letter?—Was it referred to in the report of the Fowls Commission?

1936. Yes?—Then I must have seen it. I have not seen it recently; it was mentioned yesterday by Sir Alfred, but I had forgotten it.

1937. It is to be noted in it that the idea underlying the proposal was, that the paid Commissioners or Commissioners should be not mere subordinate officers, but members of the Board?—Certainly. I do not remember that letter, but I am taking it from you that that was so, that that was the position.

1938. Then he is not a mere subordinate officer?—He is not an official of the Board, as is stated in the first volume of the evidence. I intended to correct this. I think it was Sir Samuel Dill who spoke of the higher officials like the Resident Commissioner and Mr. Dilworth. Of course, that was an inaccurate expression, as I am not an official, but a member of the Board who is paid a certain salary (quite insufficient, I am sorry to say) to give his whole time to the service.

1939. The CHAIRMAN.—That was only a loose expression?—I only mention it because Mr. Kavanagh seemed to think yesterday that I was an official of the Board.

1940. Mr. CORRY.—But does not the use of that expression, in the request made by the Commissioners in 1909, that he was not to be a mere subordinate officer, suggest that he was to have no superior authority, but to sit with equal powers with the other Commissioners?—When they are sitting in conference at the Board the Resident Commissioner is no more than anybody else; he does not even sit in the chair. When the Board is not sitting individual Commissioners have no authority at all; they go out of existence for the time being.

1941. Where is that defined?—That is in the reason of things. A Board is a Board only when it is sitting; when the Board disperses the individuals have no authority at all.

1942. You will have to explain that to us, where the legality comes in?—The members of the Board have no authority except in the Board-room.

1943. In certain Boards they have not, but in your Board you will have to show something to prove it clearly?—I do not see why my Board should differ from any other Board.

1944. It differs because yours is not a Shakespearian Board?—I do not think that alters the matter. How is it conceivable that when a Board is not sitting the individual members of it should have any authority? The thing is impossible.

12945. Would it be open to a Commissioner, if he so desired, to go and sit in the Board-room and watch the administration day after day?—No, it is not in his power.

12946. What precludes him?—The resolution of 1902.

12947. But before the resolution of 1902?—He could then.

12948. So up to 1902 he could come and sit in the Board-room?—He could, certainly; but he never did.

12949. The CHAIRMAN.—I thought we heard it stated?—Not at all.

12950. Mr. COFFEY.—That he could take part in the administration?—Certainly, as long as the Office Committee was in existence, any Commissioner that wished could turn up and sit there all day, and take part in the administration.

12951. The BUREAU OF RECS.—If he came there as a member of the Executive Committee?—As a member of the Office Committee.

12952. Not as a member of the Board?—No, as a member of the Office Committee.

12953. Mr. COFFEY.—But he would not have to be appointed a member of the Office Committee?—That depends on whether the Office Committee was a Committee of the whole Board or not, as it is only in the case of a Committee of the whole Board that members can turn up who are not nominated. I do not think anybody living or dead could answer that question as to whether they would have to be nominated, because from the very beginning nobody denied that the Resident Commissioner was the Office Committee, and so the question never arose.

12954. But it is important, in view of something that turns up later in a question I want to ask?—I dare say, but I could not tell you, because it never cropped up. If the question arose it would have had to be decided. I suppose, but it is merely an abstract question now, because from the very beginning in 1834, when the Office Committee was first established, nobody ever did appear except a Presbyterian clergyman on two occasions. As I said, for 70 years the Office Committee was the Resident Commissioner and nobody else.

12955. And you think that the change, if any change or any legal change, has been made in the status of the Commissioners as to the right to interfere in the administration was made in 1902?—Well, this is the first time that the point you are raising has occurred to me. In the light of what you say, it might be held that there was a legal change in 1902. When you asked me before whether these resolutions enlarged my powers I had not that before me, and possibly I should have to reconsider my answer in view of it. From the practical point of view, however, my answer was correct.

12956. It is not a theoretical question, because it may become a practical question, indeed, for the Commissioners. My point is, that if a Commissioner is willing to give time to the administration of the Board he can do so?—He could not do so now, in my opinion.

12957. Not since that 1902 resolution?—No. The Office Committee has been abolished, and consequently if he turned up now it could not be as a member of that Committee.

12958. But as a member of the Board?—He would have no right as a member of the Board.

12959. When you take the point that you are not a suitable body you take me on a point that I cannot quite follow you on. There are Boards where a member has no rights (and they are defined by Act of Parliament), except as a member of the Board, but in your case I do not think there is any foundation in any Act?—We have no Act of Parliament behind us; we have no Statute governing us, and consequently I have always held that, so far as the National Board can get the consent of the Treasury with regard to regulations involving money, it can do as it likes. However, it appears from your argument

that the change in 1902, by abolishing the Office Committee and the Finance Committee, did deprive individual members of certain rights which they never exercised, particularly the right they had of turning up at any time and taking part in the administration.

12960. I only wanted to make it clear?—I think that makes it clear.

12961. Sir Alexander MacDonnell, in his evidence before the Powis Commission, referred to the Resident Commissioner as being a stipendiary assistant to the Board. That is at question 11106?—I say again, as I said to Sir Hiram Wilkinson yesterday, that I refuse to be bound by any answer made at the Powis Commission, especially by Sir Alexander MacDonnell.

12962. We are not going to bind you?—He said some extraordinary things.

12963. Well, we have to take it as the history of the Board?—Yes, a history as full of inaccuracy as most history is.

12964. Mr. KERR.—Sir Alexander MacDonnell was a member of the Board?—But he was not an assistant of the Board. He speaks of himself as assisting the Secretary, and that I believe to have been actually the case. As a fact, the system at that time was run by Mr. Keenan. Mr. Keenan, the chief of inspection, ruled the roost, and Sir Alexander MacDonnell occasionally went into his room and asked him how things were going on. For a long time it has been questioned in my office whether Sir Alexander MacDonnell was able to write, for there is not a piece of his handwriting in existence. Possibly when he said he assisted the Secretary he was exaggerating his importance.

12965. Mr. COFFEY.—The only importance that attaches to it is, that in your office you have no statute to refer to, and no document to refer to, showing the powers and privileges of the Resident Commissioner, except the privilege of drawing what you call an inadequate salary, and, therefore, it is necessary for us to see from the office the exact position of the Resident Commissioner. Sir Alexander MacDonnell, who was Resident Commissioner, described himself as stipendiary assistant to the Board?—That is quite incorrect.

12966. Has a Commissioner (and I may tell you that it was claimed here by Dr. Clarke and Mr. Ward) the power or opportunity to discuss the conditions of the schools with a senior inspector or chief inspector?—Yes.

12967. Both Mr. Ward and Dr. Clarke claim that they would be quite within their rights in discussing matters connected with schools and education with any inspector?—Quite so. The Board did discuss that question in 1900, and an important member brought up a proposal that no member of the Board, or of the public either, should go to anybody except the Resident Commissioner, who was a member of the Board. That was a very drastic proposal. He proposed that the Resident Commissioner alone should interview the managers and everybody else, and that nobody should go to anybody except the Resident Commissioner. He said there was a general idea in the country that if you wanted to get anything done you had to come up to Dublin and see the Secretary or the head of the department concerned; that if you wanted information about your schools you should go to the chief of inspection. Hence it was proposed that none should be visited at the office except the Resident Commissioner. That proposal would have got rid of the suspicion of intrigue; but I pointed out what the consequences would be to the head of the administration. I asked what was to become of me if everybody that came to the office (amounting to, perhaps, 100 people in a day) were admitted to my room. The proposition was dropped; but the opinion was very strongly expressed that the Secretaries were the right people to be consulted in connection with all business of the Board. Thus, although in practice I have no objection to Mr. Ward or Dr. Clarke, when they want to consult the chief inspectors on questions of education, going to them and asking them about it, but what I strongly object to is, that a Commissioner should consult them

18th June, 1913.]

Mr. W. J. M. SYKES, M.A., LL.D., LL.D., examined.

[Continued.]

about individual cases, which may be referred to them. The Board would not tolerate a suspicion that the person who had to adjudicate on a particular case should be approached by a person interested in the case. You can see the objection to that.

12968. Yes, if the Commissioner wants to influence the chief inspector's judgment?—How am I going to tell whether he is or not? I cannot answer for my brother, and why should I be expected to answer for sixteen other Commissioners.

12969. And the question, then, is what right had you to produce him?—But it is not I.

12970. Is there a rule of the Board?—There was this discussion at the Board, and the strong expression of opinion.

12971. There is no record of it?—There is the Office Order, which, as head of the administration, I issued in consequence of that discussion. When the Board is not sitting I have always understood, and the Board has always supported me in this view, that I am the Board, and everything belonging to it. *Et cetera* et cetera.

12972. Was there any formal decision come to on that matter?—There was no formal decision ever come to on that question; indeed, it is not the practice to make formal decisions on such matters. A discussion takes place at the Board, and there is a general expression of opinion with regard to the administration, that it would be well to do something, and I do it.

12973. But you have no formal authority?—I did not get an authority in the form of a Board's Order.

12974. But I think it would be, perhaps, desirable that a resolution should be passed to that effect?—In view of your questions, I think it would be a good thing.

12975. That might be made with advantage?—No doubt.

12976. The CHAIRMAN.—What is the prohibition as to consulting officials?—The prohibition was embodied in an Office Order. I forget the exact terms, it is twelve years old, but it was to this effect, that the Secretaries are the proper persons for Commissioners or others to consult about the business of the Board.

12977. Not to go to the chief inspectors?—Not to go to subordinate officers; that was the general idea.

12978. Mr. COOPER.—That was not in any way communicated to the Commissioners?—It was before the Board in 1901.

12979. Are we to understand that there was an order made by the Commissioners themselves, or a minute made that they were not to have any interviews or conferences with any official under the Secretary?—The best thing is for me to produce the Order, if I can get it, but it was not made by the Commissioners; it was made by me, and then was discussed at the Board. As I say, I do not set on it, because I hate friction of that kind with anybody, and I never expressed any opinion in my life to the Commissioners that they ought not to do that. Never. Dr. Clarke, for the first time, asked me only two days ago whether he was at liberty to do that, and I said "I have not the slightest objection to your doing it." But there are possible objections; for instance, if one went to a chief inspector to say he wanted a school to be inspected specially, and if he influenced him privately, that would be highly objectionable; it would cut the ground from under the feet of the Board. It would be said that the whole Board was being undermined by the wire-pulling of individual Commissioners. In such matters I prefer to depend upon the feelings of gentlemen.

12980. The CHAIRMAN.—Dr. Clarke distinctly dwelt on the power of the Commissioner to act in the way in which he exercised it?—He never heard of that Order, as I do not trust on it. I drew it up at the time in consequence of some proceedings on the part of one of my colleagues which I considered to be very objectionable.

12981. Mr. COOPER.—Do you think you would have power to insist on it?—By the Board's wish. If it was approved by the Board I should.

12982. But it has not been approved by the Board?—It was approved by the Board in 1901.

12983. There was no order on it?—No; it was discussed and they approved of it.

12984. But why is it not done by the Commissioners?—If there were similar abuses I should probably ask my colleagues to rectify it, but I have never questioned or inquired from that day to this whether the Commissioners did or did not follow it, except on one occasion. The only time I ever insisted that subordinate officers have no right to go to Commissioners was in a certain letter that I wrote to Mr. Purser. I then did raise that point, that individual officers have no right to go to the Commissioners.

12985. But where does it come in that no individual Commissioner has a right to go to an individual officer?—If you put it that way, I do not think he has that right if it is done in a particular way.

12986. But the officer cannot run away?—But he can say "I cannot discuss that," and that is what he ought to say, if it is a case which is coming before him in his judicial capacity.

12987. In the evidence of Sir Patrick Keenan given before the Royal Commission he was asked how he would ascertain the views of the Board, and he said "I ascertain them from the Resident Commissioner and the other Commissioners with whom I have opportunities of discussing matters"?—So they have at present.

12988. Well, I understood you to say that the chief inspectors were not to discuss matters with individual Commissioners?—No; there is all the difference. As to many other questions of this kind in life, it must be left to the feelings of a gentleman. There are certain things that one has a perfect right to discuss with anybody, but with regard to a case that is to come before a man in his judicial capacity, one should not seek to influence his judgment. When the Board is not sitting the officials are under my direct control, and I am solely responsible for their discipline. If I give a man an order, telling him to do a certain thing, he has no right to go to an individual Commissioner to seek to influence him against my order. I would not carry on the administration for a single day if that were allowed. As a gentleman I would not do it. How could one carry on a Government department if when he has given an order, his subordinate, instead of accepting the order, goes and tries to get it reversed by underhand means. When the Board is not sitting I am the Board, and every officer of the Board is solely responsible to me.

12989. That is since 1901?—No, but always.

12990. You have told us that up to 1901 it was competent for a Commissioner to go and assist you in the administration?—But as custodian of the discipline, the Resident Commissioner occupied exactly the same position then as now; he was responsible for it exactly in the same way when the Board was not sitting.

12991. I want to be clear on it that up to 1901 it was open to a Commissioner to go and assist you in the administration?—I have already dealt with that.

# TWENTY-NINTH DAY.—THURSDAY, JUNE 19TH, 1913.

At 23, Kildare-street, Dublin.

Present:—Sir SAMUEL DILL, M.A., LL.D., LL.D. (Chairman); The Most Rev. DENIS KELLY, D.D., Bishop of Ross; Sir HIRAM SHAW WILKINSON, LL.D.; Mr. JOHN COFFEY; Mr. HENNEAGE E. B. HARRISON, B.A.; Mr. JEREMIAH HENLY; Mr. WALTER McMURROUGH KAVANAUGH, B.L.; Mr. THOMAS MICHAEL KITTLE, B.L.; and

Mr. ARTHUR J. DONNELLY, M.A., B.Sc., Secretary.

Dr. STANKE, Resident Commissioner of National Education, further examined.

19092. Mr. COFFEY.—Last evening we were dealing with the question of the right of individual Commissioners to discuss matters with officials?—I have the order that I referred to yesterday touching the right of Commissioners to converse on business matters with subordinate officers.

19093. Read it?—"Memorandum.—The secretaries, the financial assistant secretaries, and the chief inspectors will be good enough to bear in mind that if any of the Commissioners should desire information as to the proceedings of the Board or the details of the proceedings of any meeting other than the printed minutes of such proceedings, the Commissioner or Commissioners seeking such information should be referred to me. It is not in accordance with official etiquette that any officer of the Board should feel himself at liberty to refer to the proceedings of the Commissioners except in a general and formal way without the cognisance of the Commissioner. 12th December, 1909."

19094. Was that authorised by the Commissioners?—I told you yesterday that it was; after a discussion at the Board I drew it up, and subsequently it was brought before the Board, and approved of by them.

19095. That does not meet the point that I raised yesterday. It is a quite proper and quite reasonable order, I think if I may be allowed to say so, but it refers to discussing the proceedings of the Board?—The "proceedings of the Board" were intended to mean all the business of the Board; it does not refer merely to cases actually brought before the Board.

19096. It is quite reasonable, and anyone can understand that it would be an undesirable thing for officials to discuss the proceedings of the Board with even a member of the Board, but the matter I questioned you about yesterday was in reference to the right of a Commissioner to discuss, not the proceedings of the Board, but questions in relation to schools?—You mean general questions?

19097. General questions?—They are certainly at liberty to do so. I did not deny that yesterday. They certainly are. But what I did say was that I had a strong objection to individual Commissioners discussing a case with an official of the Board who may have subsequently to adjudicate on it. In practice I have never found it necessary to insist on the observance of this order, nor have I even referred to it except on the one occasion you have mentioned. I prefer to trust to the good feeling of my colleagues, who know the sort of question they ought to discuss with subordinate officials, and the sort of question they ought not.

19098. But would not the same difficulty apply in your own case?—But I am the salaried member of the Board.

19099. But the other Commissioners are members of the Board too?—They can discuss whatever they like with me. I am the head of the administration, responsible to the Board for the integrity of the staff, as near other of my colleagues is. Though no one is more suspected, I am, in the opinion of the Board, above suspicion; at any rate, above reasonable suspicion; for nobody is above suspicion, even Caesar's wife.

19100. What is the date of that Order?—The 12th of December, 1909.

19101. You say that at that time, according to your evidence yesterday, it was quite open to any Commissioner to assist and take part in the administration by sitting in the room with you?—No doubt, theoretically, but I have the greatest objection to mere theory.

19102. But in practice?—They never did so, and I should not have known what to do with him if one of them had turned up.

19103. But the question was, that he would be entitled to do it; that he would be within his rights in doing it?—No doubt.

19104. Now it is quite clear that a Commissioner was at full liberty to take part in the details of the administration?—Yes, no doubt.

19105. Now there was one amongst a number of other points that struck me yesterday in connection with your evidence in a rather strange way, and that was the expression of your desire not to be bound by or to accept the traditions of the Office as set forth by Sir Alexander MacDonnell and Sir Patrick Keenan in their evidence at the Povey Commission?—No, I would not agree to that way of putting it. I object to your turning a statement made with qualifications into a statement of general application. I disagreed with certain statements of Sir Alexander MacDonnell which I said were inaccurate, and I say so still, but you cannot infer from that that I refuse to accept anything said by Sir Alexander MacDonnell.

19106. But on certain points?—I disagree with him on certain points. Even Sir Patrick Keenan was not infallible, you know.

19107. I have not the print of your evidence, of course, before me, and with a good deal of matter spoken in a short time, it is not within my power to grasp every word, but as I understood you, at all events, you dissented on certain points from the evidence of Sir Patrick Keenan and Sir Alexander MacDonnell?—Certainly, and they dissented from each other.

19108. Now may I suggest to you that your Board having no statutory provisions and your Office having no documentary evidence to explain the functions of the Resident Commissioner, we have nothing to go on at the present time except the traditions of the Office as explained by your predecessors?—No, I do not think so; I think you have got the traditions of 1902.

19109. I am talking of the time prior to 1902?—I read over some time ago the remarks of Sir Patrick Keenan. Now, Sir Patrick Keenan, you must remember, was only chief inspector at that time.

19110. I have him examined later as Resident Commissioner before a Parliamentary Committee?—I should say that most of what Sir Alexander MacDonnell said at the Povey Commission was accurate, and applicable to my position in the Office down to 1902, but when he spoke of himself as assisting the secretary, as I mentioned in my direct examination, I certainly think he gave a very inaccurate exposition of his position. He also spoke of himself as stipendiary assistant to the Board. That is totally opposed to the rest of his evidence.

19111. He stated those particular things, and we have nothing else to go on, and there is no documentary evidence?—You have the rest of his evidence. I believe he sometimes contradicted himself, even in the same sentence.

19112. Will you show me where he contradicted himself?—He said that he was a member of the Board, and that he was the Office Committee. These two

10th June, 1913.]

Mr. W. J. M. STANLEY, M.A., LL.D., examined.

[Continued.]

facts are inconsistent with his assertion that he was "superintending assistant to the Board." The only correct word in that sentence is "superintending."

13018. The CHAIRMAN.—Was that later Committee in 1887?

Mr. COFFEY.—There were two later. One was a Committee of the House of Commons and another was a Royal Commission on Education.

The CHAIRMAN.—Which do you refer to?

13014. Mr. COFFEY.—Sir Patrick Keenan was examined before a Royal Commission in 1887, and before the Children Committee of the House of Commons in 1894. That was in the Office?—Of course, he was on that. I do not think he was examined. One was a Royal Commission and the other was Select Committee of the House of Commons in 1884. I may say that I refuse to be bound by every statement made in the evidence before the Pevsley Commission.

13015. That is except as far as it suits you?—No, so far as I agree with it. There is a good deal of it that does not suit me, but I accept it so far as I believe it to be accurate, and, as a matter of fact, it is generally accurate with the exception of those two statements.

13016. Now we had the evidence of Mr. Downing that on one occasion he was asked by a Commissioner for information which he knew was to be used rather to the prejudice of Mr. Bedington?—That was before my time.

13017. And then he thought it well to ask Mr. Bedington as to whether he should give this information, and Mr. Bedington said, "Certainly, you have to give it; every Commissioner is as well entitled as I am to all the information available." Do you agree with that view?—That was not the opinion of the Board when I came on it.

13018. What reason have you for saying that that was not the opinion of the Board?—I told you of the discussion that we had at the Board.

13019. But do you think that it is quite consistent with your evidence that prior to 1902, at any rate, that any Commissioner was as well entitled as the Resident Commissioner to any information?—Certainly, that he is as well entitled to information. That is perfectly true also of the present time. It depends on what channel he gets it through.

13020. Well is that true of the chiefs of inspection?—That was not the view of the Board when I came on it. As I told you yesterday, the Board considered that it was very objectionable that members of the Board should go to subordinate officers for information which ought to be got from another source. I will explain this if you wish to cross-examine me.

13021. I will not cross-examine you at all?—Well, I mean examine me on the weakness of an administrative Board. I am perfectly ready to speak on that for a very considerable time. You are now touching one of its weaknesses.

13022. I have my own opinion about it?—So have I. 13023. But in view of the evidence, at all events, which I have quoted given by Sir Alexander MacDonnell and Sir Patrick Keenan, and also of the evidence given by Dr. Clarke and Mr. Ward, that they considered themselves quite entitled to discuss educational matters with any inspectors?—Yes, certainly; I never denied that.

13024. May I now ask you on what precedents you ground the claim made in the postscript of your letter\* to Mr. Purser of the 12th of July, 1911, where you used the following words?—"I am the final authority on details of administration"?—As far as he was concerned.

13024. Can you give us any document in support of that?—The 1902 resolutions.

13025. You say that they gave you final authority?—As far as the officers under my control are concerned, but, of course, not final so far as the members of the Board are concerned. That is my contention. I will explain in a moment what that means. One could not carry on the system at all except on this understanding. I am responsible to the Board for the discipline of the staff. By the resolutions of 1902 the details are left to me; as in fact even before 1902 they were left

to the Resident Commissioners. I give my judgment on details of administration, and if any officer in the service can refuse to accept my decision in a matter within my jurisdiction, and appeals to the Board over my head, I refuse to be responsible for the administration any longer. It could not be carried on, it simply could not, if in matters within my jurisdiction an officer makes a practice of appealing to the higher authority. If a member of the Board wishes to raise the question of a detail he can do so. For instance, Mr. Ward was perfectly at liberty to raise the Chondaff case at the Board, or any other question if he liked, but Mr. Purser was not.

13026. Then the substance of your reply is that you are not the final authority?—I was as far as Mr. Purser was concerned. You must not make the old confusion between generalities and secundum quid. As far as subordinate officers are concerned, I am the final authority; as far as members of the Board are concerned, the Board is the final authority.

13027. Am I to suppose that there is no appeal from an officer to the Commissioners?—Not about a detail of administration; but if he wishes to the secretaries and appeals, not against my treatment of a detail, but against my treatment of him, the Board will discuss the matter.

13028. Could a secretary take it to the Board if you said it was not to go to the Board?—If you said, "It is not to go to the Board; I am the final authority over the secretary when the Board is not sitting"?—He could not.

13029. That is quite possible?—That is quite possible.

13030. With regard to the question of your preventing the secretary from letting a matter go to the Board, I had this in the evidence of Dr. Newell at Question 2476 of the Pevsley Commission?—But you are going back beyond 1902.

13031. I will have a good deal to say to 1902 later, but Dr. Newell says in reply to the question whether, as a matter of fact, every appeal would go to the Board, "I would consider it my bounden duty to do so quite irrespective of the feelings of the Resident Commissioner"?—Well, that is not so now, nor as I believe was it so then. The Board made me responsible for the agenda paper in 1902.

13032. In that letter to Mr. Purser from which I have quoted the postscript, you charge him with holding a check inspection in Chondaff without orders, and you say the point referred to him was whether a re-inspection should be held?—That was an error of memory.

13033. Of years?—Yes; what is the date of that letter? I had not seen the papers for three months.

13034. The date would be the 12th of July, 1911?—Well, I wrote that letter after from the papers, and I think there may be some excuse for the error in the character of the day; but we have heard enough about the Chondaff case to know that there was a certain amount of confusion in our minds as to whether Mr. Kelly's letter was really an appeal or not. At one time Mr. Purser treated it as an appeal, and at another time he denied that it was an appeal. On one of the documents, as you see, a clerk actually called it an appeal, but if you examine Kelly's letter, as I did subsequently, it appears that it was not an appeal at all. The difference is rather slight; as I say it was an error of memory, a comparatively slight one, but an error. It was not actually an appeal. He wrote and said, "I should be very much surprised if the manager would do so-and-so;" it was not actually an appeal.

13035. You have explained then that it was an error of memory to say that the question that was referred to him was whether a re-inspection should be held?—Yes.

13036. But that was stated in your letter?—I know.

13037. Is there an Order or was there an Order that no check inspection should be held in any school without your express direction?—Certainly.

13038. What is the date of that Order?—It is contained in the instructions to the chief inspectors, that an investigation cannot be held except by order of the Commissioners.

\* Vide Appendix XIV. (4).



1904 June, 1913.]

Mr. W. J. M. STANLEY, M.A., LL.D., examined.

[Continued.]

13039. Investigation is different?—But a check inspection is an investigation; there is no doubt about it, it has been held by the Board to be an investigation. It is an investigation into the marking of a previous inspector.

13040. Mr. KENTON.—The words in the instructions of the 23rd May, 1900, are, "The chief inspectors hold special inquiries and investigations when so directed by the Commissioners?"—Yes, that is clear enough.

13041. Mr. HENRY.—Another is that the chief inspector may examine any school any time he likes?—So he may, but there is no mention of his reporting to the Board.

13042. Mr. COOPER.—Now the next point I want to ask you about is, whether the question referred to Mr. Purser was in reference to a re-inspection?—It has been made perfectly clear since, that what was referred to Mr. Purser was a draft letter by Mr. Lemass.

13043. For what?—For his observations as to whether it was a suitable letter to send.

13044. It did not say anything, I think, about whether this was a suitable letter?—No, it did not. I am quoting from memory what Mr. Lemass's action was. I think it was "Chief inspector is requested to furnish his observations."

13045. But what observations could the Office possibly want in connection with that case except to go to the district and examine the school?—That is a pretty assumption. Mr. Lemass had no authority to ask him to go down to the school and hold an investigation. He had no authority to do it, and Mr. Purser knew that he could not do it.

13046. But was it not quite evident to the Office that Kelly had committed an irregularity?—Certainly, you must remember that I said in my letter to Mr. Purser that I had given Mr. Lemass a warning for doing that. I think Mr. Lemass's action was the cause of a good deal of the trouble that ensued. He had no business to make a reference to the chief inspector at all. There was nothing to refer.

13047. That is what struck me, that it was quite an Office matter. When did it come to your knowledge that Mr. Purser had re-examined the school?—It must have come to my knowledge, I think in the beginning of March, but, as I said before, I do not remember.

13048. In April you said to Mr. Purser?—That was the first time I came to a consciousness of the matter. I was writing from memory. The 4th of April was the date in my memory when I read the papers. I had never read them before.

13049. But we had it from Mr. Lemass that those papers were submitted to you?—Certainly, I said that in my direct evidence.

13050. In the middle of February?—No, March; in the beginning of March.

13051. Mr. Lemass gave us here a statement that you made in February, and there is no question about this, because we have that in evidence—a statement that you made in February in connection with the school?—I think it was the beginning of March.

13052. He has stated it here?—If you have the file, or can show me from the file, that that was the time, I will admit it, but I am giving my impression that it was the beginning of March. I do not think anything turns upon the particular date, whether it was the end of February or beginning of March. I will admit that it must have been brought to me either at the end of February or beginning of March. Anyhow, it was brought to me before I went down to the district.

13053. Mr. Lemass has told us that you say that the matter first got grip of your mind on the 4th of April?—It is not quite right to say "got grip of my mind."

13054. But we have it from Mr. Lemass of Question 7277 that "the first paper that came back was submitted to the Resident Commissioner, and the Resident Commissioner, as well as I am recollect, and that was an extraordinary recommendation; you had better consult Mr. Purser again before we

decide what to do." The Resident Commissioner's remark about Mr. Purser's extraordinary report was prior to the 29th of February, 1911, and he says some time between the 9th and 29th of February?—That is the end of February; he does not give the date.

13055. Between the 9th and 29th, but the reference is not dated. It was some time between the 9th of February and the 29th, and the Bishop of Ross says you might infer that it was previous to the 13th of February, because the document was typed, and the date of the typing was the 13th?—My recollection is a blank in the matter. I am willing to accept any date towards the end of February or beginning of March, because I do not think it makes the slightest difference to the point I am making. The essential fact is that it was submitted to me before I visited the district, it seems to me to make no difference whatever whether it was the end of February or 6th of March, and Mr. Lemass is only going on his own recollection.

13056. It was not recollection; he had the file here?—As far as the file is concerned, I will accept my ruling on it, but I won't accept conversations.

13057. We had it from Mr. Lemass that when the first paper came back he submitted it to the Resident Commissioner?—Yes.

13058. And the Resident Commissioner, as well as I recollect, said?—Does he quote the conversation?

13059. I am quoting his evidence—said, "That is an extraordinary recommendation?"—What is an extraordinary recommendation?

13060. Mr. Purser's.—Do you mean to say his report?

13061. "And you had better consult Mr. Purser again before we decide what to do." You remember that conversation?—Certainly not. How could I possibly? You are speaking of more than two years ago. There have been so many conversations on this case that I could not possibly say whether those remarks were made then or in the end of February or in April or in July.

13062. Then he says later, "I brought that before the Resident Commissioner, and he said, 'Before doing anything that seems a strange action,' or some expression of that kind, but I do not think I should commit the Resident Commissioner to the precise words." It is an extraordinary case; he said it was a case that would require further consideration, and could Mr. Purser have been aware of this man's career when he made that notice?—Yes, I certainly said that at one time, but I will not admit that I said it then. It is very hard, as you know, when conversations without record have been held at various times to say in what particular month a certain remark was made.

13063. The CHAIRMAN.—That is the evidence with regard to the file?—My impression is that it was said in April. If I were asked I would not take an oath on the subject, but my impression is that I made that remark on the 14th of April, on reading the file.

13064. Mr. COOPER.—But according to Mr. Lemass you read the file in February?—No, I never read the file in February.

13065. Then the official notings that have been put before us are wrong?—Certainly not. I have said nothing to show that.

13066. Mr. Lemass is wrong?—If he said I read the file in February he is wrong. I treated that file as I told you the last day with regard to another file. I never read a file until it is complete. When a report of that kind is brought to me I usually say, "Refer to chief inspector for his observations." When Mr. Lemass brought me Mr. Purser's report, no doubt what I said to him was, "Send that" (according to the course followed in the case of an appeal) "to Mr. Casson for his observations." This action was contrary to practice and contrary to regulation, but, as I said in my direct evidence, I did not wish to have any trouble with Mr. Purser.

13067. So then we are to take it that Mr. Lemass's evidence was quite wrong?—I dare say it was forgetfulness.

13066. Because he was quite close, and he pointed out his own writing on the file, and he said you used the expression, "That is a strange notion"—His recollections do not become Holy Writ by being put in evidence. I have had sufficient experience of memories, both my own and other people's to know that if a conversation is quoted years after it was held, one may reasonably be extremely sceptical not so much as to the subject of the conversation as with regard to the time when it is alleged to have taken place.

13067. Will you say that you made no such remark when the paper was submitted to you?—No, I would not go so far as to say that, because my mind is a blank on the subject.

13070. And, of course, you know that your mind being a blank and we having the positive statement of Mr. Leman that you said this on a certain date, we have to accept his statement?—It will show much simplicity to do so.

13071. But we have to accept it as a Committee?—Accept it then *pro tem*; you may accept it as a man's recollection of a conversation, but if you have studied psychology, and if you know anything about the reliability of evidence given in Court, you won't treat it as so conclusive. There is a very great difference between recollection and documentary evidence. Personally, I never accept anything but documentary evidence.

13072. But he had the document with him?—But there is nothing in the document about that.

13073. Not about the conversation?—Certainly not. I am perfectly willing to admit when I see "submitted" on a file, that it was submitted to me, even though I have forgotten all about it, but I won't go one bit beyond that. I admit everything on the file.

13074. The CHAIRMAN.—There is nothing on the file with regard to this conversation?—Not at all. Even with regard to the file, I find it very hard to ascertain when it was submitted, because it had been broken up and was submitted to me piecemeal.

13075. Mr. COOPER.—Was the record of Kelly submitted to you?—I certainly saw it.

13076. Mr. HARRISON.—If any action is taken when you have read the file, do you make a note on it yourself?—I did in this case, as I had visited the school myself. In general they are drawn up by the secretaries, and initiated by me.

13077. You would initial it?—Not always, you will find in some cases notes drawn up and initialed by the secretary, under which is the word "submitted."

13078. That is equivalent to your initialed it?—In my opinion it is not as satisfactory as having my own initials, but as I have allowed it to be done, I am willing to accept it as equivalent.

13079. You would accept the secretary's noting that it was submitted?—Yes, as equivalent to my own initials.

13080. Mr. COOPER.—You charged Mr. Pusey in this Cleeve case as being insubordinate?—Certainly.

13081. Will you tell the Committee what the insubordination was?—First of all for having held an investigation when he was not ordered to do it. He was insubordinate in that. Secondly, I told him to have been insubordinate for refusing in a matter that was within my jurisdiction to accept my decision. Thirdly, I told him to have been insubordinate (of course, this is not as conclusive as the others) in approaching Mr. Ward with a view to bringing this matter, which was already decided, before the Board.

13082. Are you quite sure whether it was Mr. Ward who approached Mr. Pusey or Mr. Pusey who approached Mr. Ward?—You are asking me as to my original charge against Mr. Pusey in this case. I did not know at that time that Mr. Ward ever approached him. I was subsequently made aware of that.

13083. Had you known that it would have done away with the charge of insubordination?—With the third element of it?

13084. Yes?—Not quite, because Mr. Pusey had no right to discuss with Mr. Ward the details of a case which he had been investigating himself.

13085. Where does that come in?—That comes in under that order about the proceedings of the Board.

13086. But this case was not before the Board?—But everything done in the Office is part of the proceedings of the Board just as every letter is in the name of the Commissioners, otherwise the country could discriminate between the action of the secretaries and the action of the Board. Everything done in the Office is a proceeding of the Board.

13087. Are the Committee to understand that a charge of insubordination would lie against Mr. Pusey for discussing a case with a Commissioner?—It depends entirely on how he discussed it. You are raising again a question that I thought we had settled this morning as to the sort of communication that might be unobjectionable between Commissioners and subordinates. As head of the administration and responsible to the Board, I could not allow a subordinate officer who has investigated a case to approach a Commissioner, especially with a view to having it raised at the Board. I could not allow that, and I would not allow that—most decidedly not. Otherwise my authority would not be worth a day's purchase.

13088. That is a power that you claim since the resolutions of 1902?—Certainly, since then; as to whether before, is another matter. I should have been inclined to claim it even before, because, even apart from the regulation, I could not hold my position for one day if I was going to have the ground cut under me by an individual Commissioner, who has no status whatever when the Board is not sitting, approaching or being approached by men who are dealing with cases. If I could answer for the morals of the staff, or if to be a member of the Board necessarily involved the possession of a delicate sense which felt discomfort like a wound; if nobody would ever do anything that was wrong, anything except what was in accordance with the strictest rules of propriety, such regulations as that which we are discussing might be dispensed with. But we must take the world as we find it. Even among the twelve apostles one person was found who was not perfectly satisfactory, and why not among twenty Commissioners?

13089. Then we have the admission that you have made already, that it was quite open to any Commissioner up to 1902, if he so desired, to take full part in the administration of the Office?—No; you are constantly trying to make that point, but I have not admitted it. I said that theoretically he could do it, but that the Board would have strongly disapproved, and would have been immensely satisfied if anybody had attempted to do it.

13090. They would, and so would I?—I think you are trying to make me admit that the constitution of the Board before 1902 (I won't say anything of it afterwards) was an admirable constitution. I will take the risk of yielding you a point by saying that I think it was a detestable and unworkable constitution.

13091. You don't know my point?—Perhaps I do.

13092. At any rate, I am not offering any opinion as to what the Board was before 1902?—You remember that I quoted a letter of Mr. Wyndham, in which he spoke of the relations between the Resident Commissioner and the Board as having become crippled from disease (but the printers, by a curious felicitas, printed it as "strophed from disease"). He had become convinced that the system, as I admit plainly, had broken down. After the appointment of Dr. Traill in 1901 I told Mr. Wyndham that I gave the Board a six month's lease of life, and in the fifth month the Archbishop resigned, so I made a very good guess.

13093. At all events, this action of Mr. Pusey in going to inspect and examine Cleeve school was regulated?—I treated it as authorised for the reasons that I gave you.

13094. You visited the school yourself with Mr. Dillworth some time later?—Yes, and Mr. Cooper.

13095. And we have it from Mr. Dillworth that you considered the school undermarked?—Undermarked?

1904 June, 1913.]

Mr. W. J. M. STARKIE, M.A., LL.D., examined.

{Continued}

18098. Yes?—Yes. I admitted that. I considered it undermarked.

18097. I do not think you will deny that you and Mr. Dineen are both outside the machinery of inspection. While I have the highest respect, if I may be permitted to say so, for both of you, I do not think your judgment upon a school should have much weight in opposition to the opinion of an experienced chief inspector like Mr. Pusey?—In Mr. Stanley's letter it is contemplated that the Commissioners should visit schools and report on them, and one of the fundamental rules (which I believe are very few in number) is that the Commissioners should visit schools.

18098. I see a good deal of advantage in the Commissioners going to visit the school, and I think they ought to visit them more, but my view on the other hand is, that the judgment of anybody outside the machinery of inspection should not carry, and could not carry, the same weight as the judgment of the inspector?—Certainly, I admit that, but you must remember that my judgment, so far as it was exercised, was exercised only when I thought a teacher had been badly treated. You think it was a mistake on my part?

18099. I have not expressed any opinion?—You know that in my direct evidence I said that only as the very rarest thing in the world did I ever act on my own judgment. Even in this case, although I made a note on the file in the Glenduff case, as a matter of fact, if I had not visited the school, I should have acted exactly as I did.

18100. How long did you spend in the school?—I cannot tell you, I suppose 20 or 25 minutes.

18101. And from your noting I see that a good deal of the time was occupied not in inspecting the school, but in inspecting the teacher?—To inspect the teacher took me, not 25 minutes, but exactly two seconds, so that I had 24 minutes, 58 seconds for the rest of the school. A good deal of the time spent there, as you see from my notes, was taken up in hearing his grievances, not so much against the inspector as against the case which he had denounced him from the class.

18102. His record as presented to us was, to put it mildly, very unsatisfactory, but so long as the Board of Education was willing to continue him in the service, do you think it was quite fair to suggest to Mr. Pusey that in estimating the work done in the school he should take account of the teacher's previous record?—Perfectly fair, I think, since I considered Mr. Pusey's report to have been a grossly unfair one. I said before that if I had not seen the school, I would have acted exactly in the way I did, having once decided to overlook his violation of regulations in visiting the school at all, and holding an investigation. Having done that, and having read Mr. Pusey's report, and Mr. Cussen's reply to his charges, and having noticed that Mr. Pusey stated that Glenduff School was a better school than Belies School, which had got "very good" for many years, I should have said, "Mr. Pusey's report is open to grave suspicion," and on looking back on the record of Mr. Kelly, I should have seen that it was very bad, and that he had been dismissed, and that he had never in his life got a good report, nothing better than "fair." My suspicions of Mr. Pusey's impartiality would have been strengthened, and I should have felt myself obliged to ask him whether he had Kelly's record before him when he wrote his report.

18103. Kelly's record did not come into this case?—Most certainly it did come in. It is a very difficult thing to separate a man from his past record. At any rate, it was impossible for me when comparing Mr. Pusey's with Mr. Cussen's report not to feel suspicious of the former's fairness, on account of his depreciation of the Belies school, whose record was good, and his appreciation of Mr. Kelly, whose record had been uniformly bad.

18104. We had it in evidence from an official of yours who recently left the service that he regarded your visits to schools as having a disturbing rather than a smoothing influence in the matter of securing uniformity among the inspectors?—That is Mr. Hynes, I suppose. I was surprised at some things in Mr.

Hynes's evidence, because he had so consistently expressed in my hearing a different opinion as to the value of my visits to schools. This was my opinion, apparently, which he adopted after he left the service.

18105. Perhaps he always had it?—Possibly he had it. How can I tell what a man has in his mind except from what he says?

18106. Mr. Hynes.—What he said is quite consistent with Mr. Coffey's question and your statement. He said that for some time he thought highly of your visiting schools, and he thought it very valuable, but that after a time he found it to be a disturbing factor, and that he thought you came sometimes to very erroneous conclusions?—Erroneous conclusions?—Meaning, of course, conclusions different from those of Mr. Hynes. Knowing the character that Mr. Hynes had with the teachers, I should say that if I differed from him, it must have been in the way of being more favourable to the teachers.

18107. Mr. Coffey.—But does it at all suggest itself to you that if you have capable and efficient inspectors, as I think your chief inspectors are?—Not were?

18108. No, I think they are capable and efficient. I do not say they are not, but I say they were not. I asked to the Board, on the occasion of Mr. Hynes's retirement, that I had, since 1900, been plagued by the most unsatisfactory chief inspectors that could easily be imagined, and that was also the opinion of the Board.

18109. But having the opinion that your inspectors are efficient and capable officers, does it suggest itself to you that all that their judgment is likely to be disturbed by your interfering with their marking?—But I do not ever interfere with their marking; I never have interfered with their marking.

18110. But have we not had it in evidence—of course, as it was so recently given we have not yet got a print of your evidence, but have we not had the evidence from you that you wrote on a number of occasions to the chief inspectors to say that you had been in such a district, and that you thought the marking of the inspector was too high or too low?—Certainly.

18111. But was not that interfering with the judgment of the inspector?—Certainly not in an objectionable way.

18112. How?—Because I wrote to the chief inspectors who were responsible for uniformity, pointing out what divergences from uniformity I had found in certain districts, and asking them to inspect the schools and see whether things were all right. I directed their attention to spots where I was convinced the inspectors were not carrying out our instructions. I said in my direct evidence that in most cases the chief inspectors agreed with their subordinates and disagreed with me.

18113. I think it would be not at all unreasonable if the communication asked with the chief inspector, but I see a very serious difficulty connected with that when the chief inspector went to such a district and said to the local inspector, "The Resident Commissioner was here, and he does not agree with your marking"—He had no right to say that.

18114. But if he did it?—It would be contrary to my orders.

18115. But you may take it from me that it was said?—Well, it was entirely contrary to my orders. I was most particular about that, and I have said that. I think, in answer to Mr. Harrison. I was most particular about that.

18116. I would not at all think it unreasonable or unfair for the Resident Commissioner to say to his chief officials that the standard was too low or too high?—That is all I did.

18117. But it tended to have a disturbing influence when the chief inspector communicated it to the local inspector?—They had no right to do that.

18118. If the chief inspector communicated to the local inspector the view that the Resident Commissioner had taken of the district?—He had no right to do so. It was contrary to the whole spirit of his instructions, and never in my life have I mentioned to a subordinate inspector that I disagreed with his marking, and surely I should be the person to do it if I wanted the inspector to be informed. Mr. Ward was

the first person who ever told me that people were saying that. He said that some teachers told him that I visited a school, and that next morning the senior inspector turned up and reduced the mark. That was a tale. Never, except on one occasion, have I mentioned to any inspector that I disagreed with his marking. I was visiting a convent school in the County Kilkenny last year, which I thought to be an admirable school, and as it was marked only "very good," I said before Mr. W. A. Brown and the manager that if I were marking the school I should have given it "excellent." That was the only occasion on which I ever said to a man that I disagreed with his marking.

18119. But did you make any entries in the observation books that the marking had been given too high or too low?—It would be hard to answer that, as I have no record of my notions. But I am pretty certain that most of my remarks have been laudatory; nearly all of them.

18120. But your evidence on this point has been that except in this case of Mr. Brown in Kilkenny you never conveyed to a subordinate that you disapproved of his marking?—Not so far as I know. You may possibly produce a noting out of an observation book that might imply that, but certainly it is not before my mind.

18121. Could you recall to your memory this remark from an observation book, "I entirely dissent from the marking of this school by the district inspector"?—No, I do not. Tell me where it was said I might.

18122. Do you want it particularly?—I cannot recall it. What is the date?

18123. Do you want it particularly?—Well I cannot recall it. What is the date?

18124. I will give you the school. You will find that in the observation book in ——— School?—That must have been some years ago. I have not been in that part of the world for I should say two years.

18124. That is, at all events, the case?—Well, of course, if that is so, it is so. What I said was, you must remember, that I never mentioned to an inspector or said before an inspector that I disagreed with his marking.

18125. But you have it there for the teacher and the manager?—Was it, might I ask, in favour of the teacher or against him?

18126. It was in favour of the teacher?—Quite so.

18127. The school was marked "good" and another school was marked "very good," and you made a reflection on the judgment of the local inspector by saying that you entirely disagreed with this, and like Mr. Purser in the Clonsilla case you said it was a better school than the school next door?—Now that you recall the circumstances of the case, it comes back to my mind. What I remember was this, that I said that in my opinion the girls' school was very much better than the boys' school.

18128. I do not want to multiply these cases, but I find a good deal of evidence of dissent?—Is it always in favour of the teacher?

18129. I won't say that?—I think it always was. If you want me to say more on this point, I mean with regard to my visits, I may refer you to the evidence I gave on the second day. As I said, these visits were strongly recommended to me by Sir Antony MacDonnell in 1908. He stated that in India it was the duty of a person in a position somewhat similar to mine to travel 10,000 miles a year inspecting schools, and he procured for me subsequently a motor car for the purpose. My object, as I said, in visiting schools is not to usurp the functions of an inspector, but to supplement their labours by devoting myself to some sides of the work that I think the inspectors are in danger of neglecting. My object is to see that the policy of the Board is carried out where I believe it has not been carried out; that is, I cultivate everything that comes under the word "tone," and in addition English Composition, Drawing, and a few things of that kind, in respect of which the chief inspectors and

their subordinates were not sufficiently, in my opinion, carrying out the policy of the Board.

18130. Do not take my question as, for a moment, suggesting any objection to your visiting schools; on the contrary, it is very desirable, but I think it highly undesirable when you have an inspection staff that you should go to interfere with them?—I think in general there is something in what you say, but supposing he finds, from his knowledge of the Board's policy, that the inspector in a certain district, as was the case in the district you speak of, is giving marks to schools in utter disregard of the aspects of the school which the Board considers of importance, what is the head of the Department to do?

18131. Well, I would bring the inspector to a sense of his duty, to a sense of his responsibility to the Board in some other way than letting the public know?—But the observation book is not published.

18132. Well the managers would know, and as a matter of fact it was here in Dublin that I heard of that, and there are a number of other cases more or less of the same kind before me, and I understand that a regular return of these observations of yours has been prepared?—As I note them down when I am in the school, and keep the record of them, it is not easy for me to remember. All I can say is, that they were called for by the special circumstances of each case, and almost invariably were in favour of the teachers.

18133. Mr. HENRY.—We asked for a copy of those notings, and we were not furnished with any return?—From the Office?

18134. From the Office?—But I could not give them. You could not get a return of them from me, as I don't know what they are.

18135. I suppose the return asked for was the notings that were made in the school?—In order to collect them it would be necessary to search every observation book in the country.

18136. The return asked for was the return of the Resident Commissioner in regard to schools?—That was understood to be my notebook.

18137. Copies of minutes and other records addressed to the local inspectors?—I understood these observations to be my notebooks. I could not give those, and it would give the most enormous trouble to get the observations from the schools, as I should have to go through my notebooks for ten years to find out the date when I was in each school.

18138. Mr. CONNELL.—You say that you did not visit the Clonsilla circuit till the trouble had arisen?—No, not to any great extent. I had probably visited five or six schools. I have looked through my notebooks, and I cannot find that I was in more than five or six.

18139. "The inspection before Mr. Weply came was undoubtedly easy-going." What are the grounds for that statement?—I said I agreed with Mr. Hynes for thinking so. I had the evidence of my own visits to the seventy schools before Mr. Hynes's inspection. I did not make any use of my five or six visits before Mr. Weply's time.

18140. And what opinion did you form of your seventy subsequent visits?—On what grounds did you form the opinion that the inspection previously was undoubtedly easy-going?—I said in my direct evidence that after the inspection of these schools I agreed with Mr. Hynes that the inspection had been easy-going. I quoted in inverted commas Mr. Hynes's words. They were Mr. Hynes's words, not mine.

18141. But he had only inspected fourteen schools?—You have been furnished with his report, so that you may see I was quoting him.

18142. Apart from quoting Mr. Hynes's words did you form an opinion yourself that the inspection previously had been easy-going?—Certainly.

18143. On what did you form that opinion?—From visiting 70 schools and comparing the marks Mr. Weply gave with the marks that previous inspectors had given.

18144. But would there not be two points suggested by a difference of marks, either that the previous inspection was too easy-going or that the latest inspection

19th June, 1913.]

Mr. W. J. M. SWANKE, M.A., LL.D., LL.D., examined.

[Continued.]

was too narrow?—Yes, there is always a possibility of these two views. I had them both before me. I could not see the schools quite as Mr. Welpy had seen them, because in some cases he had not inspected them that year, and they may have altered in the interval; but I had Mr. Welpy's reports on the schools, and Mr. Brown's or Mr. Yates's or Mr. Moloney's or somebody else's on each school as it had been years before, and it seemed to me that in a certain number of cases Mr. Welpy's mark more closely represented what I myself thought to be the merit of the school than the previous one.

13141. And with regard to those 70 schools that you visited, the time you spent in the school would be, may I take it, very short?—Yes, it had to be short.

13142. About how long?—It differed; I suppose from 20 minutes to half an hour.

13147. You think you were quite capable of forming a proper opinion in 20 minutes of the marking that the school should get?—I was not forming a final opinion; I was only making out a *prima facie* case for selecting schools which I thought most favourable to the teachers. I have heard many inspectors say that their judgment of a school does not differ very much, however long they stay in it, after the first 20 minutes. If a teacher is to suffer from the marking of a school, no doubt it is a man's duty to stop a much longer time, a very much longer time. He has to satisfy the teacher and to satisfy others that his judgment is a well reasoned one. In my opinion, a primary school is a comparatively simple thing. It involves problems which are, no doubt, extremely difficult to solve in practice, but the field is a very limited one. I will tell you exactly what I do when I go into a school, and you may take my judgment on these things for what it is worth. When I arrive at a school, I see whether the place is neat, orderly and nicely kept, whether the windows are clean, whether the panes of glass are broken, whether the out-offices are clean. All this I can see in a moment or two. When I go into the school-room I can see at once whether there is order and discipline among the children, whether the floor is clean, whether papers are lying about. I can see what the teacher is like (as I said, it did not take very long to write that characteristic description of Mr. Kelly). I ask for the observation book. While the children are engaged for reading at the other end of the room I look at the written work. I go through all the compositions while Mr. Dilworth or somebody else with me is in another part of the room taking mental arithmetic. I revise the drawings. The whole of that can be done in a comparatively short time. I maintain that it is possible to form a good working opinion of a school, but, of course, not one on which I should like to take serious action.

13148. But you think you could go through all that in 20 or 25 minutes?—Yes, I do, but not so as to form a final judgment, a judgment on which one would take action either in degrading or promoting a teacher.

13149. In what districts or circuits were you accompanied by Mr. Welpy in your visits to schools?—It is hard for me to say. I was in Kerry with him two or three times.

13150. That would be when he was in Kerry, but that is not exactly my point. In what circuits outside his own did you carry Mr. Welpy as your helper or assistant—did he visit schools with you?—He did, certainly.

13151. In circuits?—Yes.

13152. What were those circuits?—I remember his being in Down with me; I remember his being in some schools near Belfast. He may have been with me in some schools about Limerick, but I do not know. He was in Adams with me once, but that was peacefully in his own district.

13153. It is not his own district?—But it is just close to it. You can visit his district from Adams, because I have done it.

13154. He was through Down with you?—Yes, some schools near Belfast; and I may tell you another place where he was with me, in company with the chief inspector, Mr. Hynes, the O'Doherty country.

13155. In Donegal?—Yes.

13156. How long is it since Mr. Welpy visited those circuits with you without the chief inspectors?—I do not remember, except in 1911; as July I think it was. That was the time he was with me in Down. We were travelling North. I had to deliver a lecture in Belfast, and I went through Down on my way there.

13157. In what capacity did Mr. Welpy visit those circuits?—He visited them simply as a friend of mine, and a very pleasant companion.

13158. Was he in this district officially?—Yes, in this sense, that I suppose his expenses were paid.

13159. What was set forth as his duty?—To accompany me.

13160. Did it come to your knowledge at all that this introduction of Mr. Welpy into other circuits was very much resented by the chief inspectors?—Never. I never heard of it.

13161. Well, we won't have evidence of inspectors here, but I have reason to think that it was so?—I never heard of it.

13162. Now you say he accompanied you. What was the object?—In asking him?

13163. What was the object of Mr. Welpy being taken away from Cleland to County Down and Belfast and Limerick?—Well, I have often taken inspectors about in my car with me (Mr. Welpy is not the only one) to talk over educational problems.

13164. That is to say you took Mr. Welpy with you and he was paid his expenses, and I want to be clear as to what were set down as his duties?—I did not set down anything. I have power to take about anybody I like.

13165. But your friends of the Treasury come in there sometimes?—No, they raise no objection to that, not the slightest.

13166. Have they to be satisfied?—But they are satisfied.

13167. That the man is discharging official duty?—Yes, because Mr. Welpy is returned to the Comptroller and Auditor-General as having travelled about in attendance on the Resident Commissioner, and they never quarrel with that. I can take about any member of the staff I like.

13168. What, may I ask you, as distinct from casual company, was Mr. Welpy to do in this district?—Mr. Welpy was not to do anything, but he travelled about to give me information and help concerning a district in which he had been stationed himself, so I would take about any other inspector in similar circumstances. I was most careful he should do nothing in the schools. He never wrote anything in the schools.

13169. But he formed an opinion of the schools; he looked at the marks of the schools?—I don't know that he did. I looked at the marks, but I don't say much if he did.

13170. But he formed his opinion and gave you his opinion himself of the marking of the schools?—I cannot say whether he did or not. I do not know whether he did or not. Very probably he may have done so occasionally, but he certainly did not make a practice of doing it.

13171. What other inspectors did you carry away to distant parts of the country, apart from your private secretary or the chief inspectors—what other senior inspectors did you carry away from the South of Ireland to the North?—I cannot say from the South of Ireland to the North, but I have taken them out of their districts.

13172. Out of their circuits?—Yes.

13173. Can you mention some others?—I carried about Mr. Cussen with me. I cannot tell you all the senior inspectors I carried about, but I carried about Mr. Cussen.

13174. Out of his circuit?—I never considered that matter, because I do not know very well when I am travelling about where a circuit ends or not, but I certainly carried Mr. Cussen out of his circuit into Galway, because I wanted to see some of the schools in Galway, and Mr. Cussen happened to be with me.

13175. But that would be just barking on his own strength?—Yes, that is so.

13176. And that would not look so striking as taking a senior inspector, and a comparatively recently appointed senior inspector, from Tipperary to Bellsh and Dewar?—No, I suppose not.

13177. Was Mr. Welgely a senior inspector whom you looked on with some favour to succeed Mr. Purser as chief inspector?—I really do not think that is a fair question.

13178. I will put it in another way to make it a fair question. I will put it in this way to make it perfectly clear. Did you express an opinion to anybody that he ought to succeed Mr. Purser?—I do not consider that even that is a fair question.

13179. Then you do not answer it, and I won't press it?—I had a very high opinion of Mr. Welgely. I may say that, and I have already stated it.

13180. In the ordinary course, Mr. Brown was the senior inspector who would have claims, and he had escaped censure of every kind up to the retirement of Mr. Purser?—He has never been censured even since, I think.

13181. In the ordinary course Mr. Brown would have claims to the chief inspectorship on the grounds of seniority?—But then we do not give great weight to seniority.

13182. But he would on the ground of seniority?—There were lots of men senior to him.

13183. Seniors of his religion?—Why drag in religion? It was not necessarily a Presbyterian appointment.

13184. I am sorry to introduce it, but religion has to come into these appointments?—I cannot tell you whether Mr. Ross is senior to Mr. Brown or not. Mr. Dewar was the senior Presbyterian.

13185. I will leave that to you?—I do not follow (so quote what Mr. Dewar said about merit marks) these nice distinctions.

13186. But we have to take it in connection with your department that there are religious distinctions?—I will go with you so far; if three positions were given solely on seniority, of course Mr. Brown's claims would have been strong.

13187. And Mr. Brown at that particular time was transferred from Clonmel to Waterford. Is it not the fact that pending the resignation of Mr. Purser it was about that time that Mr. Brown was transferred from Clonmel to Waterford?—I think he was transferred two years and nine months before. You are making the same mistake as Mr. Purser made.

13188. I do not think so?—The 1st of July, 1909.

13189. That was the date of Mr. Brown's transfer to Waterford. And what was the date of Mr. Purser's retirement?—October, 1911.

13190. I have no theory, but a certain point has been suggested to me that would just suit?—I don't mind whether it suits or not, I am telling you the fact.

13191. But Mr. Brown was transferred, as the senior officer who had some claim, at all events, to the chief inspectorship, from Clonmel to Waterford in 1909?—Yes.

13192. And he was succeeded by Mr. Welgely?—Certainly.

13193. And you have not answered the question, and you decline to answer it, and, perhaps, properly decline to answer it, whether Mr. Welgely was the officer whom you looked on favourably for the chief inspectorship?—I won't answer. As a matter of fact, I had not at that time, or for long afterwards, made up my mind.

13194. I asked you whether you had expressed any opinion on it?—I cannot tell you whether I did or not; I cannot remember my private conversations.

13195. I am not making any complaints in relation either to you or to Mr. Welgely, but I am trying to get out the facts as things have been represented to me?—As a matter of fact, I did not propose Mr. Welgely for the chief inspectorship.

13196. I know you did not?—I do not understand what point turns on this transfer to Waterford. Waterford is a good district, and Mr. Brown had been quite long enough in Clonmel. No man is ever left in a post longer than Mr. Brown was in Clonmel.

13197. The Chairman.—Is Mr. Brown in the service still?—Yes.

13198. And will be for years I suppose?—He is under 45. I was at school with him, so I know his age.

13199. Mr. Cooney.—You say the actual increase of dismissions has been small?—Yes.

13200. I think you said the absolute increase is small. What is the meaning of "absolute"?—When I meant was, that although one may say that dismissions have increased by 200 per cent. the actual increase is small.

13201. You say in your prices that the increase in dismissions has been small, and I think you explained it, but I am not quite clear that I understood the explanation. Will you kindly say what is the force of the word "absolute" when you speak of the absolute increase of dismissions in connection with this question?

—What I meant was this. When you say the dismissions have increased by 200 per cent. it looks very formidable, but one must get the figures to know whether it is formidable or not. If there are two dismissions in one year and four dismissions in the next people who objected to dismissions might represent it as an increase of 100 per cent. That would look a terrible thing, but it would mean an absolute increase of only two; so that when we hear of the dismissions having increased 200 per cent. it is astonishing to be told that the highest number they have reached for all offences, including inefficiency, drink, &c., was 50 in the year, that is one in 250 teachers. The largest number that has ever been reached is 50.

13202. Now, you say that the absolute increase of dismissions has been small, but will you say that the retirement of teachers on reduced pensions since 1905 has not been very much larger than it was in the preceding 10 years?—The retirement of teachers on reduced pensions would come under the head of dismissions. The number 50 includes retirements on reduced pensions.

13203. Does it?—Certainly. As I have already explained, we do not dismiss a teacher. Dismissal is only a ready expression for getting him out of the service. We withdraw the grant and say that the teachers are no longer recognised, and "dismissal" just describes that; but the 50 dismissions include the cases of teachers compulsorily retired on reduced pensions.

13204. We asked for a return in connection with the number retired on reduced pensions for each year of the last thirteen, and we asked for that, I think within the first four or five days?—Have you not got the returns?

13205. We have not got them?—I have not heard anything about them; so that you had better repeat the request. Am I to understand that you asked for a return of the retirements on reduced pensions.

—13206. Yes?—We have that, of course. I thought you had got all the returns you wanted.

13207. I had an idea that the number of teachers forced out of the service for inefficiency, whether real or imaginary, was very large in the last thirteen years?—No, not absolutely large; there has been an increase, no doubt. I went fully into that in my direct statement.

13208. The Chairman.—You have gone into it in a very full way in the report for 1906?—Yes, since 1905 the dismissions have fallen very considerably.

13209. They reached the top in 1905?—We got rid of the really lame ducks before 1905.

13210. Mr. Cooney.—In using those words, "real or imaginary inefficiency," I am personally not charging any of your inspectors or the Board, or any of the chief inspectors; but has not the charge been made by one of your own Commissioners, who, I presume, knew a great deal more of the working of the office than I do?—I don't think he knew half as much. When I tell the Committee that the Commissioner you refer to is Dr. Trull, I think they will all agree with me.

1918 June, 1918.]

Mr. W. J. H. STANLEY, M.A., Litt.D., LL.D., examined.

[Continued.]

19211. I know nothing about your office at all, but it was a Commissioner who used the expression "enforced inefficiency"?—Yes, his conduct was very culpable, and was brought before the Board. He was censured by the Board, and he had to give a solemn promise that he would never do the like again. That is what occurred. I had to bring the case under the notice of Mr. Bryon, who thought it was a matter for the Board, but Dr. Traill apologized, and the matter dropped. I think, perhaps, I said enough about Dr. Traill.

19212. But putting aside Dr. Traill?—But you couldn't do that.

19213. Have you ever considered whether in your Ballast address in 1902 you did not make use of a rather unfortunate observation (only once, or perhaps there were two) when you said: "I fail to see what place there will be for lazy and inefficient teachers, if the inspectors do their duty," for it always struck me that that was rather preparing the ground for enforced inefficiency?—Shall I tell you the meaning of those words? They were due to my desire to reply to a charge which the teachers had been making in their journals that the new system encouraged only the lazy and inefficient. When, however, the teachers read my reply they at once took up the opposite point of view; so there I was compelled to make a choice between whether the system encouraged the lazy and inefficient, or whether it drove them out of the service. The teachers, as usual, had it both ways. Whichever horn of the dilemma I chose, I was impaled on the other. In fact, I was replying to a real objection. We had abolished the results system, and the managers thought that now that the stimulus of payment for individual passes was removed there would be a general reign of what my friend from the Treasury would call inactivity (you remember the quotation I read from his letter). I was thinking of all these things when I made that speech, and such was the genesis of it.

19214. But you were the Resident Commissioner, and how would the ordinary inspector with even a small degree of official wisdom be likely to take the hint?—If he had a small degree of official wisdom, he probably would not have taken it.

19215. And if he had a large degree of official wisdom?—My influence with them may have resulted in the percentage of dismissals, rising from one in a thousand to one in 250, but even one in 250 is not what you could call panic-making. When Mr. Bryon was informed that there was a panic in Ireland, that the teachers were paralysed with fear at these terrible figures based at them from the Education Office, he asked me what the proportion was, and when I said the largest number was one in 250, he thought we were not doing our duty, and other people thought so too, in not dismissing a much larger number. I may say, without, I think, wishing to expose myself to any more abuse than I have had up to the present, the proportion of inefficient teachers in Ireland is much larger than one in 250.

19216. But at that time you gave what I consider was rather a strong hint to the inspectors?—It was not intended as a hint.

19217. I know, but that is how it would be read?—Well, it certainly was not so read upon.

19218. Well, at that time, though you made use of this observation in regard to the possible inefficiency of the teachers, your attitude towards some of the higher officials in the office was more tolerant on grounds of inefficiency—were you not more tolerant of inefficiency in the office than you were of inefficiency among the teachers?—I don't know that I was; how do you know?

19219. In your memorandum of July, 1904, you said that the success of the scheme had been endangered by some high officials?—Yes, certainly.

19220. And you expressed regret at the apparent want of consideration shown an old officer who had given valuable service in difficult times; but in the case of the teachers you even expressed regret for the failure of the inspectors to do their duty in the removal of inefficient officers?—You must remember that that is one of the drawbacks of the teaching pro-

fession, that inefficiency in it is much more deleterious than it is in the Civil Service. Inefficiency among the chief officers of the army is a very dangerous thing; it might destroy a whole army. Inefficiency in a captain of a man-of-war is a very dangerous thing, and might cost over a million of money to the country, and consequently it is generally put down with a strong hand. Inefficiency in my office is extremely unpleasant to myself, but it is not absolutely intolerable. An inefficient clerk does harm, but he does not do harm as an inefficient teacher does. Indeed, inefficiency in a teacher is ruinous to a whole generation of children. We expect, for a comparatively small salary, from teachers, qualities that are not required even among Prime Ministers.

19221. Your term of office as Resident Commissioner has been marked by some very exceptional, and, I think, some unprecedented incidents?—Possibly.

19222. You have had a suspension during your term of office of some of the higher officials?—Yes, of two. They were not numerous. That was 12 years ago.

19223. You spoke of the inefficiency of those higher officials. That did not enter in your memorandum, as I understood it, to the two chief inspectors. They were disloyal, but not inefficient, at that time, and your reference in the memorandum at that time was to other officers?—It is quite possible to combine disloyalty with inefficiency.

19224. Quite so?—And one of the chief inspectors succeeded in doing so.

19225. But that is not my point. Those higher officials were disloyal?—As well as I remember that document, what you say is roughly true; that is, that the two inefficient ones were not the chief inspectors.

19226. Two different ones?—Very well. Now, in connection with that, have we not an amazing admission of yours, that you shrink from what you thought your line of duty with regard to those officers in the fear that you might weaken your already imperilled position at the Board by risking this on the possibility of a snatch vote?—Yes, but there is nothing amazing in that.

19227. So that you let the inefficiency go on, you shrink from doing your duty and let the inefficiency live sooner than be defeated on a snatch vote?—You must remember that in 1900 I did my level best to remedy this, and I could not get my way. I put the whole case before the Board, but it did not do its duty, and I attribute to that weakness on the part of the Board most of the troubles we have had ever since. In the first part of my evidence I went very fully into that question. In my opinion until about 1905 the National Board was not an institution that in the interests of the country ought to have been allowed to lumber the ground. At that time I had my hands full of the question of Irish, which divided the Board in the most extraordinary way, and I did not feel myself called upon, after my experience of the year before, again to put myself into a position in which, if I were defeated, I should have had to resign. I could not afford it.

19228. Irish had not become so acute in July, 1901?—Indeed it had. When was Irish not acute?

19229. But you did not happen to be divided on Irish in July, 1901?—Most decidedly. I read some passages from letters of a distinguished colleague, which show how far the division had gone, even to the point of breaking up the Board. Why, that was the one subject which divided the Board from the middle of 1900 to the middle of 1906.

19230. Then we may take it, and I think you have very frankly admitted that you let the inefficiency go on?—Because I had to.

19231. Either that or —?—Or to resign, one or the other, and, in fact, I was in communication with the Government as to whether I should resign or not.

19232. During your 12 years as Resident Commissioner, have we not had an unprecedented number of resignations of Commissioners?—I don't think so; but there is no doubt that the position of Commissioner is a very unpleasant one.

18248. How many resigned during the time since you became Resident Commissioner?—I do not know that a single one ever resigned on account of me.

18249. I am not saying that, but as a matter of fact, six of the Commissioners resigned, did they not?—There were only four. I will give you the reasons of their resignations, if you like.

18250. There is only one that I want for the present. I had the honour of his personal acquaintance, I might say almost his personal friendship, Lord Justice Fitzgibbon?—That was not since I was appointed. I was never on the Board with Lord Justice Fitzgibbon.

18251. Very well. Then you do not know why he resigned?—I have not the slightest idea. He resigned at least a year before I was on the Board, but the very first letter I got when I was made Resident Commissioner, was a letter of congratulation from him, which I read the other day. He asked me to call on him, since he had been 12 years on the Board; he said that he could give me a few tips.

18252. Mr. HENLY.—And he told another one in pretty strong language, that if they would take his advice, they would pitch the Board to some place or other?—You cannot blame me for that; that was long before my time; Lord Justice Fitzgibbon's wish was one I entertained myself in my early days.

18253. That was Lord Justice Fitzgibbon?—I never was on the Board with Lord Justice Fitzgibbon.

18254. Mr. COFFEY.—You complained in your memorandum, that in July, 1901, the attitude assumed towards you by two of the Commissioners was one of persistent hostility and distrust?—Certainly.

18255. You had, I presume, some particular Commissioners in view?—Certainly.

18256. How many?—They were seven, all opponents of Irish. It was solely on the question of Irish, I may tell you.

18257. Oh, no?—The voting on one occasion was 7 to 1. The whole question during that year, I can tell you, was as to whether under the new programme Irish could be taught within school hours or not. That seems absurd to you now, but it made the atmosphere of the National Board very hot in those days. Under the resolve system there was no rule that Irish should not be taught during school hours, provided it was not paid for. Do you know that?

18258. I don't know anything about it?—When the fee for all subjects taught during school hours was abolished, Irish remained as it was before, it could be taught like other subjects during school hours. That was our point, but it convinced the Board.

18259. Now, I have to approach another matter, which I approach very unwillingly. I regret, and regret extremely, that you have introduced the name of His Grace the Most Rev. Dr. Walsh into this inquiry. For many reasons, I would be most anxious to keep the Most Rev. Dr. Walsh away from any of the worry of the unpleasantness connected with an investigation of this kind, but as you have introduced his name in reference to misunderstandings, I feel, in gratitude to His Grace for past kindnesses to me, as well as for the public interest, that I must ask you some question. From the official report of the proceedings of the 6th July, 1901, I see that on that date the Commissioners made the following minute:—"The Resident Commissioner submitted an official memorandum dealing with the various matters referred to by His Grace Dr. Walsh, Archbishop of Dublin, in his recent letters to the Press, and in his interviews with representatives of the papers." In that memorandum, Dr. Skerid, you made a statement?—Do not say I. I have already explained that I did nothing of the kind.

18260. But in the memorandum, at all events?—I did not write the memorandum. I told you that.

18261. It says that you submitted a memorandum?—That is another thing.

18262. Well, the memorandum was submitted with your approval?—Certainly not, as I had not read it. I stated that in my direct evidence. I told you that I was in London, and that I never saw the memorandum.

18248. You were present at the Board when the memorandum was adopted?—Certainly.

18249. And you agreed to the memorandum?—Certainly.

18250. And this is one statement in it: "When His Grace ascertained that his charges were unsubstantial he resigned." Now, what were the charges made by His Grace which the Board characterized as unsubstantial, and which you were a party to characterizing as unsubstantial?—Charges embodied in the two letters that were published before he resigned. He made certain charges against the Financial Assistant Secretary. He was the only member of the staff mentioned. There were certain definite charges, which were investigated by the Board in the Archbishop's presence, and the Board passed a minute which you will find in that document. It cannot be denied that certain definite charges were made.

18251. What were they?—You will find them in the two letters of June 8th and 4th. The charges against the Financial Assistant Secretary were that his letters did not contain a word of truth, or something like that, that they contained statements inconsistent with the policy of the Board, and the premises which it had made to the teachers. These were the definite charges brought against the Financial Assistant Secretary.

18252. And you say, and the Board with you, that those charges were unsubstantial?—That was the opinion of the Board.

18253. And in that opinion you agree?—Yes; as to those particular charges.

18254. Was not that an extraordinary statement for the Board and for you to make in view of His Grace's declaration that he felt compelled to resign by his despair?—He stated publicly that he resigned because he despaired of procuring any adequate reform from within in the work of the Education Office?—Was it not extraordinary, in view of His Grace's statement that he was convinced Parliament would have to look into the whole matter, otherwise he did not believe that it would ever be remedied, and that the reason he resigned was that he despaired of effecting any adequate reform from within in the work of the Education Office?—But he did not write that letter before he resigned.

18255. What letter?—The letter you are quoting from. What the Board had before it when it discussed the letters of 8th and 4th of June, were those letters and no others, and the Board passed a minute, which the Archbishop objected to afterwards, and which has been published. You know the minute.

18256. But I do not think, if I remember rightly, that His Grace made any direct charge against any officer?—He certainly did, you have his letters; he attacked the Financial Assistant Secretary, Mr. Young.

18257. Mr. HENLY.—And what was the charge?—That Mr. Young was writing letters to managers who were making special appeals to the Commissioners to get exceptional treatment, as promised to them, if their circumstances were exceptional, that those appeals could not be listened to, and that it would be impossible to accede to them. His Grace said that this was inconsistent with the promise of the Board that it would specially consider exceptional cases.

18258. The Chairman.—That the Board reserved to themselves the right of specially treating exceptional cases?—Yes, that was the promise made in 1900. In acting as he did, Mr. Young departed from my express instructions. His explanation was that, having to deal with thousands of cases of appeal, and on examination seeing that a certain number of them were not exceptional at all, he took it upon himself, without getting the sanction of the Board, to inform the managers that they could not be listened to. That was the charge that was brought against him, and he did not attempt to rebut it.

18259. Mr. HENLY.—And was it not substantial?—I think not. It was the feeling of the Board that, in the exceptional circumstances of the time, it was not substantial. There was a good deal of excuse for Mr. Young, and that was the view taken by the majority of the Board. There is no doubt about it. As to the charges made in the letters of the 8th and 4th of June, they persistently refused to do anything that might seem to involve a serious censure on Mr. Young.



18260. Mr. CORRY.—Did you at that time tell His Grace that trust was a worthless security in the Education Office?—I have not got the whole of the letters from which I quoted in my direct statement. They were private letters, which I wrote in a state of great irritation at having discovered that Mr. Young had submitted to me for formal sanction an important letter which got me into considerable trouble with the Board.

18261. You won't deny that you made that complaint?—No; I quoted it myself in my direct statement.

18262. Now, Dr. Starrie, from what you have told us of your highest officers and the Board, is not trust a poor security still in the Education Office?—I would not say that.

18263. Well, we have a most extraordinary reference from you yourself in the opening statement as to the putting away of documents?—The putting away of documents.

18264. Documents being put away for some years that could not be found?—But the officer who did that is not in the service.

18265. But is not that a good reason for saying (I won't say to-day) but until quite recently that trust was certainly a poor security to you in the Education Office?—I see that you are again generalising from the particular.

18266. But in reference to some of your higher officials?—What do you mean by some?—I believe "some" in logic means at least one, so if you accept the logical sense of it I will admit "some."

18267. I may say two?—I don't think I would go so far as two.

18268. In one of the public communications of His Grace the Archbishop, he says that the Commissioners indeed, know nothing, or next to nothing, of what is going on in the office, although, of course, nothing that is done there can be valid, or ought to be done at all, except in so far as it is done under their authority?—Certainly.

18269. Do you think that that correctly represents the responsibility of the officers to the Commissioners?—Yes, nothing that is done is valid except what is done with the authority of the Board.

18270. His Grace was one of the Commissioners who felt unwilling to accept official responsibility for official action of which he knew nothing. He has stated so. Is not that the fact?—I suppose that was his contention.

18271. Do you agree with the view expressed by His Grace that there is no authority in any official independent of the authority of the Board?—Certainly, that is quite true.

18272. His Grace stated that the Commissioners knew nothing, or next to nothing, of what was going on in the office. Did he refer to the fact that a typewritten circular was issued in the name of the secretaries, of which they discovered knowledge?—The question of the circular was explained in that document that you have quoted from. His Grace had a statement of Mr. Lomas that he had not seen the circular. But it was explained afterwards that his name was substituted for another's, because it was a formal business. The name of Mr. Hamilton, the secretary, had been struck out, and his successor's was put in subsequently. It was a very innocent transaction.

18273. Did you yourself deny all knowledge of a letter which was issued by one of the higher officials?—Yes.

18274. And did you subsequently acknowledge that it was submitted to you and initiated by you?—Quite so, I dealt with that a few moments ago.

18275. Did not his Grace in his letters and in the report of interviews deplore the hopelessness of being able to fix responsibility in the proper quarter in connection with these matters without a full public inquiry?—I think he did. I have not read his letters recently; but I think he did.

18276. In Judge Shaw's memorandum of the 30th

July, 1901, I notice a statement that some of the letters and circulars issued by you might be open to criticism in point of form?—Does he mention my name?

18277. Yes?—Are you certain of that?

18278. I am certain?—I think not. I do not think he could not have said, "issued by the Resident Commissioner," because, of course, I do not issue anything.

18279. But under your authority?—No, not under my authority; issued by the secretaries.

18280. Here is the note of Judge Shaw (reads document). Did not that refer to you?—He tells you there to whom he referred. He referred to the Financial Assistant Secretary. He was not referring to me.

18281. Who was he referring to?—The Financial Assistant Secretary.

18282. Have you since then issued circulars or similar letters without any authority from the Board?—Henty, that is, without direct authority, by the powers delegated to me. I issue circulars on matters of not sufficient importance to be brought before the Board.

18283. These would be very important matters that I am going to refer to, because the managers of schools are mostly clergymen, are they not?—Yes, I think so.

18284. And the lay men who are managers of schools are, I assume, men of standing and good character in their districts?—I hope so.

18285. Was the circular letter which you issued to the inspectors in November, 1907, insinuating that managers were taking bribes for appointments to the schools submitted to the Commissioners?—I think so.

18286. You think it was?—I think so; I will not be certain, because you are asking me without notice, but so far as I know, it was. There was a big discussion at that time on the subject you mention, and I was asked by the Board to obtain information from the inspectors.

18287. The CHAIRMAN.—What was the charge or insinuation?—We did not insinuate anything. I deny that entirely. I have not seen the circular for six years, but I am sure we did not make any insinuation. That was not our idea at all.

18288. Mr. CORRY.—Whatever the idea was, it was calculated to leave an impression on the minds of inspectors that bribes were taken by managers for appointments to schools?—But the Board wished to obtain from the inspectors any information they had on the subject.

18289. You stated in the proceedings in connection with the great improvements that have been made in the condition of the schools since the new system came in that the bad schools have largely disappeared, that the girls' schools are models of neatness, that there is a great advance in the boys' schools, that more desks are now provided, that there are kindergarten desks for infants, that flowers are now common, and also school costumes and libraries?—Yes.

18290. That does not appear to be borne out by the reports of the inspectors?—I expended my pains in my direct evidence, but I do not think I went so far as to say that libraries and museums were as common as other things.

18291. But you say there is an improvement?—There is an improvement in libraries and museums, and in all the other respects I have mentioned.

18292. You say Mr. Dale attributed the condition of the schools to the lack of local interest, and that that is no longer true. Now, here is what what Mr. T. P. O'Connor says in connection with the Cork district in 1910:—"There is a considerable number of schools deficient in classroom accommodation. Many of the schools are without a playground; in others the plot is too small. On the subject of furniture and equipment there is little new or gratifying to report. The schools have as a rule to be content with the barest essentials, perhaps dating back 30 years, and faded and worn, and a still more ancient globe of pigmy size, pictures soiled and defaced, charts begrimed, idle clocks, broken casks, blackboards

1914 June, 1913.]

Mr. W. J. M. STANLEY, M.A., LL.D., examined.

[Continued.]

belonging to the same. These may not all be found in accommodation in any one school, but they are familiar items in each school's equipment." That is in regard to Cork. And Mr. McElwaine, writing in Cork at the same time, says that the scrubbing of floors is much neglected?—What is the date of that?

18298. 1910. "There are school floors which are not scrubbed once in a year. The whitewashing and colouring of the walls and painting of the woodwork are not done as regularly as they should be done. The schools are not well equipped for physical culture. Drill is nominally taught in the great majority of schools." That is in Cork. Now in Athlone Mr. Craig reports that the walls are very often bare, except for a few maps often torn and discoloured, desks of faulty design, poor in condition and insufficient in number. In Westport "a spirit of indifference to education is shown by the reluctance of parents to purchase the books required." Mr. Fenton says, "In too many cases the schools present a neglected appearance, and the playground is in bad repair." Mr. Daly, in the Westport districts, says the schools are as a rule not well kept, and patches of plaster falling off the walls are not renewed. Mr. Cosser reports that the training of infants is one of the weakest points in the instruction. Mr. Connolly, writing in the Sligo district, says the schools are of poor structure, is in keeping with the building relics of a past age. Foul walls, a thatched roof, and a few desks seem to be simple equipment. In Dundalk Mr. Hogan reports, "I fear any improvement in the school is as far off as ever"—That would be in 1906.

18299. In Banishillen Mr. McEntook reports that formerly the schools were brushed in the evenings, but now he finds the brushing and dusting proceeding between 9.30 and 10 o'clock in the morning, and the air continues dust-laden when the pupils are arriving. These are the official reports from all Ireland for that year, that is three years ago, and I fail to see how they support your statement that everything is going on satisfactorily?—I never said that. I never said everything was going on satisfactorily; indeed I believe the very opposite. I said there was a great improvement, and this statement is not inconsistent with anything you have read. If you read the reports on the schools ten years ago, you would have got very much stronger language from the inspectors. I will tell you exactly what I did say. I said there was an immense improvement. With the building grants that we are giving at present, we are erecting schools quite as good as the schools in England. I said we had made a rule that whenever infants were enrolled there should be kindergarten desks. I said with regard to the bad schools that in every case their owners had applied for a building grant, so that in a few years if the building grants were allowed to continue there would not be a bad school in Ireland. They would have disappeared long ago if the building grants had not been stopped for six years.

18295. The CHAIRMAN.—Are they stopped now?—No, they are not stopped now. What I said was that things were in the way of improvement, and that there had been an immense development since the time of Mr. Dale, and I defy any inspector in Ireland to deny that. I have gone through thousands of schools; I have seen them both before and since, and I have as much right to my opinion as anyone with regard to the appearance of the schools.

18298. Mr. COSSET.—You have a perfect right, but I take it that it is quite possible that I have visited as many schools within the last thirteen years as you have?—You have visited as many as 2,000?

18297. I think so. Really, there are very few days of the week that I do not visit a school?—What I said of the boys' schools was that the great improvement had taken place since 1911. Before that, as I have often said, the floors were grimy enough; if you read my speeches you will find denunciations of the condition of the schools at least equal to those of any of the inspectors whose reports you have read. The standard of 1911, by directing the teachers' attention to these things, has brought about a great improvement.

18298. The CHAIRMAN.—Are there some districts where the improvement is more marked?—I think there is the greatest possible difference between districts.

18299. And there are some where there is stagnation?—I am not disposed to deny that.

18300. Mr. COSSET.—I have these extracts from all Ireland?—There are certain districts, for instance, along the coast of Kerry (the inland parts are not so good) where the schools are kept excellently, and I never could see anything to find fault with in the state of the floors or out-fittings. And the same thing is true of Clare and Limerick. There are other districts where the condition of the schools is an eyesore. We all know that one cannot really reform education without reforming the social life of the people; and that takes an acorn of years. The advance in the social well-being of the poor since the *Ice Age* has not been tremendous.

18301. Mr. HENLY.—Does not portion of Limerick come in on that circuit?—Yes, bits of it. The schools in Ireland differ in the most extraordinary way. Where there is a good manager, who is interested in his work, the school is good; where there is a manager who is not, the school is liable not to be good. In the last thirteen years the managers' attention has been concentrated on education more than ever before, and a great number of them take a great interest in their schools. I say without fear of contradiction that there has been an immense improvement in the state of Irish education. Considering the amount of attention that has been directed to it, it would be very strange if it were otherwise.

18302. Mr. COSSET.—You had something in your evidence yesterday to the absence of any reference to merit marks in your rules?—Kindly say that again.

18303. The absence of any reference to merit marks?—I understand what you mean. There is a mention in the rules of the fact that the school must show merit.

18304. But the Committee had a very strong desire from the start, if I am expressing the view of the Committee, to know why the rules and regulations of the Board did not contain any specific and clear reference to the merit marks?—I thought I explained that; it was through fear of the Comptroller and Auditor-General.

18305. Yes, but I do not know whether that explanation would be considered satisfactory?—By the Comptroller and Auditor-General?

Well, even satisfactory to this Committee, satisfactory to me at any rate, as a member of the Committee.

18306. The CHAIRMAN.—I want to be clear. I do not know whether Mr. Cosset means the same thing as I do. Take an instance, that three "v.g.'s" are necessary for promotion to the first of first grade. How would the Auditor-General deal with that?—He does not know any thing about that.

18307. And what would be the objection to having that appear in your rules?—In that case he would insist on the three "v.g.'s" being got, but we give promotion sometimes in exceptional circumstances, even without them.

18308. Mr. COSSET.—I think it would be more satisfactory to have it quite regularly stated that three "v.g.'s" are necessary for first of first?—The Board has not the slightest objection.

18309. That it should be so stated?—Yes.

18310. I hope we are done with merit marks, from what you said yesterday?—I hope so.

18311. But that is the explanation of it now?—Entirely. The Board likes to leave things as vague as possible, in order that its payments may not be subjected to very close scrutiny.

18312. The CHAIRMAN.—May I ask you, just to be perfectly clear, do you think the Auditor-General might step in and interfere if you gave an increment or promotion by the system of compensation?—He certainly would, unless we got permission from the Treasury, which nearly always refuse permission to sanction that device.

19th June, 1913.]

Mr. W. J. M. STANLEY, M.A., LL.D., examined.

[Continued.]

13313. Mr. HENLEY.—I saw a letter that was addressed to you some time ago in reference to the conditions on which first, second, and third class were awarded to the students leaving training colleges. The letter went from ———, and there was a positive refusal to give the conditions on which those classes were awarded?—That is, the marks?

13314. Not the marks, but the conditions?—But are not the conditions the marks?

13315. I do not know?—They are, and the Board has a great objection to give the marks got by candidates in their examination.

13316. That letter was shown to me by the principal, and it was simply an inquiry to know what were the conditions on which students leaving training colleges got first class, second class, and third class?—That is, the marks.

13317. It was absolutely refused?—The Board has always refused to give the marks.

13318. The Auditor-General could not come in there?—But that is in the interest of education. The Board wishes to make its examinations as little objectionable as possible.

13319. Mr. CORRY.—I can easily understand, and I am sure the Committee as a whole can easily understand, why in your department as in any other department, in the formal acknowledgment of communication the expression "I am directed by the Commission" should be used, and that it is necessarily used; but we find the use of it in at least one other document in a way that seems to require explanation. Mr. Knight, Secretary of the Belfast Teachers' Association, wrote to you on the 14th of November, 1910, asking for some information in regard to the conditions governing increment, and he had the following reply:—From whom?

13320. From your Private Secretary, on the 24th of November:—"Dear Sir—I reply to your letter to the Resident Commissioner, of the 14th inst., in which you request to be informed of the character of the reports required to warrant the awards of increment and promotion to teachers in the various grades. I am requested to say that the Commissioners do not deem it desirable to give formal public expression to any more precise rules in those matters than are to be found in Chapter 8 of the Code. I am, yours faithfully, A. N. Barnardo Wyse." Now, the name of the Commissioner is used. "The Commissioners do not deem it desirable to give formal expression." Was that request of the Belfast teachers decided by the Commissioners?—Not that particular letter, but it had already decided that such information should not be given.

13321. But the Board did not decide it in this particular case?—Certainly not; it decided in before.

13322. When before?—When the rules came before it. We had a very long discussion on that very question whether the merit marks, and the conditions of increment, should be put in the rules or not, and it was decided point blank not to do it.

13323. The request of the Belfast teachers was never put before the Commissioners?—Certainly not.

13324. And their name was used?—And it is quite right to say it.

13325. And Mr. Philip Ward, who was examined here, seemed to think that it was quite improper used?—His statement does not settle the matter. He would not know. Why should he? It was decided at the Board long before he was a member.

13326. So that the letter of Mr. Knight was not before the Commissioners?—Certainly not. The Commissioners' name was rightly used in the answer to it. When the Board has decided a general principle, you must not expect every instance of its application to be brought before it.

13327. But apart from the regularity, or irregularity it may be, in the terms of Mr. Wyse's letter, will you give the Committee any good reason why the teachers should not get precise information of the character of the merit marks they are entitled to?—Personally, I have not the slightest objection to giving them that information, and I would put it in the rules, but

the Board decided that in the interest of the teachers it was better not. I had no more to do with that decision than any other member. It was not done on my initiative at all, and probably if it were left to me, I should point them in the rules.

13328. Mr. HENLEY.—And would the Board overrule you on the subject?—Certainly it might, and it often does. My individual views are not more sacrosanct than anyone else's.

13329. Mr. CORRY.—In the Tipperary cases, upon which I will ask you some questions later, there was some criticism by a teacher of one inspector, that was criticism by Mr. Mansfield of Mr. Welby?—Yes.

13330. Will you kindly explain to the Committee why the Belfast teachers have not been asked to republish their public criticism of the whole inspection staff of the Belfast circuit?—There is safety in a multitude. If you attack a sufficient number of people, you can do what you like; but if you attack an individual, it is dangerous. That certainly is the case in legal actions. You can say what you like of a class, if not composed of managers of schools, but if you say certain things of an individual he will have you in Court.

13331. So it comes to this—it is not a legal action, and it is not governed I think by nice discriminations of law, but it comes to this that it would be open to Mr. Mansfield, would it, to criticise even in strong language the three inspectors of the Clonmel circuit, but it would not be open to him to criticise one?—I do not say that. The question is how many constitute a multitude? I said there was safety in a multitude.

13332. But we will have to come closer to it. The teachers in the Belfast circuit have published a statement that they have no confidence in the local inspectors, and that they are being forced to settle down in silence as hopeless discontent as the victims of harshness and injustice. That is a clear charge of harshness and injustice against the whole inspection staff of Belfast. There are two ways of looking at the safety of a multitude. Is it the multitude of inspectors or of Belfast teachers that gives the safety?—I think a little of both. When I am going to make an attack I much prefer to be one of a large number.

13333. So that I may take it that one of the reasons which operated against calling on the Belfast teachers to republish their criticism was that there was a multitude there to be attacked?—I don't think that is quite fair. I do not blame you, but I do not think it is quite fair that you should trust the Board as if it was an individual and more or less actuated by consistent and rational motives. It is indeed an innumerable body (hence I always speak of it as "it") composed of members who are directly members when it is not sitting. No two Boards are absolutely identical. What one Board might do another might not do.

13334. The CHAIRMAN.—Do you mean one meeting of the Board?—Yes; and I could not anticipate the action. It adds some excitement to my position to conjecture what view any particular Board will take on any particular question. What I say is not damaging to the Board, because the same thing applies to Parliament. And then you have to consider the constitution of the Board, which is a very important point from many points of view. It is a very excellent constitution, but it does not show to advantage in maintaining discipline, and until a case arises which really drives it into action, from its inactivity, nothing is likely to be done. In the case of Tipperary this vice inactivity was overcome, but it was otherwise in the case of Belfast.

13335. Mr. CORRY.—So it comes to this, that the Board being so constituted as it is cannot be expected to be quite consistent in its action, and that what might escape one time will be punished another time?—He who expects consistency from a Board may be written down an ass, that is any Board except a paid Board, which can be held responsible for the performance of its duty.

13336. The CHAIRMAN.—They are bound to be regular in attendance?—At any rate, it is their duty to be regular in attendance. You cannot get consistency from a Board, or Parliament, or House of Representatives, or even a County Council.

13337. Mr. CONNOR.—So it comes to this, that the Belfast teachers, for this attack on their inspectors, may be penalised at one meeting of the Board, and escape at another meeting of the Board?—I think it is quite probable that on account of various reasons the Belfast teachers would have escaped at any meeting of the Board.

13338. Does it not follow from your explanation, which is very clear and very interesting, that Mr. Mansfield might have escaped punishment at one meeting of the Board and be penalised at another?—I said of the Belfast teachers that they would have escaped at any meeting of the Board; I say of Mr. Mansfield that he would have escaped at one meeting of the Board.

13339. I think we have very valuable information from you with respect of escape of the Belfast teachers. In the returns or memorandum which the Commissioners issued to the Belfast teachers they say as the returns indicate that the inspectors now in Belfast are stricter than their predecessors, how is the Board to determine that the present standard is the right one, and that the standard of the inspectors who were removed was the wrong one?—What they want so there was the report of the chief inspectors. They had nothing else to go upon.

13340. But the chief inspectors only inspected, I think, 15 out of 111 schools that were complained of?—What they did was by arrangement with the deputation. I suggested to them that they should take a sample, and that if the report on this showed a marked divergence from the reports of the senior and district inspectors, possibly one might find it necessary to examine the whole lot. Mr. Wood was asked to put the names into a hat, and to take out 15 or so, whatever the number was, and these were examined both by Mr. Purser and by Mr. Hynes, in those 15 cases their judgment coincided with that of the other inspectors, did it not?

13341. Mr. HASTY.—Oh, no?—I am speaking from memory, but is not that so?

13342. Oh, no?—With regard to Belfast?

13343. With regard to Belfast?—What is the divergence?

13344. Forty-six per cent?—Between what?

13345. Between Mr. Purser and the other marks?—Didn't the chief inspectors say in their report that they agreed to the present marks?

Mr. CONNOR.—Substantially.

13346. Mr. HARRISON.—In 46 per cent. of the cases the mark is different, but it is always the one way?—It is my impression that the chief inspectors said that they agreed with their subordinates.

13347. Mr. HASTY.—It is higher in every case, I think, but one. This is the report? (report handed to witness)?—There is a very slight difference. In Frankfort Street it is lower than the mark given before. In Grosvenor Road Purser has given "very middling," which is lower than the inspector's mark. In the next school Mr. Hynes has "fair," which is lower. In Infirmary Lane, Downpatrick, Purser and Hynes give "fair," and the inspector gave "good." The differences are mostly one-half; in the majority of cases the marks given by Hynes and Purser are lower than those given by the inspector.

Mr. HASTY.—I do not think that is so.

13348. Mr. HARRISON.—What was the difference in time between the visits?—A good deal, possibly a year and a half or two years.

13349. Did the teachers know that there was likely to be re-inspections?—I fancy not, because the names were taken at random.

13350. But did they not know that there was likely to be a re-inspection?—Possibly they would have heard that from the deputation.

13351. And perhaps they were all working at high pressure?—I suppose they must have heard. These things are never kept secret.

13352. Mr. CONNOR.—In some of your communications with the Teachers' Association, in a letter written to the Belfast teachers, and I think in a communica-

tion to the Tipperary people, the Commissioners state that it is impossible to deal satisfactorily with complaints and appeals of this kind if they are not made at once to the Office, but are you aware that the appeals or complaints most of necessity be tardy because of the delay in getting the minutes?—What the Board was finding fault with was that they came in a mass a very long time afterwards, and it was very hard to deal with them.

13353. But in any case there is certain to be delay?—Appeals are very unsatisfactory things, as I have stated many times.

13354. But the minute does not issue to the school very often for two months after the inspection?—The examinations issue them as soon as they can. I think Mr. Purser gave reasons for occasional delays; further inquiries and matters of that kind.

13355. What do you think, from your knowledge and experience of the inspectors of the schools, of a suggestion that the inspector might have a copy of the report that he is to send to the Board in the observation book?—I think the observations are very much of the same character as the report which is subsequently sent in.

13356. If they are, it is all right, and his observations would be very much of the character or kind of report that you want, that you were speaking of yesterday, that is a report of a general kind noticing good points and shortcomings, and so on; and do you not think that if he puts these matters in the observation book, and if he notices and makes comment on the satisfactory aspects of the work and on the unsatisfactory aspects of the work, it would be perhaps a better arrangement if a copy of that was sent to the Office?—I think that question was asked, was it not, of the examiners?

13357. No, but it was asked of somebody?—I should like to know exactly what the person dealing with reports thought of it. As I have never been an inspector, it is not a point on which I should like to give a final answer without consideration.

13358. The Examiner or Not?—It was a question that was suggested by Mr. Harrison, that perhaps it might happen that an inspector might make the observations in the observation book when he felt himself irritated at the end of the day?—It is a matter on which one would require time to come to a conclusion. I see one possible disadvantage, that it would concentrate the notice of the teacher too much on the inspector. If the report comes in the name of the Commissioners, the teachers might think the inspector was not so directly to blame for it. There is also a rule of the Board that the inspector must not write the report when he is in the school.

13359. Mr. CONNOR.—Where is that?—It is a rule for the inspectors. Years ago a person might sit down and spend an hour writing a report and not paying much attention to what was being done. We did not like that.

13360. But do you not think that the Belfast teachers had very good grounds of complaint that when they came up and submitted 111 cases reports were only got on 15 of three cases?—They commented to that themselves. My arrangement with them was that if, in a large proportion of the cases selected by Mr. Ward or someone else, the difference was, in the opinion of the Board, very considerable, we would examine all the schools, however troublesome it would be; but when the report of the chief inspectors came before the Board did not think the difference great enough.

13361. The CHAIRMAN.—Did you notice this on page 2, for when you were talking of the selection of the case, you seemed to be uncertain about it?—"In order to obtain more conclusive evidence of the existence or non-existence of the undermarking alleged, it was decided that the chief inspectors should visit a certain number of schools, and give their opinion of the character of the work done. As the teachers were unwilling to select the schools to be visited, and as the chief inspectors wished to avoid choosing the schools, the following plan was adopted?"—What the teachers objected to was not so much the selection of sample

schools as that they should be expected to select them. I asked them to select the best schools from their point of view; but they would not do that. They said that it was an invidious or a difficult thing, or that they had not the information, or something of that kind.

13362. Mr. CORRY.—In reference to the question of the severity of the inspectors in Belfast and the possible leniency of others, was not Mr. Kelly, the senior inspector, in Belfast during the whole time the teachers complained?—I cannot tell exactly how long he has been there, but he has been there at least seven years. He has been there a good long time.

13363. He was there, and how could severity and leniency be identified by the same man?—It is quite possible.

13364. That he should change?—I think it was explained that in the earlier years of the system the inspectors stepped as warily as possible, and that they gradually put on the screw.

13365. But this would not be in the earlier years?—It went on to 1906, at any rate, because Mr. Hynes reported in 1906 that the marking was too easy.

13366. In certain parts?—In the parts that he visited, but I do not know what they were. He visited districts, wherever that was.

13367. The CHAIRMAN.—I see from this statement before me that Mr. Kelly visited Brown Street in 1901?—That was before he was appointed senior inspector.

13368. And he was there in 1906, in the same district?—They got directions in the circulars to be easy in the earlier years.

13369. Mr. CORRY.—But the teachers think that the change in the inspection standard, having in view the fact that Mr. Kelly was there all the time, would appear to lend some countenance and support to the idea that some pressure was brought to bear on them to raise the standard?—I do not know. I heard them say that, but both the chief inspectors denied it. Mr. Hynes was present, and I think he denied it, did he not? They spoke about secret instructions being sent out. I denied that any secret instructions had been sent out without my authority, and I never saw them.

13370. Well, formal secret instructions are one thing, but did you at any time convey your opinion to the Belfast inspectors that the standard of marking was too high?—Certainly not. As I said in my direct statement, I visited a few schools near Newmarket with Mr. Hynes in 1903, and both Mr. Hynes and I were of opinion that there were some schools there which, though very unsatisfactory, were marked "very good" and "excellent." But I never told Mr. Hynes to give instructions to the Belfast inspectors, because, as a matter of fact, I knew very little about the Belfast schools. I was in a few of them with Mr. Dale, but I do not think that except on one or two occasions I have visited any since. I had no idea whether the Belfast schools were highly marked or not. Mr. Hynes succeeded Mr. Purser as chief inspector in the North of Ireland in 1904, and possibly this event had the same effect on the marking as the succession of Mr. Welpy to Mr. W. A. Brown in Chancery. There is no doubt that Mr. Hynes did report in 1906 that Mr. ———'s district, at any rate, was too easily marked, and he recommended that he should be removed from the circuit.

13371. The chief inspectors, in their report on the Belfast case, embodied the reports of the district inspectors?—Certainly.

13372. Did you give the teachers any opportunity of proving matter-of-fact statements that were controverted by the inspectors?—That matter was before the whole Board. I proposed that these documents should be sent to the teachers, but the legal members said that it would be contrary to usage. They said they were confidential documents, and informed us that we should lay ourselves open to all sorts of pains and penalties if we published them.

13373. The CHAIRMAN.—That is if the observations of the inspectors were confidential?—Certainly.

13374. Mr. CORRY.—You made the following observation to the Belfast deputation:—"When we introduced a uniform school year we had reason for it. They have got it in England and in Scotland and elsewhere. That, of course, may be no reason why we should have it, neither is it any reason for saying we have got a double dose of original sin because we adopted it."

13375. Does a uniform school year obtain in England?—Yes, I think so. Is not that so, Mr. Harrison?

13376. Mr. HARRISON.—No, but there is an idea of it. At present most local authorities have their own uniform school year, and it is not the same throughout the country; that is to say that in a great part of the South of England the school begins on the 1st of April and ends on the 31st of March; in other places it would begin on the 1st of August or 1st of May. In some places it would coincide with the calendar year?—I think that originally the uniform school year was suggested by Mr. Dale.

Mr. HARRISON.—The principle of the uniform school year is accepted by almost every local authority.

13377. Mr. CORRY.—But we have had it in evidence that not only is each local authority allowed its own school year, but that various schools under the same local authority might have a different school year. That was in Mr. Dale's evidence?—I do not know; I have not seen it.

13378. Mr. HENRY.—In the Scotch code when the department agree to place a school on the list of those to which grants may be made it assigns to the school a school year with reference to which all grants that are paid by instalment or otherwise will be calculated?—But they have a uniform school year.

13379. No?—I do not mean to say all over the country, but within certain districts. Within certain limits they have a uniform school year. They have not got anything like what we used to have, that is that each school had its own year.

13380. Mr. CORRY.—It is open to any local authority there to have a school year?—I have no doubt that it would be convenient in Ireland to have a different school year in Cork and Antrim. We would agree to that.

13381. Mr. Dale said that within the same area, under the same local authority, a school could have its own school year in England?—I do not know. There are great advantages to the same school year.

13382. And there are certain disadvantages too?—In their relations with intermediate schools there is a great advantage, and it also suits inspectors (so they tell me, at any rate), since they know with regard to any school how much work it ought to have done. They get quite familiar with that when each school begins at the same period of the year.

13383. I find in that memorandum connected with the Belfast case this statement of yours:—"The inspector's instructions are, that he should form his judgment not upon the pupils, but upon the teacher and his method of work."—That is at the beginning of the year. If you inspect a school, for instance, within the first fortnight it would be absurd to give any great weight to the proficiency of the pupils in the programme for the year.

13384. But that would be a very extreme case where the merit mark would be concerned?—But you must remember that the inspector has to work throughout the year, and he has to begin at the beginning of the school year doing something. I think I went fully into that so well as I was able.

13385. Mr. HARRISON.—That would not have been a visit to test the school for the merit mark?—According to the spirit of the circulars, no inspector would be justified in lowering a merit mark at that time. Certainly not; he would not do it.

13386. Mr. CORRY.—But he would be at liberty to do it?—If it came to my knowledge I would not allow it, since they are told not to reduce the mark without very good reason.

13387. The CHAIRMAN.—But it was put before us that that might be done, and is there not a danger of an inspector not making allowance if he came in in the first month of the uniform school year, and of the school suffering a great injustice in that way?—The inspectors are told often enough by the chief inspector that they should not.

13388. How is it that they are doing it—it was brought before us quite recently?—I should like to get particulars. It is a very difficult thing to answer for the efficiency or the common sense with which people perform their duties. There is not the slightest doubt that if it were brought home to me that an inspector had reduced the mark of a school during the first month of the school year, after paying too much attention to what the children were supposed to know, I should consider it a very indefensible proceeding.

13389. And do you consider that it would be difficult to test for the first three or four months?—After three or four months one has got a certain amount of material on which one can examine the children.

13390. Mr. HARRISON.—In the case of a visit during the first months the inspector would only send in what is known as an incidental report?—It might be the annual report of the year.

13391. Is it possible that the annual report might be sent in on a visit made in the first months?—Nothing very much may depend on the annual report. For instance, the school may be one of the satisfactory schools in which the inspector is directed by the 1911 circular not to hold an elaborate inspection, but only to see that things are going on all right.

13392. On the other hand, might he be forced by the condition of things to make a report on which important might depend on a visit during the first months?—I would not like to go so far as to say that he could not. It is very difficult in regulations to anticipate every case, and one has to leave a good deal to common sense. But if the inspector did what you say, he would be acting contrary to the spirit of our regulations.

13393. But might he be forced by the nature of his work?—You mean if the school was not very satisfactorily worked?

13394. I do not mean that, but that he had to come to this school in going round?—I cannot answer that question as I do not interfere very much with the inspectors as to their distribution of the work. That is done by the senior inspectors under the control of the chief inspectors, who are responsible for the allocation of the work. I have no doubt that, being reasonable men, the senior inspectors would take early in the year the schools that would not be likely to be affected by the short period of preparation and the particular season of the year. I should like that question to be put to people who deal directly with that matter.

13395. Mr. HENRY.—There is a special circular issued that the dates of these inspections must vary from year to year?—Yes, they must vary.

13396. So that when they vary from year to year they must sometimes take place early in the year?—Certainly, some schools must come early in the year.

13397. Sir HIRSH WILKINSON.—There is one question that suggests itself. Inspectors are expected to hold normally three inspections of each school during the year. Would it be possible so to arrange the schedule that the annual inspection would come within four months of the end of the year?—I doubt it very much. That would mean that 3,000 schools would have to be visited for the main inspection during the last three months of the year. That could not be done.

13398. I said four months?—It could not be done, because it is a longer inspection than the incidental visit.

13399. Mr. HENRY.—Could it be met by allowing each school its own school year?—There are great objections to that. I would not care to go back to the old system, which was universally condemned by the people we consulted. Mr. Dale complimented us on the great advance we made in introducing a uniform school year.

13400. Mr. CORRY.—Well, that is only Mr. Dale's opinion?—Well, but does not that settle the question? Mr. CORRY.—I do not agree with that at all.

13401. Mr. HARRISON.—Is it absolutely necessary that there should be a full formal report on every school every year?—I do not think so.

13402. Under the present system it does seem necessary?—I do not think it is necessary.

13403. Under a more chaotic system it would not?—I do not think it is necessary or desirable even as present.

13404. Then at any rate, a change in that direction would have your approval?—Yes, I have always tried to get rid of it; in fact, I have suggested to the inspectors that in accordance with the spirit of the 1911 circular it is not necessary to visit the schools for the annual report at all, and that it is possible to answer all the queries of the annual report out of the incidental reports.

13405. Is it necessary that the inspector should write a report of every incidental visit?—It is not if the visit is only for a short time; it is only necessary if it occupies some time, say, an hour, and a number of incidental visits are really of less than an hour's duration.

13406. But even after an hour's visit, does it not hamper him to write a report?—You mean that it is a waste of time?

13407. It is difficult to report on a school after an hour's visit?—Sometimes. With our usual humanity we have told the inspectors, treating incidental reports, that their reports generally should be of a laudatory character. On a matter of that kind I should like to consult the chief inspectors in order to test my views. I think a man might answer all the queries of the annual report without visiting the schools for the annual report, but on the matter supplied by the other visits. If a school is very efficient one need not waste time on paying it a lengthy annual visit. Before I forget, I should like to say that circular is the only one that you have not got. It was issued this year. It is really explanatory of the 1911 circular. (Witness hands in circular.)

13408. Mr. CORRY.—I take it that by the abolition of what was called the results examinations the country gained something, but I am one of those who believe that every creditor has a debtor, that if you gain in one direction you have a loss in another?—That is human life.

13409. What do you think of the loss in education by the abolition of the results examinations (I am not talking of payment by results, but of the individual examination of the children)?—Personally I think that we have not lost anything of much value, but I dare say some people differ from me.

13410. Was not the individual examination a very great incentive to exertion in preparing for it, and have they not lost that?—I do not think so. I know a good deal about the stimulus required by children, as I have a large family, and I do not think there should be a stimulus for children beyond interest in their work. I think that is the only stimulus worth having.

13411. Do you not think that it was a fine training in self-reliance and in self-confidence to have to face the annual examination?—A fine training in exertion during the last six weeks.

13412. No?—Not in your school, Mr. Coffey.

13413. But you say exertion during six weeks?—I do; it was just cramming. What I mean is, that there was a tremendous amount of cramming at the end of the school-year just as there is in the intermediate schools at present.

13414. There was repetition, not cramming?—Yes, iteration, to which Shakespeare applies an epithet not to be mentioned in the hearing of a Bishop.

13415. You can only say what you have heard in regard to this cramming?—My dear Mr. Coffey, there is no man living who has suffered more than I have from being crammed, and there is no man who has had longer experience of its effects on his digestion. I was 22 years of age when I won my Fellowship, a great deal too old for that sort of work, and in certain eventualities which I need not mention I may have to go in for the same test again.

18419. But pupils of Intermediate schools and students of the Universities have to stand examination?—I pity them.

18417. The CHAIRMAN.—There is no earthly doubt about Intermediate examinations being crammed for?—I have heard constant complaints in Trinity College, and also in Belfast and elsewhere, as to the mechanical nature of the abilities of the boys who have done most brilliantly at the Intermediate examinations.

18418. The best teachers lay blame on us for permitting cramming, and I believe we are to blame for it?—There is nobody who has a greater admiration for Irish intellect than I have. There is no reason why you and I should not be proud of it, as we are Irishmen; but I do not know any intellect in Europe, except perhaps in some of the more southern nations, that suffers more from the dead hand of mechanical tests than that of the Irish boy. What he wants is ample air to expand in if you submit him to mechanical tests to which people of other countries—let us say Germans—may be subjected with impunity, he will suffer.

18419. But the Germans are not?—They are not, but I say that they might be (I do not wish to mention certain stolid people nearer home) subjected with impunity to mechanical tests, which would be fatal to an Irish boy.

18420.1. Mr. HELLER.—Might I read one statement from the report of 1910-11:—"There are few signs of improvement in the character of the education of candidates for King's Scholarship Examinations. There are a few really good papers that show evidence of a thorough grasp of fundamental ideas, but the majority of the papers show little common sense or power of thought, and bear every evidence of cram of the worst description. The frequency with which candidates answer questions not asked on the examination paper shows what a large part mere memorising plays in the preparation of candidates for the examination. These bad methods of preparation are by no means peculiar to Science. The methods are the same in most subjects, but the Science subjects bring the bad methods into stronger relief than most other subjects. As a result the training colleges are fed with material moulded in utterly inadequate methods of study, and can seldom correct the evil influence of those years of unsystematic unintelligent instruction?"—What Mr. Heller means by inadequate methods are the very methods Mr. Coffey is praising. I know Mr. Heller very well, and he is entirely against results examinations, but, like most scientific people, I think he goes too far.

18422. Mr. CONWAY.—I do not think that I have praised the results examinations. I have a strong view as to whether it would not be desirable, even in face of what you say (and I have a deep respect for your judgment and experience), notwithstanding that I still have a strong view that it would be desirable that our children should be examined?—But in this 1911 circular which the teachers have mentioned so often, we insist on examination in every school at least every three years, that is class examination, and in the case of schools that are doing badly we have such a high opinion of examination that we require it every year. We think examinations are an admirable thing for bringing a bad teacher up to the mark. The results system did a good deal of good work in 1872 in bringing home to managers and teachers the fact that the Irish schools were in an awful condition.

18423. But the question that I started with was, that while there have been some gains by the abolition of a set annual examination there have also been substantial losses?—Possibly.

18424. And one of the things that struck me is, that we all deplore the loss of local interest in education?—But it never existed.

18425. You say there is a lack of local interest?—Yes, and I used stronger language about that in 1902 than I do at present, and that was just after the results period. The attendance is 10 per cent. better than then.

18426. There are reasons for that?—My dear Mr. Coffey, give us credit for something.

18427. I give you credit for it. It is a very happy thing to find that the attendance has increased, but there are a number of things operating besides the education in the school that makes the attendance better. But one of the things that struck me was the lowering of the interest of parents. They have not now to look forward to the annual examination to see that their boys pass?—Why are they not satisfied with the examination by the teachers?

18428. The examination by the teachers in large cities in England and in certain schools in Belfast and in Dublin, I think, is quite satisfactory?—They preserve the records of the examinations in the country schools in Ireland, and I generally look into them.

18429. You do not question that the examination by a teacher in a school of 30 or 40 is devoid of all interest?—I do not know that.

18430. I am quite at one with you that it would be satisfactory enough if you had the head master examining four or five hundred pupils, but in a school of 30 or 40, where there is only one teacher, he is supposed to test his own work?—That is in accordance with the most advanced ideas of the Universities, where the professors have to examine their own pupils.

The CHAIRMAN.—And audit your own accounts. 18431.2. Mr. CONWAY.—But I certainly do not think it is the best way for a National school?—One of my great objections to examination is that it ruins the teaching. It would not be nearly so objectionable, mind you, if, as in the Intermediate schools, the inspector had no influence whatever on the fortunes of the school. If an inspector goes and examines an Intermediate school he does not injure the teacher, who listens to the examination by the inspector, and probably thinks that he would do it much better himself. Anyhow, he does not go about irritating the inspector; but if anything depends on the examination the teacher inevitably will copy the methods, or even the questions, of the inspector, and the result will be that the teaching will become mechanical and unintelligent. That is a very general opinion; it is certainly my opinion. I had much experience of it in the Queen's College, Galway. When I was lecturing there the students used to ask me occasionally whether they would get questions in a certain part of the course, and I said, "No; but I think you ought to understand it, although you may not be questioned on it." If they heard they were not going to be asked questions in it, they paid no further attention to me. That is the universal experience.

18433. I see some advantages in the abolition of the annual examination, but I see very substantial disadvantages. I understand that the position would be this now. The inspector goes into a school and selects at random a child here or there, and asks a few questions, and looks at the written work?—I think he would take a class. What I do myself when I go into a school is this: I take a class, the 4th class, or sometimes the 6th class, and I get every child in it to read. That is what I understand the inspector does.

18434. That, I think, is not what the inspector does. And then he reports, in the case of the Belfast teachers, not on the proficiency of the pupils, but on the teachers?—That is in the beginning of the year when he has not got any proficiency of the pupils to report on. Remember what I said, that towards the end of the year he would examine the proficiency, and if he found that it was extremely unsatisfactory, he would argue that the methods could not be satisfactory that had produced such bad fruits. Did I not say that?

18435. I think the feeling of the children at the end of the inspector's visit is that they are left without any sense of having said or done anything, and they have no interest in the inspector's visit?—I gather from their compositions that they take a very great interest in the inspector's visit. They usually tell me that the inspector visited the school to-day, and was very nice, and beautiful to look at, and that he asked them very hard questions.

19th June, 1913.]

Mr. W. J. M. SPARKS, M.A., LL.D., examined.

[Continued.]

18436. Sir HIRAM WILKINSON.—A point occurred to me when we were discussing the question of promotion of the pupils, and when there was a question raised that teachers sometimes refused to promote pupils, with the result that there was a disagreement between the pupils' parents and the teachers, and we discussed the question which Mr. Coffey has just been referring to as to the desirability of the pupils taking an interest in the Inspector's visit, and the parents themselves also taking an interest. The point is this, which I just wished to put by way of question for consideration, whether, if it is found impossible to revert to any general system of examination which could be elaborated so as to prevent the evils which everybody acknowledges in the case of the results system, an examination of the pupils as to whether they ought or ought not to be promoted, might not be possible, and might not at the same time arouse really the greatest interest that it would be possible on the part of the pupils. I only throw that out. I do not suppose you would care to narrow it without referring to the Inspector?—Will not that make the teacher's salary depend on the proficiency of the pupils? That is the objection I have to examinations.

18437. In this case there would be no danger of that. It would be simply one question—Is this boy fit to go up this year? And if it were feasible it would have the advantage I suggest of bringing out the attention of the pupils?—Yes.

Sir HIRAM WILKINSON.—Whether it can be done or not I will leave for the consideration of those who know better.

18438. Mr. COFFEY.—When a teacher appeals his appeal is forwarded to the Inspector of whose marking he complains?—Yes, certainly. A further report is got from the Inspector. Are those further observations of the Inspector sent to the teacher?—No.

18439. And no communication is made to the teacher or manager until the case is finally closed?—I would not say "finally closed," but until it is provisionally closed.

18440. Until you are in a position to say that the appeal cannot be allowed?—No; no decision of the National Board is irreversible. It would be more accurate to say that no decision is final. We do not approve of the laws of the Medes and Persians.

18441. But that correctly represents the procedure?—Yes.

18442. In your letter of the 2nd of November, Mr. Bonaparte Wyse's letter, the procedure is so represented?—I think so.

18443. But that does not seem consistent with the evidence of Mr. Wyse, because it is there stated that if the teacher is dissatisfied with the marking and appeals against it the general practice is to send the complete statement furnished by the Inspector to the teacher?—So it is, at a later time. They send the decision to the manager with the fuller statement.

18444. Mr. HENRY.—That is after the case is closed?—When the case is provisionally closed.

18445. Mr. COFFEY.—But that does not fit in with the letter of the 2nd of November, because it is stated there that if he is dissatisfied with the Inspector's marking and appeals against it, the general practice is to send the fuller statement furnished by the Inspector, and this action may or may not result in the re-inspection of the school; so that it appears from that letter that it was sent before the decision was communicated?—That was not intended.

18446. It is open to that reading?—Well, it was not intended. Did you read it that way?

18447. Yes?—It was not intended. There is no doubt in anybody's mind what the procedure is, as it is pursued in every case. An appeal comes in; it is referred to the Inspector; it is examined then by me, and my decision is final. It is open to revision on further information. A letter is written to the manager containing the further observations of the Inspector, and giving our decision upon the case. If the manager or the teacher wishes to write again, I always consider their letters, and it very often

happens that the teacher or manager communicates something which enables me to re-open the case. I have known of many cases. If my letters were read differently the fault was in the drafting.

18448. Was the further statement or statements of Mr. Weiply of the 26th of August, 1911, and 26th of October, 1911, or were any extracts from them forwarded to the Tipperary teachers who appealed? This was before the whole Board?—Yes. I am trying to recall the letter we wrote to the Tipperary teachers. I do not think we did communicate those any more than we did those in Bellin, and for the same reason, viz., the legal opinion of the Board that they could not be communicated.

18449. Mr. HENRY.—That would apply to every communication from the inspectors?—I have a very simple answer to that.

18450. Mr. COFFEY.—Were Mr. Weiply's further statements\* of the 26th of August and 26th of October, 1911, or any extracts from them forwarded to the Tipperary teachers?—We were not allowed to do it. I told you before with regard to the Bellin case that if I had my own way, I would have done it, and, in fact, some of my colleagues did do it. With regard to Professor Henly's question, whether it would not be equally illegal to send any portion of the Inspector's report, as we do in every case—is that your point Professor Henly?

18451. Mr. HENRY.—Yes?—My answer to that is, that I do that when the legal members of the Board are not present. Between ourselves, we venture to do many things when lawyers are not present which we should not be allowed to do in their presence. If I put it to the lawyers whether I was acting illegally in communicating portions of a confidential document (as I always do in three cases to the manager and teacher), it is easy to anticipate what their answer would be.

18452. Then you could not send to any manager or teacher in Ireland a report on a school, it being a confidential document?—It is easy to answer that: the minute is not confidential, as the Inspector is told that it goes to the manager, and it is quite possible that the Board may remanage that for the future there are no such things as confidential documents. In that case the inspectors would have to alter the character of their reports, which would cease to be privileged documents. I do not know whether in England reports are confidential documents. Are they?

18453. Mr. HARRISON.—I should be sorry to give a lawyer's opinion?—But I prefer a lay man's opinion.

18454. I fancy that to a large extent what the Inspector says in a report would be regarded as privileged?—As privileged—that is a very important point.

18455. I do not exactly know, when you say that a report is confidential, what the term connotes?—We were once asked by a manager whether it was permitted (and this has a bearing on a statement which Mr. Coffey made the other day) to read the reports on his schools from the pulpit. We wrote back to say that it was not.

18456. The CHAIRMAN.—I thought we heard that was done sometimes?—Plenty of illegal things are done in this country.

18457. Mr. Coffey told us?—Yes; he did; but the next time, Mr. Coffey, you will be able to bolster yourself with the opinion of the lawyers. They pronounced it to be an illegal act.

18458. Mr. COFFEY.—In the final reply of the Commissioners to the memorandum of the Tipperary teachers, it is stated that the memorial was referred to Mr. Weiply on the 14th of July. Is not that so?—Yes.

18459. And he furnished a reply on the 19th of August?—Yes, certainly.

18460. Was not that an extraordinary delay?—I asked him the reason the other day by letter. Should you like to know it?

18461. It would be well to read the letter. I may tell you that it is important from the fact that the Commissioners afterwards blamed the teachers for their



19th June, 1918.]

Mr. W. J. M. STARR, M.A., LL.D., examined.

[Continued.]

delay?—I will give you Mr. Welpy's reply. I asked him whether he was on vacation; he said he was making the July papers.

13462. Mr. HENLY.—Surely that is not so urgent as to prevent him answering?—It certainly was very urgent. One has to work at full pressure at those papers, because the Board is very touchy if the results are not ready by the end of August.

13463. Mr. COFFEY.—Of course, that delay was important, in view of the complaint that the Commissioners made later that the fact that the teachers held back their complaints had made it more difficult to investigate them. But there was a month's delay?—Yes, you may take it as a month.

13464. And there was delay by the Board themselves?—I think not.

13465. Oh, yes?—I do not think there was any delay after that.

13466. The CHAIRMAN.—Oh, yes; the case came up before the National Board on the 19th of September, and it was postponed till the 16th of November?—That was in order to get my report.

13467. Further evidence?—Yes, and the teachers were asked to forward detailed statements. But when was the delay before that?

13468. Mr. COFFEY.—From the 16th of July to the 16th of August?—That was the delay of Mr. Welpy.

13469. And then there was some delay in getting the teachers' specific cases?—That was not our fault, was it?

13470. No, but there was delay later, because you only put your official machinery in motion in November by sending Mr. Hynes there?—I had to go there first.

13471. The CHAIRMAN.—It was referred to Mr. Welpy for his decision on the 17th of October, 1911, and the Resident Commissioner then visited 70 schools, and Mr. Hynes was then ordered to inspect some of the schools?—I do not think there was any delay, except Mr. Welpy's first delay, because by a rule of the Board no controversial matter can be brought before it in August and the first half of September.

13472. Mr. COFFEY.—The Commissioners, in their final letter, expressed strong disapproval of the action of the teachers in presenting their claims in a joint memorial, but had not some individual cases of appeal in that group been forwarded previously?—I only know of two—one was Mardylke and the other was Gortagowra.

13473. Gortagowra and Mardylke?—Yes, that is right.

13474. Have you the particulars in connection with these appeals?—I can tell you of them. There was an appeal from Mardylke.

13475. Was Mardylke prior to Gortagowra?—I really could not tell you. There was an appeal from Mardylke and I went myself to the school. The marks had been reduced. It was one of those in which I thought Mr. Welpy had been too severe.

13476. What was the date of the appeal?—I can get that date for you.

13477. I was very anxious to have full particulars?—If you want that, I will bring it to-morrow morning. Mardylke was one of those I referred to Mr. Hynes.

13478. What was the appeal?—As a matter of fact, the original appeal was not in the file. It has been separated from the file, and they are searching for it.

13479. We will leave Gortagowra and Mardylke over till to-morrow. You asked the Council teachers on this memorial to submit specific cases, and they forwarded 14, I think?—Yes.

13480. Why is it that only six of those appeals were sent to the chief inspector for report?—The cases submitted to the chief inspector were not those supplied by the teachers, but those selected by myself. I had arranged with the Board that I would pick out myself those in which I thought Mr. Welpy had been too severe.

13481. But let us see how that would work. You asked the teachers to send their cases. They sent up 14 cases in which they thought they had substantial grounds for complaint. Could you give me the date of their being sent up?—The date was not before my visit. It is not a question I need answer—if it was subsequent to my visit, I mean.

13482. But the Board asked them to specify their cases and they sent them up, 14 in October, 1911?—When were they before the Board?

13483. They were not before the Board, I take it, until some time in December, because the letter to the teachers from the National Board was written on the 14th of December?—This is my explanation. I arranged with the Board to visit certain schools, and it was agreed that the schools I picked out should be referred to the chief inspector. My visits began on the 4th of October, that was before the teachers' cases were sent in. I have got the dates here. My visits to the schools began on the 4th of October, 1911, and they went on till the 15th of October.

13484. Mr. HENLY.—What day of the week was the 14th?—I did not put down the day of the week, I only put down the date. I left Dublin on the 4th of October, I have it here: "4th October, 1911. On the way to Adare."

13485. The CHAIRMAN.—I have down here that the appeals were referred to Mr. Welpy on the 17th of October, and Mr. Welpy reported on the 26th. And then I have here that the Resident Commissioner visited 70 schools, but I have not got the dates?—I can give you the dates. The dates of my visits are from the 4th to the 15th of October, and those visits were made considerably before the specific cases of the teachers were sent in.

13486. And that was before the appeals were referred to Mr. Welpy?—They could not be referred till they were received, and they had not been received.

13487. Mr. HENLY.—You could only be inspecting schools for eight days, for Saturday and Sunday must have intervened, and those including the 4th as one day, you were really eight days visiting the schools?—I dare say.

13488. Then you must have done practically nine schools a day?—Yes; I deprecate that would be about the number with a motor car.

13489. And then, apart from the distances, you could only be five-ninths of an hour in each school?—When you asked me how long I was, I said 20 or 25 minutes.

13490. Mr. COFFEY.—But whether you were long or short in the schools does not at all explain why, if an officer of the Board asks the teachers to furnish the cases they complain of, or that they thought they had substantial grievances in, those 14 cases that they did furnish were not sifted?—They were sifted by Mr. Welpy.

13491. That was no sifting; that was a submission of the cases to the man they had appealed against. Then you sent cases to the chief inspector?—Yes, my own cases, before I got those others at all.

13492. But you asked them to specify cases of complaint, and you got them, and in handing them over to the chief inspector for investigation you kept back eight of them?—No, I did not keep back any of them. The cases referred by the Board to Mr. Hynes were those which, by arrangement, I had selected, and not the particular cases sent forward by the teachers. Consequently you cannot say that we rejected a certain number of cases, because they were not before us when we referred the cases I had selected to the chief inspector.

13493. But they must have been?—No; they had been sent down to Mr. Welpy.

13494. But you had got the 14 cases in your office on the 16th of October?—Yes.

13495. And you referred 14 cases to Mr. Hynes?—Yes; when were they referred?

13496. The CHAIRMAN.—Mr. Hynes reported on them on the 7th of December?—When were they referred to Mr. Hynes?

The CHAIRMAN.—His reports on the 7th of December on 18 cases.

13497. Mr. COFFEY.—Of course, it is for you or for the office to say when the cases were referred to Mr. Hynes?—I cannot give you that date at present.

13498. We have the fact, at all events, that his report came on the 7th of December?—Yes; but he delayed a long time.

13499. We cannot say that?—I remember that he delayed. He was very busy and he delayed considerably. I don't know when they were referred to him.

18990. But it requires very large explanation why the 14 cases supplied were not sifted?—When did they come back from Mr. Welby?

The CHAIRMAN.—He reports on the 20th of October, and the intervening dates I have not got.

18991. Mr. COFFEY.—The only thing we have is that Mr. Hynde's report was forwarded on the 7th of December, and what I want explained is this. We asked Mr. Hynde, and Mr. Hynde said we would have to ask you, and now we have to ask you why, of the 14 specific cases that were sent up only six were sent for investigation to the chief inspector?—What I say at the present time is that the six were sent to him, not as turning part of the specific cases of the teachers, but as forming part of the cases selected by me.

18992. Mr. HENLY.—Why call for cases, and then not have them investigated?—I cannot say why the Board called for cases, except that Mr. Welby asked for specific cases to be submitted, and that he would answer them. The Board scrutinised Mr. Welby's answers, and apparently they were satisfied with them.

18993. If they were satisfied, why did they refer them to Mr. Hynde at all?—Because they referred them as belonging to the category which I had submitted.

18994. But it appears in one of your notes, or in the evidence, that the cases were selected by Dr. Starkie as being most favourable to the teachers?—Certainly.

18995. But don't you think the teachers were the best judges themselves of what was favourable to them?—Possibly.

18996. Would it not have been fairer to test them on their own ground?—If you asked me that now I might say that probably it would have been fairer. To be perfectly frank, I am in the difficulty of not being able to recall the circumstances.

18997. It was this difficulty that led to this inquiry with regard to these Tipperary cases, was it not?—Yes.

18998. Then, of course, it is a vital part of our whole inquiry, and we have to sift it and get the particulars? Quite right.

18999. But it is certainly not an explanation which I am prepared to accept as a member of the Committee, that cases were sent which you considered most favourable to the teachers, because my point is that the teachers should stand or fall by the cases they presented themselves, and there would be no meaning, if I may suggest or submit to you that view, in sending down the cases that the teachers had not complained at all about?—I don't know that.

19000. The CHAIRMAN.—As you have spoken of six cases the Bishop and I and Sir Hiram are greatly puzzled, because there are 18 cases on this memorandum. I want to repeat that about the six cases, because six cases are not mentioned in this, but thirteen?—Thirteen is the number I selected.

19001. Sir HIRAM WILKINSON.—And some of those do not belong to the complaints at all?—No; the six belong to the class Mr. Coffey is speaking of. They were in both classes.

19002. Mr. COFFEY.—I do not know anything about your classes?—But you do, because they are down in that memorandum.

All I know is that only six of the thirteen specific cases that the teachers sent up as showing their grievances have been investigated by the usual machinery, that is, the chief inspector. The whole thirteen were selected by the teachers, and only six were referred to the machinery of inspection.

## THIRTIETH DAY.—FRIDAY, JUNE 20TH, 1913.

At 23, Kildare-street, Dublin.

Present:—Sir SAMUEL DILL, M.A., LL.D., LL.D. (Chairman); The Most Rev. DENIS KELLY, D.D.; Bishop of Ross; Sir HIRAM SHAW WILKINSON, LL.D.; Mr. JOHN COFFEY; Mr. HENRAGE E. B. HARRISON, B.A.; Mr. JEREMIAH HENLY; Mr. WALTER McMURROUGH KAVANAGH, D.L.; Mr. THOMAS MICHAEL KETTLER, B.L.; and

Mr. ARTHUR J. DONNELLY, M.A., B.Sc., Secretary.

Dr. STARKIE, Resident Commissioner of National Education, further examined.

Witness.—Before I begin, I want to refer to a question of Mr. Coffey's yesterday which took me rather by surprise. He examined me with regard to a confidential circular, which he said contained an intimation against the managers of selling the places in their schools. That is an extremely serious allegation, and I should not like it to go to the public without explanation. It was never, in any sense of the word, intimated that managers did so, and it was entirely in their interest that we sent out the circular. Advertisements had appeared in the Irish Educational Journal from time to time offering places in schools for certain sums of money. I brought these before the Board, and I was requested to write to the owner of the paper in question drawing his attention to the dissimulation these advertisements were causing. In reply he promised that nothing of the kind should ever appear again in any of his journals. Almost simultaneously an article appeared in the English Schoolmaster, charging the managers in Ireland with selling the places in their schools. This generally was brought before the Board, and as it was a charge of

the greatest possible enormity, it was decided that, in order to be able to answer the Schoolmaster, as we did later on, we should circulate the inspectors, so as to ascertain whether any intimation of this alleged state of things had reached their ears. At the same time we were able to identify the authorship of one of the advertisements in the Educational Journal, whence it appeared that a certain manager down in the country had permitted the outgoing teacher to advertise his place in the school; he offered, I think, to accept £10 from the successful candidate. After investigation, we compelled the manager to resign. Although it was not proved that anything went into his pocket, it was obvious, however, that a man who took such a view of his responsibilities could not be permitted to remain manager. He said in his defence that the teacher had convinced him as to whether he could offer to accept the money, and that he had permitted him to do so. As I said, we circulated the inspectors, and the result of their inquiry was that there was no evidence that the alleged practice was going on to any extent.

19003. Mr. HARRISON.—This was a confidential cir-

20th June, 1915.]

Mr. W. J. M. STANLEY, M.A., LL.D., examined.

[Continued.]

cular?—Yes. Mr. Dilworth was questioned about it, but he was not able to answer. When he asked me about it I had no difficulty in indicating the occasion when it was issued.

18314. The Bishop of Ross.—You found that it was the outgoing teacher who was to get a consideration for the appointment?—He was to get a consideration for advising the manager as to who was to be the best man to be his successor.

18315. But it was he that was to get the money?—Yes.

18316. So that the idea was the same idea as that of a doctor in England attempting to sell his practice?—Yes; but I never looked upon the relationship of a teacher to his successor exactly from that point of view.

18317. Nor do I; but I want to make it clear that it was not the manager himself who was getting the coin?—Yes, I said that.

18318. But it was the outgoing teacher who wanted to make a little money for himself on his giving up his school?—Yes.

18319. Mr. COOPER.—That may be open to the assumption that it was the outgoing teacher; but was not there the other assumption that the manager was going to profit by it?—We had no evidence of that. We had his own declaration that he was not. I may say that a case of a manager profiting by an appointment has never been proved to me in my 15 years in the office. I have heard it stated occasionally that managers did make money out of their schools; but so many lies are in circulation about primary education in Ireland that I do not pay much attention to it. I have never known of a case where a manager did get money.

18320. Had you ever reason to think that there were cases where managers could be regarded as taking money bribes?—No, I have heard it said, but I never believed it.

18321. Why then, did you issue the circular?—In order to be able to answer the Schoolmaster, as we did. We wrote to the editor to inform him that, having investigated the case, the Commissioners could find no evidence for the statement in his paper.

18322. Now, to come back to last evening's evidence. In regard to the reference to Mr. Hynes of the Tipperary cases, I wish to know why only six cases were referred to the chief inspector, leaving regard to the fact that twelve cases were specified by the Teachers' Association as their strong cases?—As I have said more than once, it was arranged between myself and the Board that I was to visit the circuit, and give them a general idea of the education in Tipperary. I think that was the way it was done.

18323. Had you any document referring that to you?—No; it was only mentioned to the Board. As I am a member of the Board, it is not usual to prescribe my duties by means of formal orders.

18324. So there is no Board's Order?—No, there is no Board's Order.

18325. And there was no Board's understanding?—There was a Board's understanding.

18326. There was no Board's understanding in any definite form that those cases were referred to you?—There was an understanding, but not an order.

18327. I know that; but you have not said that there was any Board's understanding that the cases were referred to you?—I stated at the Board what I proposed to do in accordance with the suggestion of some of my colleagues, and the Board was satisfied; at any rate, it raised no objection to my proposal. I subsequently brought a report to the Board, and read from my notebook my observations on some of the Tipperary schools. The Board then arranged that the chief inspector should investigate my specially selected cases. The reference to Mr. Hynes is mentioned in the minutes of the Board.

18328. That would be proper machinery?—Yes. That is mentioned in the records of the Board, when I read it some morning. It is recorded that "certain special cases" were referred to the chief inspector.

18329. Was there a special designation of you by the Board to investigate those cases?—No.

18330. There was none?—No, there very rarely is in a case like that.

18331. Now, the Commissioners with whom you share the responsibility, complained that the teachers in the Circuit direct took back their complaints for such a time as to make it more difficult for the Board to get trustworthy evidence?—That is so.

18332. And it was very desirable, as I understand it (and I can quite understand it from their point of view) that appeals, if they are to be made, ought to be made within a reasonable time; but can you give us the particulars that reached you in connection with the Goringstown and Mordyke schools?—Yes, I can. Mordyke school was inspected by Mr. Welgely for the general report on the 6th of December, 1910. The appeal from the manager, Father Humphreys, for the re-inspection of the school in May or June, was received on the 23rd of January, 1911. It was referred to Mr. Welgely for his observations on the 4th of February, 1911. The appeal was not of the ordinary kind.

18333. What was the date of the appeal of Father Humphreys?—The 23rd of January.

18334. And it was held back from any re-inspection?—Only for 11 days.

18335. Till when?—Till the 4th of February.

18336. The Bishop of Ross.—You say the nature of the appeal was not of the usual kind?—Yes; the appeal was not to reverse the mark, but that the school should be re-inspected some months later, in May or June, so as to give the teachers time to put on a spirit. I see from Father Humphreys' letter that as they had been slackening a bit, and were capable of better work, he wished they should get an opportunity of putting themselves in their best trim.

18337. Mr. COOPER.—Did Father Humphreys say that?—He asked for a re-inspection in May or June.

18338. You say that he asked for a re-inspection on the ground that the teachers would have an opportunity of giving a better display of their work?—Yes, certainly. Mr. Welgely's observations were received on the 7th of February, 1911. Having carefully considered them, together with Father Humphreys' letter, I declined to grant the manager's application on the 23rd of February, 1911.

18339. I may take it that you said on the 23rd of February that this appeal was unsubstantial?—It was unsubstantial; but I did not say so. Mr. Welgely was very strongly against it, and he gave full extracts from his note-book of the results of his inspection, which I carefully considered. Furthermore, Father Humphreys' letter had not any real argument (what I call an argument) in it; and it was also a rather unusual course to disregard an inspection in November, and to give the teachers a chance to do better before May. As I said, I refused to allow the school to be re-inspected in May, but it was inspected in November, 1911, when the mark was raised to "good" by Mr. Yates, with Mr. Welgely's approval. In 1912 the principal teacher claimed promotion, and we waited to get another general report. This report was furnished in May of this year, 1915, and as it was "good" the teacher has got promotion from the 1st of April, 1915. We dated it back.

18340. But that is not the point?—I want to give you the history of the case.

18341. But it is not really the point that affects this Committee, because if a man ought to get it, no question of compensation ought to come in?—On the evidence before me, I came to the conclusion that he should not get it in 1911, but he got it from April, 1912.

18342. Does it not strike you now that the whole thing is peculiar?—No.

18343. The CHAIRMAN.—The same occurred in the Chonduff case?—Yes; as I said, I make a practice of paying back after I get the evidence that a man is doing improved work.

18344. Mr. COOPER.—My view is that a lost increment ought not to revive. If a man deserves it he ought to get it, and if he does not deserve it he ought not to get it?—I am inclined to think, Mr. Coffey, that I always take a view more favourable to the teachers than you do.

20th June, 1913.]

Mr. W. J. McSWANE, M.A., LL.D., examined.

[Continued.]

18545. But I am not here for the teachers; I am here in the interests of education?—I am not sacrificing any educational interest when I say that if it can be proved to me subsequently that a man is doing better work, he should be paid back, so far as I am allowed to pay him, for the period in which he was reported not to be doing such good work. I have not such absolute confidence in reports as to decide against a man on an unfavourable report, without allowing him another chance of proving that he is a good man. If he can do so subsequently, I am very glad to disregard a report.

18546. Can you give us instances of where those reports have been reversed?—I can give you the Clonaduff case. That is certainly a case. Mr. Kelly really got his increment on a "mildling" report.

18547. The point there is very acute. Can you give me others?—I cannot at present, but there are very many others. In fact, as I told you the other day, it has become the practice since 1905.

18548. But a very important point for this Committee is how far this compensation has been effected. Can you give us any other cases except Clonaduff?—I could not give you the names, but there are many others.

18549. If there are others, I may take it, that you, as Resident Commissioner, claiming to be the chief authority of the Board, can give them?—I am; I do not claim to be.

18550. Ought to be able to give them?—That is rather a large order.

18551. You say that in the Clonaduff case the compensation balance was adjusted. I want to know whether there was any other case, and if you can point to any other case, I will be glad to hear it?—I could give them on enquiry.

18552. But you cannot give them now?—Certainly not. I cannot keep the names of Irish schools in my head for ten minutes. When you asked me to inquire into the Gortagowna case I had the greatest difficulty in remembering its name until I reached my office.

I may say, I think a member of our Committee, who has great administrative knowledge of details, Sir Hiram Wilkinson, for finding that the 13 or 14 cases in one instance referred to in Clonaduff were not the 14 cases referred to in the other. I thought I knew all about it, but I found I did not?—But you will persist in calling them 14.

18553. Well, 13?—No, 12.

Well, we will say 12. Sir Hiram Wilkinson has very kindly pointed out that they were not the 12 cases.

Sir HIRAM WILKINSON.—Perhaps I might just ask Dr. Stickle on the point of numbers. It appears that Dr. Stickle is under a different impression from what I have been under as to the numbers of the schools examined?—I have got the Blue-book here.

18554. Have you got a list of the schools?—What is the page.

18555. I am looking at the original paper?—The schools that I am referring to, that is, the 12, will be found on page 214. Mardynke is the last of them. That is the schools selected by the Tipperary teachers at 12.

18556. Those twelve cases are set out on pages 204 to 210 of the Blue-book, and again on pages 210 to 214, and I now refer to the cases in the chief inspector's return, beginning with Killybeg (Boys) on page 215. What I wish to say is, that in going over them I wanted to see what the chief inspector thought of each of the twelve schools?—They were not referred to him.

18557. And I find that only five of the twelve are mentioned by the chief inspector. These are Cullen (Boys), Monard (Boys), Mordynke, Mohober, Silevoodagh (Girls). Taking the twelve schools in the order in which they appear in the statement, those which are and those which are not mentioned in the Chief Inspector's report are as follows:—Mohober (yes), Cullen (yes), Bakhloria (not), Tomplance (not), Killybeg (not), Gortagowna. You mention Gortagowna as having been inspected a short time before. I don't know whether you include it?—No.

18558. Bakhloria (not), Silevoodagh Boys' (not), Monard (yes), Rosegreen (not), Silevoodagh Girls' (yes), and Mardynke (yes); and I can only make out five

of these twelve schools as having been re-inspected?—As a matter of fact, Sir Hiram, I visited most of these schools myself.

18559. I had only this paper before me, of course?—I inspected most of those schools myself, and I came to the conclusion that some of them were in the class most unfavourable to the teachers. For instance, I was in the Silevoodagh Boys'.

Sir HIRAM WILKINSON.—All I wanted at this stage was to put the statistics right.

18560. Mr. Cowley.—I ask you now whether the teachers were asked to submit specific cases of complaint. Did they do it?—Yes; certainly.

18561. They submitted specific cases of complaint, on which they decided, rightly or wrongly (I do not make any charge against any inspector), that those were the 14 or 15 substantial cases in which they had a grievance. Is not that so?—They submitted.

18562. Is not that so?—Did you say "most substantial" or "substantial"?—

18563. "Substantial"?—Yes.

18564. What I wanted is this. Having regard to your high position, I do not think the word I used last evening was a proper word to use, to call on you for an explanation; but I think the proper phrase to use is to ask you to elucidate why those 15 cases were not submitted to Mr. Hynes. Mr. Hynes told us, "You would have to ask Dr. Stickle why they were not." I do not want to ask you a question that is in the smallest degree derogatory to your high position. I have a high view of what ought to be done by the Chief of a Department, but it certainly requires some elucidation why those cases were not submitted?—I said earlier in the day that the Board agreed to my visiting the schools and selecting certain cases.

18565. Is that in any order?—I have said at least half a dozen times that there was not.

18566. It is not in any order?—No. The Board considered that the complaints made against Mr. Welpy in the teachers' memorial were not in respect of his action in regard to particular schools, but were of his whole performance of his duty, and the standard of marking throughout the circuit.

18567. Is that in any document?—It is in a document before me here.

18568. Is it in any document of the Commissioners?—No. You asked me what the view of the Board was. I am attempting to give it. What I say follows from a study of the memorial sent in.

18569. But I do not want to commit you to anything. I only want to know, in a regular way, whether the statements you made were reduced to a formal report by the Commissioners?—No, of course not.

18570. That is all right?—If you will allow me to continue.

18571. I want to be perfectly clear whether the Commissioners made a ruling on the particular point. You say they did not. Do I take you correctly?—They certainly did not make a ruling to the effect of what I am saying at present.

18572. That you were to visit Clonaduff?—No. I have said that several times.

18573. I know you stated it, but I want to be clear about what the Commissioners did and what they did not. They did not direct you to go to Clonaduff?—That would be a misuse of a word. They cannot direct me to do anything.

18574. But there was no order?—No; there never is an order about anything that I do.

18575. That is what I wanted to be clear about?—Well, the complaints, as I said before, were not in respect of his action in regard to particular schools, but generally of his whole performance of his duty, and the standard of marking throughout the circuit. The petition contained several serious charges touching his manner towards the teachers. It was with reference to that particular charge of rudeness that the Commissioners were desirous of getting further information, and it was with a view to clearing up that matter that the teachers were asked to send forward specific cases. The Commissioners were anxious to get specific cases, not in order to refer them to Mr. Hynes, but to satisfy Mr. Welpy, who had found a difficulty in dealing with the position of the Tipperary teachers, on account of his vagueness.

18876. One moment. Was that pointed out to the teachers, that there were charges in respect of rudeness?—They had made charges of rudeness.

18877. But was it pointed out that that was what was wanted?—The letter to the teachers was that the Commissioners required specific instances of the charges brought against Mr. Welby.

18878. Was there any word whatever with regard to rudeness?—No; not necessarily. But that is obviously what was meant.

18879. But the teachers could not know, or do you suggest that they could know, what was meant when they were asked to send some specific charges?—It is hard to refer to the Board's letter.

18880. Yes, but the question is what the letter of the Commissioners was about?—It was about complaints which, as Mr. Welby stated, he was not able to deal with on account of their vagueness.

18881. There was a letter addressed to the teachers?—Is the letter given here in this Blue-book?

18882. Yes. They were asked to submit or specify charges?—Yes, that is exactly what I say. That cannot have meant the cases of reduction of marks in the schools, because those were already known to us in the office, and had been collected and submitted to the Commissioners by their own order.

18883. Then how is the Committee to understand what was the meaning of the letter from Mr. Keegan, the Secretary of the Tipperary Teachers' Association, if the Commissioners already understood what was meant by it?—The Commissioners wanted specific cases of Mr. Welby's having acted in the way that he was charged with acting in the position of the teachers. The cases should cover facts of manner, in addition to everything else. They should not refer solely to marking, because, as I said, the Commissioners had got a return from the staff in the office of the marking in the district, and they knew exactly how Mr. Welby had been reducing the marks without any information from the Tipperary teachers. The complaints against Mr. Welby were not in respect of particular schools, but of the general performance of his duty throughout the circuit.

18884. I am not making the suggestion, and you are not to think for a moment that I suggest that Mr. Welby did anything but what was fair. You asked the teachers to point out special cases where they had grievances, and I take it for the better working of your system that those cases should be investigated, and the point that comes home to me is the point referred to by Sir Hiram, that those 14 or 13 or 12 cases were not referred to the chief inspector as the machinery of inspection, and on that point I desire to elicit information?—The 12 specific cases were sent up by the Tipperary teachers in answer to a request from Mr. Welby to be furnished with specific instances. They were accordingly referred to him for his observations. Those observations were printed and circulated to the Board, and read very carefully and discussed line by line. They did not deal solely, or even mainly, with the marking of the schools; they dealt with all sorts of charges, which the teachers had brought against him. Mr. Welby says himself, on page 214, in a passage which I should like to read, as being very germane to this question. "But what I do complain of is that all these charges, varying in age from 31 to 6 months, were not made within some reasonable time after the alleged occurrences. My recollection of many offences is naturally indistinct in most cases, and non-existent in others on this account, and I do not think the teachers' recollection can be any better. There ought to be a statute of limitations for such matters." The Board did not think it necessary to go beyond the observations of the senior inspectors, as it felt that that it was entirely impossible for any chief inspector to investigate these charges of rudeness, overbearing manner, etc., dating from years previously. It was particularly moved by the paragraph I have quoted from Mr. Welby's letter. Indeed, it is obvious to any person of common sense, and of experience, that charges of rudeness of manner cannot be satisfactorily investigated almost at any time. I have investigated dozens of them myself, but without any satisfaction

to myself. It always turns out that the teacher says that the inspector was overbearing in his manner, and that on the other side the inspector says that he was most polite. Thus we cannot get any further. Hence, we thought that there was nothing to be gained by referring these 12 cases to Mr. Hyman. It is a different thing with regard to the marking of the schools. Even here it is difficult a year after the event to arrive at any certain conclusion (even the school may have changed in the meantime), but an investigation of that kind is much less difficult than an inquiry into facts of manner. For that reason the Board preferred to investigate the list of schools that I thought most favourable to the teachers.

18885. But when we come down to that question, that you selected schools most favourable to the teachers, I did not from the start suggest, and having met you I would be very slow to suggest it now, but may I ask you to say whether it is not trifling with the capacity of this Committee to ask them to accept your evidence that you selected the schools most favourable to the teachers?—Why?

18886. I am not here to answer questions?—I want to say that when a charge is made against me that I am trifling with the Committee, I insist on my right to ask you what you mean by it.

18887. I make no charge; it rather suggested itself?—You used the words.

18888. I am not willing to ask you any question that could be regarded as merely contentious, but it struck me that in asking us to accept the statement that you selected cases in the Clonmel circuit, which were particularly favourable to the teachers, you asked the Committee to accept as evidence a matter that seemed to me to be trifling with the Committee. That is my own view. I do not say that the Committee is of that view?—I have no idea what you are driving at, Mr. Coffey.

18889. Well, if you have no idea of what I am driving at, I may say that I have a most cordial respect for your scholarship, and I have the highest respect for your office, and I have had friendly association with your Board all through my life, but when you ask us to accept the statement that you selected the cases which were most favourable to the teachers, I think that I am fairly entitled, and so is the committee entitled, to ask you for some elucidation?—My position is this: having stated to the Board, and with its full appreciation, that I was visiting Tipperary for the purpose of selecting schools which I thought most favourable to the teachers, and my colleagues having accepted my report on the circuit with full confidence in my character as an honourable man, I expect the members of this Committee to accept the same view. At any rate, it is no use my occupying your time day after day, except on the assumption that my statements are accepted as those of an honourable man. Otherwise it seems to be a waste of time to continue my evidence.

18890. I do not think that that is exactly the point, because we accept your statements as an honourable gentleman, but we, as a Committee, have to sift them?—Certainly, I have not the slightest objection to your sifting them, but you should not start by begging the question.

18891. I do not think so. You remember yesterday that we had evidence from you, if I took it rightly, that you had never interfered with the mark awarded by an inspector, and immediately after I directed your attention to it you had to admit, or you did admit, that in a certain school you had?—I never admitted that I interfered with the mark. I merely expressed an opinion; I did not alter the mark.

18892. But you disagreed?—I did disagree.

18893. Well, I, as a member of this Committee, have to view your evidence from the point where you first stated that never did you interfere with an inspector's mark, and then I showed a specific case where you did interfere?—To interfere with an inspector's mark is to alter it, or to take measures that it shall be altered. That is what I intended to convey to the Committee. If I meant anything else,

my statement that I spoke to the chief inspector on various occasions about the marks being too high or too low, would be inconsistent with my assertion that I never interfered with the merit mark.

12604. We will, I take it, have a great number of cases of that kind before the Inquiry closes, and they are quite inconsistent with your statement that your visits never interfered in any way with the marking?—I stated that I never interfered with the merit mark of an inspector. I must ask you to take my explanation of those words; at any rate, you must understand it before you condemn them.

12605. I am not misunderstanding, and I am not condemning for a moment, but my questions were directed to the point that you did not leave the inspectors that freedom which they ought to have?—It might be said that if I spoke to a chief inspector with regard to the marking of any district I did not leave the inspectors the freedom they ought to have.

12606. Yes, that is what happens?—But I never denied that. I put that in my direct evidence, and I maintain that my writing in the observation book, that I disagree with the marking of the inspector, does not alter the marking of the school in the slightest.

12607. I will come to that later on, but, at any rate, it induces his judgment?—As head of the administration, I consider, and the Board considers, that I have a general supervision over the way in which the inspectors are doing their work, and the Board does not wish the inspectors to have absolute freedom, because they have put the senior and chief inspectors over them to see how they do their work, and I am over the chief inspectors.

12608. You have the inspectors, the senior inspectors and the chief inspectors?—Yes.

12609. Will you kindly point out to us where you come in as the superior of the chief inspectors?—I was not aware that anyone had denied that the head of the administration is superior to everybody who is under it. But if you want evidence, you will find it stated in the resolutions of 1902, that the chief inspectors are subject to the Resident Commissioner.

12610. I do not think you will find that in the resolutions of 1902?—You must certainly will. But no evidence at all is required by a rational man, who has any knowledge of administration. If the chief inspectors are independent of me you may say "good-bye" to the whole organisation.

12611. I would be very glad if you just now give the Committee any evidence to show that in the matter of inspection you are a superior authority to the chief inspectors?—I am superior to the chief inspectors in everything.

12612. In the matter of inspection?—Certainly, in everything.

12613. Where does that come in?—As head of the administration.

12614. In what document?—It is not necessary. As I said before, my duties are not specified. I am the civil administrator of the Board, and consequently every officer of the Board is subject to me.

12615. That is, may I take it, since 1902?—No, even before that. I never heard anyone deny that.

12616. It is not a question of denial, but a question of claim?—Well, I do claim it, and every Resident Commissioner has always claimed it.

12617. But was it not open, as you told us yesterday, to any other Commissioner to claim it too?—He could only claim it when he was sitting in the office.

12618. But it was open to him to sit in the office?—It was, if you like.

12619. There were charges connected with Clonmel. I do not mean to suggest that were true, but there were specific charges made of rudeness with regard to Mr. Welpy?—Certainly.

12620. How was the truth or falsity of those charges investigated?—I dealt with that some time ago. I read what Mr. Welpy said on the subject, and I pointed out the impossibility of investigating, years after, a charge of rudeness, and I pointed out that I had investigated dozens of that kind of case before, and that I never could get any satisfaction, because there is only the word of the teacher on one side and

the word of the inspector on the other, and there is no use in investigating between them. That is what we said in our final letter to the Tipperary teachers.

12621. In that final letter to the teachers I don't think you deal with those specific charges?—We point out the impossibility of investigating them. You will find the final letter on page 116 of the blue book—"When a teacher believes himself to have been unjustly treated it is open to him to submit a full statement of his grievance, and it is essential that the appeal should be made without unavoidable delay in the interests of all the parties concerned. But to hold back a number of complaints for a considerable time, and then to submit them simultaneously as a mass of evidence in support of various charges, some vague and ill-defined, is a course that is not adapted to enable the Commissioners to give a full and satisfactory consideration to the case."

12622. I know that, but there is nothing in reference to the complaints with regard to Mr. Welpy as regards the truth or falsity of the charges relating to rudeness?—I can tell you exactly how the charge in regard to rudeness was investigated. I said in my direct evidence that I visited 70 schools in which Mr. Welpy had reduced the mark, and that having asked the teachers in every case what they thought of Mr. Welpy's manner, I wrote down their replies. I pointed out in my direct evidence that in nine of the cases they stated that Mr. Welpy was unympathetic and rather hard; in three or four cases they positively accused him of rudeness. I read out those particular cases; one of them was the case of Mr. Mahony, and the other was that of Mrs. Barry, of Slieveagh. In the remaining cases, 50 or 51, the teachers stated that they had absolutely no fault to find with Mr. Welpy's manner. It seems to me that that was as thoroughgoing a means of ascertaining the views of the teachers in each individual case as you could possibly adopt. I do not say that I put down a full statement of the teachers' views, but, at any rate, they had an opportunity of giving me their views with regard to Mr. Welpy's manner. I found that those who made charges of rudeness against Mr. Welpy were very few in number. As I said, in only three cases was the charge serious; in nine other cases it was an imputation of coldness of manner, which may be merely temperamental. In such a case a person may be considered unfortunate, but he cannot be considered culpable. On hearing my statement the Board came to the conclusion that the allegation of rudeness had emanated from a very small minority of teachers.

12623. Did you investigate the cases of those teachers that had complained of Mr. Welpy's rudeness?—The specific cases had not reached the Commissioners when I was in the district. They did not come in till the 16th of October, which was really after my return.

12624. So the Commissioners have taken no action, may I take it, in reference to these charges of rudeness against the inspector?—They did, because, as I say, I visited nearly all the schools where the rudeness was alleged.

12625. Now, you say that you have not visited the two schools where rudeness was particularly alleged?—Which ones?

12626. Gortnagowna and Mandryke?—I visited Mandryke.

12627. Did you visit Gortnagowna?—I do not think so. Gortnagowna is in a rather out-of-the-way place.

12628. You have not made clear to me as to why you selected those 12 cases that there was an appeal against, and why you included six schools that made no complaint?—I think I have explained that several times, but I will do it again.

12629. When I say that, perhaps you have made it clear to other members of the Committee, but you have not made it clear to me?—I will tell you exactly. These two lists must be kept absolutely separate as Sir Hiram has done. When I visited this district, from October 4th till October 13th, I could not possibly have paid attention to the schools which were sent forward by the teachers as specific instances, because

they had not yet been collected. I could not have known them, but I think it is a tribute to my impartiality and persistency, that although I was unaware of the schools to be submitted later on by the teachers, and although I did not visit the whole of the circuit, but only about 70 schools, out of a larger number in which the marks had been reduced, and in which consequently the teachers probably felt aggrieved, five cases out of twelve mentioned in the two lists. Five of the thirteen cases, as Mr. Hynes has already pointed out, which I selected as being most favourable to the teachers, are those that they themselves included in their twelve as being specific instances of the charges they were bringing against Mr. Welby.

19620. I am not for a moment making any charge whatever against Mr. Welby nor against Mr. Brown, but it certainly is not convincing to me, and I think it is not convincing to the other members of the Committee, that we have a sufficient explanation why, after twelve or fourteen cases were submitted by the Tipperary Teachers' Association, those twelve cases were not investigated by the official investigator, Mr. Hynes, but that you submitted to him five or six cases?—I submitted to him thirteen cases.

19621. Yes, but only five or six had reference to the twelve specific cases?—We are not dealing in *pari materia*, I think. The Board directed that Mr. Hynes should investigate the thirteen cases which I brought before them in which I differed from the senior inspector.

19622. Have you any record?—There is a record of that.

19623. Is there?—There is.

19624. Because Mr. Ward, I think, led us to think, that there is no such record?—It is impossible for me to say exactly what question Mr. Ward was answering. I read this morning in the Board's minutes a mention of the special cases submitted to Mr. Hynes for investigation.

19625. But is there any mention in the Board's minutes of any special cases referred to you for report?—No; as I said at least ten times, there is not. I mentioned the matter at the Board, and the Board raised no objection to my going to Tipperary. When I came back I made an informal report to the Board, which ordered that the cases I selected as that most favourable to the teachers should be sent to Mr. Hynes.

19626. Have you any minute to show that the Board did agree to that?—I said so before.

19627. You have no minute to show that the Board directed you to go there?—It could not direct me to do anything.

19628. Well, it comes to this, that the proper machinery for inspection was the chief inspector?—I said before that the Board was dissatisfied with the way the chief inspector had treated the Belfast case. Not being satisfied with them, it had come to the conclusion that an investigation by the chief inspector was not a very satisfactory way of dealing with this question.

19629. I think Dr. Clarke stated that?—I think he was the first that ever suggested it.

19630. But I think Mr. Ward said he knew nothing about it?—Do you mean that he did not know that the thing was going to be done at all?

19631. That he was not a party to any arrangement of the Commissioners that you were going to Tipperary?—I certainly mentioned it to the Board.

19632. Do you disagree with Mr. Ward's evidence that he was not a party?—I have not seen Mr. Ward's evidence.

19633. Well, I will put it to you this way. If Mr. Ward gave his evidence that he knew nothing about

any arrangement by which you were to go to Clonard, would you dissent from that?—That he did not know I was going?

19634. That he did not know of any arrangement by which you went?—I do not know exactly what he means by "arrangement." If he means that the Board did not order it, I agree with him, for there was no order; but if he means that I did not state at the Board that I was going to do it, and that the Board gave consent by silence, that is that nobody raised any objection, I would disagree with him. There was no formal arrangement. Since this did not seem to be called for. What I proposed to do in Tipperary was within my competence to do at any time without any direction or approval being required. I merely notified my intention to my colleagues in order to ascertain whether any of them objected. I can always visit my circuit and investigate anything I like.

19635. It would be quite within the competence of any other Commissioner prior to 1902?—Any Commissioner, even at the present time, can go down to the schools and visit them; certainly he can; that is in the fundamental rules. Any Commissioner can inspect the work in a school, and order the classes about any way he likes.

19636. The point that troubles me is your memorandum that the schools in the Tipperary circuit were selected by the Resident Commissioner as being most favourable to the teachers?—Yes.

19637. Now, the point that puzzles is that one of the schools that you included in your list to Mr. Hynes was Longmore School?—Yes.

19638. Now, may I ask, could that be favourable to the teachers when it was marked "excellent" already?—Favourable to the teachers, as possibly showing that Mr. Welby was erratic in his marking. That is my point.

19639. I will take it exactly that way?—The contention of the teachers was that Mr. Welby was erratic in his marking. I included Longmore school as possibly showing that his marking was incorrect. I stated in my direct evidence that in ten cases I thought Mr. Welby had been too hard on the teachers, and in eleven cases I thought he had been too easy. So the teachers were more interested in the cases where he reduced the mark than where he raised it. I referred to Mr. Hynes all the ten cases, and I put only one out of the eleven cases as a specimen of his incorrect marking the other way. I do not think there was very much harm in doing that.

19640. I do not for a moment suggest that Mr. Welby's marking was not quite correct, and it would take a very large and strong body of evidence to convince me that an inspector would give a mark that was not quite just?—A man might be unjust without intending it. I do not believe any one of them deliberately over-marks or under-marks a school.

19641. With regard to tone, you have attempted a definition, and I quite agree with you that it is quite within the power of any inspector to form an opinion of tone for himself?—Even if a man does not possess "tone" himself, he may be a good judge of it in others. After all, the best way to judge black is by the contrast of white.

19642. With regard to those remarks about the Belfast schools, I will ask you if you can kindly elucidate this for us. Mr. ———, referring to Mr. Larnmore's school at Belfast, says—"When people's eyes are laid on rows on walls and window-sills which repel by their bareness, the atmosphere of the school was such that I could hardly commend its tone." Now, have you any observation to make on that?—I think it is an awfully bad piece of English.

19643. So do I, but it is not a question of English, but a question of money for the teachers?—I do not know what it means. There is no worse fault of style than not to convey any meaning. What does he mean by the tone of atmosphere?

20th June, 1913.]

Mr. W. J. M. STANLEY, M.A., Litt.D., LL.D., examined.

[Continued.]

18644. "When pupils' eyes are laid on walls and window-sills which repel by their bareness the atmosphere of the school was such that I could hardly commend the tone." Now, I ask you, as Resident Commissioner, what do you think of that?—When Cardinal Newman was asked to explain the meaning of "Angels' faces" in "Lead Kindly Light," he said that no poet should be asked to explain his own meaning. If you ask me to explain my own prose I will make the attempt, perhaps a futile one, to explain what I mean, but if I am expected to explain the very prosy prose of other people, I think it is rather a large order.

18645. They see your inspectors' reports, and they come to you officially?—Do you think I read everything that comes to me officially?

18646. Mr. Larmour suffered a loss by it?—I do not think he did. Except perhaps from having to read that.

18647. Do you think it was quite fair to Mr. Larmour that he should suffer a loss?—You have to prove to me that he has suffered a loss by the absence of pictures on the wall.

18648. But even if he did not suffer a financial loss, was it not a loss to him to have a report like that on an efficient man?—Such reports are not published, and an efficient man does not suffer financial loss from a few ridiculous statements in a report. Teachers are touchy on such matters; they should remember that, in a large system, it is impossible to obviate the occasional occurrence of things fairly open to criticism. Some difficulty has been made in this room as to the impossibility of defining tone. Mr. Dilworth tried his hand at it, but he was not very successful; but the difficulty of defining it does not take from its value. For instance, no simple idea can be defined. How would you define courtesy? A blind man can't define it as the sound of a trumpet. How would you define truth? On a certain occasion Plato found it a hard nut to crack. Thus, we don't define tone, we all know pretty well what it is. There is as much uniformity with regard to it as there is with regard to reading or geography or arithmetic.

18649. But Mr. Larmour complained that while that was Mr. Kelly's report in regard to tone, in another year 1904, while the same walls and window-

sills repelled by their bareness, Mr. ——— reported at that time that an excellent tone pervaded the school. The earlier report was in 1904, and he then reported that an excellent tone pervaded the school.

18649a. Apparently he is not growing wiser as he grows older. When did he say that about the children's eyes?—In 1909.

18650. But do you think it is fair that the teacher should suffer for those views?—If Mr. ——— was guided in his appreciations of the tone of a school by the absence of pictures on the wall, and if his report injured Mr. Larmour, I would certainly say he was badly treated. It is an absurd sentence. I never attempt to defend absurdities.

18651. So that you have the two reports, one in 1904 saying the tone is excellent, and the other in 1909 saying that he could not commend the tone?—There is nothing objectionable in these two positions, if you leave out the reasons.

18652. Because of the bareness of the walls?—That is humbug.

18653. And in 1904 he commended the school as having an excellent tone, although the walls and window-sills were the same?—You must remember that when he mentioned the word "tone" in 1904 and 1909 Mr. ——— had not seen our circular of 1911. I hope his views have since been cleared up as to the meaning of tone. I am sorry to say anything reflecting on this inspector, who is a most admirable man; he was champion high-jumper of the world at one time. But this need not be any further debility as to the meaning of tone, which we explained in the circular as having to do with the manners, discipline, and character, intellectual and moral, of the children. Mr. ——— is no longer likely to refer to the absence of pictures as deciding tone. But I am not confident that our views are even yet fully grasped. I know some people suffering from what Dr. Kelly would call "invariable ignorance," who have recently defined tone as having a flower-pot in the window. I refer to the Provost of Trinity College.

18654. The CHAIRMAN.—There is a typewritten document that you got yesterday referring to the salaries, and the Bishop wants to consult you about it?—Yes, I have it here.

# SCALE OF SALARIES DRAFTED BY THE BISHOP OF ROSS.

## SALARIES OF TEACHERS.

| Men.             |  |                  |  | Women.           |  |                  |  |
|------------------|--|------------------|--|------------------|--|------------------|--|
| THIRD GRADE.     |  |                  |  | THIRD GRADE.     |  |                  |  |
| Present.         |  | Proposed.        |  | Present.         |  | Proposed.        |  |
| £68 for 3 years. |  | £69 for 7 years. |  | £51 for 3 years. |  | £57 for 7 years. |  |
| 70 " 3 "         |  | 72 " 1 "         |  | 53 " 3 "         |  | 60 " 1 "         |  |
| 77 " 3 "         |  | 75 " 1 "         |  | 65 " 3 "         |  | 68 " 1 "         |  |
| 84 " 3 "         |  | 78 " 1 "         |  | 72 " 3 "         |  | 66 " 1 "         |  |
|                  |  | 81 " 1 "         |  |                  |  | 69 " 1 "         |  |
|                  |  | 84 " 1 "         |  |                  |  | 72 " 1 "         |  |
|                  |  | 15 "             |  |                  |  | 12 "             |  |
| 12 "             |  |                  |  |                  |  |                  |  |
| SECOND GRADE.    |  |                  |  | SECOND GRADE.    |  |                  |  |
| Present.         |  | Proposed.        |  | Present.         |  | Proposed.        |  |
| £94 for 3 years. |  | £94 for 1 year.  |  | £90 for 3 years. |  | £90 for 1 year.  |  |
| 104 " 3 "        |  | 94 " 1 "         |  | 88 " 3 "         |  | 82 " 1 "         |  |
| 114 " 3 "        |  | 97 " 1 "         |  | 95 " 3 "         |  | 84 " 1 "         |  |
|                  |  | 100 " 1 "        |  |                  |  | 86 " 1 "         |  |
|                  |  | 108 " 1 "        |  |                  |  | 88 " 1 "         |  |
|                  |  | 106 " 1 "        |  |                  |  | 90 " 1 "         |  |
|                  |  | 109 " 1 "        |  |                  |  | 92 " 1 "         |  |
|                  |  | 112 " 1 "        |  |                  |  | 94 " 1 "         |  |
|                  |  | 115 " 1 "        |  |                  |  | 96 " 1 "         |  |
|                  |  | 9 "              |  |                  |  | 9 "              |  |
| 70 "             |  |                  |  |                  |  |                  |  |



20th June, 1918.]

Mr. W. J. M. STARRIS, M.A., LL.D., LL.B., examined.

[Continued]

12<sup>th</sup> GRADE.

| Present.          | Proposed.        |
|-------------------|------------------|
| £125 for 8 years. | £125 for 1 year. |
| 137 " 8 "         | 125 " 1 "        |
|                   | 129 " 1 "        |
|                   | 132 " 1 "        |
|                   | 135 " 1 "        |
|                   | 138 " 1 "        |
| 6 "               | 6 "              |

11<sup>th</sup> GRADE.

| Present.           | Proposed.          |
|--------------------|--------------------|
| £140 for 8 years.  | £140 for 1 year.   |
| 161 " 8 "          | 152 " 1 "          |
| 178 " 8 "          | 165 " 1 "          |
| 185 " later years. | 158 " 1 "          |
|                    | 161 " 1 "          |
|                    | 164 " 1 "          |
|                    | 167 " 1 "          |
|                    | 170 " 1 "          |
|                    | 173 " 1 "          |
|                    | 185 " later years. |

12<sup>th</sup> GRADE.

| Present.          | Proposed.        |
|-------------------|------------------|
| £107 for 8 years. | £100 for 1 year. |
| 115 " 8 "         | 108 " 1 "        |
|                   | 110 " 1 "        |
|                   | 112 " 1 "        |
|                   | 114 " 1 "        |
|                   | 116 " 1 "        |
| 6 "               | 6 "              |

11<sup>th</sup> GRADE.

| Present.           | Proposed.          |
|--------------------|--------------------|
| £124 for 8 years.  | £124 for 1 year.   |
| 135 " 8 "          | 126 " 1 "          |
| 142 " 8 "          | 138 " 1 "          |
| 151 " later years. | 130 " 1 "          |
|                    | 132 " 1 "          |
|                    | 134 " 1 "          |
|                    | 136 " 1 "          |
|                    | 141 " 1 "          |
|                    | 146 " 1 "          |
|                    | 151 " later years. |

18633. The Basher or Ross.—Does that scheme recommend itself to you?—Yes, I think it does.

18634. I think you have seen a suggestion in the evidence that we have had already as to making the increments annual, and also a table of figures that was suggested before for that purpose?—Yes.

18637. Did you notice that that paper of figures\* was sent in in response to the opinion of Mr. McNeill, the chief inspector, who wishes that the increments, though they would be much smaller than they are at present, should be, if possible, paid annually?—Yes.

18638. And that scheme was devised in answer to that opinion; but I may say personally I did not quite approve of the figures, and there was one fatal objection, which was that the maximum, both for men and women, in the third grade would be very much less than at present, and, of course, a number of men and women assistant teachers, and teachers of small schools, would have to remain at the maximum, and it would be very unfair to reduce that maximum?—Yes.

18639. You see in this table of figures that that objection is quite got rid of, because the maximum in all the grades is the same as the old maximum, with the exception of the second grade for men and second of first grade both for men and women, where there is an increase of £1 in the maximum of each?—Yes.

18640. And I was unable to fit the figures together without that slight increase?—Yes.

18661. And in the third grade, on the present table of figures, I keep the candidates for seven years on the initial salary; but I wish to call your attention to the fact that for men that initial salary is £69, and under the present system of increments the man remains for three years at £68, and for the next three years at £70, so that in reality I think we may regard the men as having started with their increment?—Yes, paid in advance.

18662. Paid in advance; but as the teachers will get, especially in the first three years, larger sums than they get at present, of course, it will follow necessarily that in the later years the sums cannot be quite so large?—Yes.

18663. For you are aware, no doubt, that we have no competence to recommend a scheme that would substantially increase the expense to the Treasury?—Unless you could do that without knowing it.

18664. And also, naturally, we should wish not to reduce in any way the remuneration of the teachers?—Certainly.

18665. Well, in that third grade, if all the candidates that entered were all to persevere in the service, and all to get their increment regularly, I think that it is only fair to point out that under the proposed scheme the candidate would have received a little less

at the end of his twelve years than he receives at present, but, on the other hand, as some of the candidates will leave the service in the earlier years, and as some of them never get promotion at all, or get increment at all, and as all these would have been paid £6 a year in the earlier years more than they are paid at present, it is quite clear that those who leave the service will carry away more of the public money than they do at present, and that so far that would tend to increase the expense, and hence if there is a slight saving on the whole scheme it will go some distance to meet the loss in the higher initial payment to those who may leave the service?—Yes.

18666. In my opinion I do not think it will quite cover it, but the difference one way or another will, I think, be exceedingly slight. Now, in the other grades outside of the third I think that objection will not hold, because in the other grades (I start there at the same salary, or in some instances at a lower salary). The amount of money paid in most divisions will be exactly the same as it is at present?—Yes.

18667. Also in a system of this kind you have to consider adjustment, which is a very important thing, and you had very considerable difficulty in 1900 in bringing about an adjustment between the old system and the new?—Very.

18668. Well, I think in this proposed system that in the second and both divisions of the first grade the thing practically adjusts itself, and that in any year a teacher may pass over from the present system to the new system with neither loss nor gain either to him or to the public exchequer. No doubt there are individual years where an individual might be hit. But in the third grade there will be need for considerable adjustment, because suppose a teacher has started under the present system, and remained for three years, he has been paid only £63 each year. Now, if he passes over to the new system he will be paid less money in the later years under the new system than under the old, so that, therefore, he will have been paid on the lower portion of the old system and on the lower portion of the new system, and that would be unfair; so there will be need for adjustment?—Yes.

18669. In the third grade the adjustment might be made in either of two ways, either by giving a person a lump sum, amounting to what he would be deprived of, and that would have the disadvantage of suddenly demanding a large sum of money from the Treasury, which would be very inconvenient. Well, now, there is another way in which it might be settled, and it is this. The teacher who has spent one year or seven years in the third grade at the time of the change finds himself short of either £6 or £7 by the change from the old system to the new, and I propose that that should be remedied in this way. Those who have spent either one year or seven years in this

\* Vide q. 1861 et seq.

third grade shall receive a double increment in their tenth year, or an increment of £6 instead of £3. They will reach the maximum in the eleventh year of £84 for men, and they will be paid the maximum in both the eleventh year and twelfth year, and thus they will have recovered the £6 they have lost earlier; and the same thing is true both for the men and the women of the grade. And these teachers who have spent two years in the third grade have been paid under the present system £12 less than they would be under the new system. The men will be paid only two sixty-three instead of two sixty-nine, and the women will be paid only two fifty-six instead of two fifty-seven. They will be short £12, and that would be remedied by giving them a double increment, or £6 increment in their eighth year. Thus they will reach the maximum in the eleventh year, and be paid the maximum in the eleventh and twelfth year, and this process will secure them an additional sum of £12 between their eighth and twelfth year inclusive. And then for those who have spent three or four, or five or six years under the old system, they will have lost £15, £18, or £17 (and we may bulk them), and that will be secured to them by starting their increment in the seventh year, or by giving them £72 in the seventh year, and thus letting the increment grow to the end, which will secure them. In some instances it will give them £1 less and in other instances £1 more than they otherwise would have got. Now, these adjustments will be necessary?—Yes.

18670. And these adjustments will have the advantage of not demanding any extra grant at the starting of the system. With regard to those who are already eight, nine, and ten years in the service, except they are allowed to continue under the present system, to which I see there are considerable objections, they will be at some slight loss. Well, I am sure you would be quite prepared to agree with me that it is exceedingly hard to bring in a new system that will hit things off to the last penny?—Yes, we certainly did not succeed in that in 1900, although we tried.

18671. You do not think it could be done?—I could not say. I am not a distinguished financier.

18672. I suppose you are conscious that it is very easy to criticise a scheme of this kind, that it is very easy to pick holes?—Very, and especially for those who, like Mr. Friswell, went through the malism of the last reorganisation. He is not very keen on having to work out a new one.

18673. I should be very glad if some people would construct a better scheme, and I should be very glad if, before people indulge in a destructive criticism, they would try a scheme themselves?—Mr. Friswell's objections do not seem to me to go very deep. I got that memorandum only just before I came here.

The *Removal of Books*.—I think from a glance I have given over it that the scheme before us meets the views of Mr. Friswell. Before Mr. Henly begins I want to say that something was said yesterday about the removal of Mr. Brown to Waterford. I have got the paper here in which Mr. Brown's removal was made, and I see it was done on the recommendation of Mr. Fuser. Mr. Fuser recommended that Mr. W. A. Brown should be transferred to Waterford from the 1st of March in succession to Dr. Sheffington, who retired from the 28th of February, 1906, and that he be succeeded by Dr. Beatty. But Dr. Beatty did not take up the position because he was ill, and then Colonel was offered to Mr. Cussen, and on his refusing it, to Mr. Welch.

18674. The CHAIRMAN.—Is that all?—That is all.

18675. Mr. HENLY.—I have only to ask one question connected with inspectional work. You said in your direct evidence that an inspector was prohibited from asking questions on the subject-matter of what the children read?—That was under the rework system. So I am told; I am giving you hearsay evidence.

18676. I think it is important that it should not appear on our minutes that was the state of affairs. I have here the rules laid down for the guidance of inspectors in 1896, and speaking of the sixth class it

says:—"The pupils of this class will not be awarded a pass in reading unless, in addition to exhibiting fluency and correct pronunciation, they are able to answer readily and intelligently on the meaning of the words and the subject-matter of the lesson read. The examination of the words and the subject-matter may be conducted with books open." Well, the standard was raised, I should say, in that year, and even third class pupils were required, to some extent at least, to answer on the subject-matter?—Putting that question aside, before that year was there a prohibition of asking on the subject-matter.

18677. There was no prohibition ever; it was simply that that did not count?—I was going on hearsay information, because I really had not first-hand knowledge.

18678. And at the same time the inspectors were required distinctly to report on the moral tone of the school, and the observance of discipline and cleanliness and order, and should also bring under notice defects in neatness and the condition of the school-houses and premises?—Yes.

18679. Then, at the same time, there was a circular issued requiring the teachers to plant flowers about their schools and have flower-pots in the windows. Are you aware of that?—I am aware that it was not done.

18680. And I suppose you would find it in some cases not done at the present time?—Indeed I do.

18681. Now, I have a number of extracts here, and I do not wish to read all of them, but I should like to get them on the minutes. They are extracts from your own inspectors. I am simply pointing out the immense improvement that was effected in the intelligence of the pupils from 1896 up to 1899?—In those three years?

In those three years, owing to the fact that examination in the subject-matter of the lessons was made compulsory, and these are extracts:—

#### "LONDONDERRY."

"Having for many years deprecated the continued exclusive use of unsuitable reading books, and deplored the unintelligent character of the reading in our schools, I may express my great pleasure at the recent changes made by the Commissioners, in allowing the use of other lesson books, and requiring that children shall read with intelligence, and be able to explain what they read. It may fairly be expected that from this reform alone the teaching of reading will in future be easy, pleasant, and successful, and unless I greatly mistake, the habit of seeking the meaning of what is read will tell favourably on the whole intellectual work of the pupil, and make his progress in other parts of the school course more certain and more rapid. In fact, I consider the change to be the turning-point in our system of education."

"W. J. BROWN'S Report."

"Appendix to 54th Report, p. 145."

"Report, dated 29th January, 1898."

#### "STRABANE."

"Explanation is undoubtedly one of the most important, although one of the most difficult, subjects in the education of a child, consequently the attention now given to it marks a distinct advance in the education of National Schools."

"MR. CHANDLER'S."

"Appendix to 64th Report, p. 137."

"January, 1898."

#### "BELFAST."

"The teachers of this district are perfectly capable under favourable conditions of raising the schools to a high state of efficiency. Many of the principal teachers are taken from among the picked men of the service, and principals and assistants alike possess in a large measure the industry, the intelligence, the

20th June, 1913.]

Mr. W. J. M. BEAVER, M.A., Litt.D., LL.D., examined.

[Continued]

perseverance, to bring the teaching art to perfection. I have had ample evidence of this during the past year in the successful attempt which has been made to meet the new requirements with regard to explanation.

"Mr. DALTON,

"Appendix to 66th Report, p. 143.

"31st January, 1898."

"OMAGH.

"It is a source of great satisfaction that explanation of subject-matter now forms part of the test for passing in reading, and that this branch cannot any longer be neglected with impunity. I believe that proficiency in this subject should be tested by collective examinations, but not individual.

"Mr. McNEILL.

"Appendix to 66th Report, p. 143.

"12th January, 1898."

"BALLENAMORE.

"Now that a wise change has been made, requiring that a knowledge of the meaning of words and phrases be regarded as essential for a pass mark in the higher classes, a considerable improvement may be anticipated, the progress made in this respect, even during the past year, gives promise that this anticipation will soon be realized.

"Mr. FRYBERGALL.

"Appendix to 66th Report, p. 192.

"26th January, 1898."

"KILLARNEY.

"Under these regulations the children must read with intelligence, and be able to explain the meaning of the words and phrases occurring in their lessons. As the pass mark is partly determined by these considerations, a very marked improvement has been effected in a very short time. So great is the improvement, that it is to be hoped that in the near future reading may not be as it has been in the past, the most unskillfully taught of all the subjects of the programme.

"Mr. CHOMER.

"Appendix to 66th Report, p. 237.

"22nd January, 1898."

"BALLYMENA.

"I think there is a gradual and steady improvement in the general intelligence displayed by the pupils, and I believe that the enforced teaching of explanation of the reading lessons has had great effect in this direction. If an analogous change in the programme in arithmetic in the junior classes were ordered, so as to make it less mechanical, I believe it would go far to rescue our school work from the charge of want of intelligence. An examination, individual or otherwise, cannot very well test the intelligence, when an intelligent knowledge is not required by the programme, and it would be well to recognize that the programme is to blame in this respect, and not the system of examination.

"Mr. WYSE.

"Appendix to the 66th Report, p. 25.

"November, 1898."

"BELFAST.

"Within the last few years this subject (reading) has been much improved. There is now an attempt made to read naturally and as we speak. In no subject has progress been so marked. This is due to the changes in programme, and the numerous teaching tests

for highly efficient service, for promotion and for classification, have already exercised a most beneficial influence, and are supplanting tedious and thoughtless methods by good systems, which occupy the minds of teachers and scholars alike. Some years ago I never heard teachers read. Now they constantly read aloud for the children, and endeavour to make them imitate their modulation. Explanation is intelligent and the knowledge of the subject-matter fair. Not long ago I was frequently obliged in sixth class to assign more failures in reading than in arithmetic. Now, I am glad to state, failures in reading are quite exceptional.

"Mr. FENLOW.

"Appendix to 66th Report, p. 40."

"BELFAST.

"Reading is certainly improving. It is more intelligent, clearer, and more expressive. This is partly owing to the requirements as to explanation of words and phrases, and still more to the choice now permitted of various series of readers. I am told that children now frequently read their books at home for amusement far in advance of the lessons prescribed for them. This would have been quite incredible in the case of the Board's series of reading books.

"Dr. BEAVER.

"Appendix to 66th Report, Jan., 1900, p. 40."

"GALWAY.

"I had occasion two years ago to give it as my opinion that for twenty years no more important regulations had been made by the Commissioners than that by which knowledge of the meaning of the words and phrases became merged with Reading proper, into one subject, upon which the new marks were to be assigned, and the results have not disappointed my expectations. I think I can perceive a general advance in Reading as regards style and intelligence. The teachers as a body have adapted themselves to the new conditions, and the meanings of the words and phrases of the Reading lessons now receive more or less attention in every school.

"Mr. WHELAN.

"November, 1899."

Appendix to 66th Report, page 102.

See Hendin's Report, pp. 110 and 111.

1898. Mr. HARRIS.—Now, with reference to a statement in Mr. Wyse's paper, there was a point in connection with which I did not ask Mr. Wyse anything, because I thought it was a proper question to be addressed to you. In speaking of the teachers, he says that they may be divided into three categories—the highly efficient, the efficient, and the inefficient, and then he goes on to say that the inefficient are those with reports lower than "good," to whom increments are refused, and these three classes are roughly 30 per cent., 50 per cent., and 20 per cent. respectively.—That corresponds with the figure that I gave you, that 80 per cent. of the teachers get "good."

Quite so. Now, the important point that I want to direct your attention to is, that. "The aim of the administration would be to reduce the number in the third category, and eventually to eliminate them entirely; they are a hindrance to efficiency."

1898. Now, is it the aim of the administration at the present time, as stated in that paper of Mr. Wyse, that all the teachers below "good" in the service of present are to be eliminated?—I do not know what Mr. Wyse meant, but if that sentence came before me, I should say that elimination was an ambiguous word. You can eliminate a bad teacher by dismissing him, but you can also eliminate him by turning him into a better teacher.

1898. Yes, that is so?—And I am not certain that Mr. Wyse did not mean that.

1898. I don't know what he meant?—But I will tell you what I mean, that it never even occurred to me that all the teachers below "good" should be dismissed. Of course not.

26th June, 1915.]

Mr. W. J. M. STANLEY, M.A., LL.D., examined.

[Continued.]

18980. I thought it was not a question for Mr. Wyse to answer?—I think that is what he meant.

18987. What he meant is of no consequence?—But I can tell you what I mean. I pointed out that the highest number of teachers ever dismissed for any kind of offence in a single year was one in 1902, and that is the furthest that we have ever gone. It is easy to prove a negative, but so far as I remember, we have never dismissed a teacher for inefficiency who got "fair."

18988. Then it is not part of your settled policy that all teachers who do not get "good" are to be dismissed or eliminated?—Certainly not; that would be cruel.

18989. I grant you. That is the reason I reserved the question for yourself, because I thought you were the one that could give us official information on the subject. Now, to come back to that troublesome year 1902; have you a recollection of Father Longhery submitting to the Board a modified programme?—Certainly.

18990. Can you tell the Committee the circumstances that attended the presentation of that programme to the Board?—I do not think I can. I remember Father Longhery's sending up a programme, which was rejected as not coming within the limits of the revised programme.

18991. Do you remember Mr. Purser was sent down to see Father Longhery in reference to this programme?—No, I do not remember.

18992. And that he induced Father Longhery to make certain modifications in this programme?—I do not remember.

18993. And that the modified programme, as suggested by Mr. Purser, was submitted through the secretaries to the Board, and that a sharp censure was proposed on Mr. Purser by Mr. Lemaire?—Yes, I remember something about that, because I remember what followed from it.

18994. And then, if I am informed aright, you were unwilling to submit the programme to the Board unless Mr. Lemaire's letter of censure on Mr. Purser for modifying the programme was submitted along with it?—I don't think that is accurate. If you had asked me a moment ago what Mr. Lemaire's memorandum was about I could not have told you, but you have refreshed my memory. He wrote a very long memorandum about Mr. Purser, which was put on his table for his perusal. Mr. Purser wrote an equally long memorandum in reply, to the effect that he objected to being criticised by Mr. Lemaire. These two memoranda were submitted to the Committee which was drawing up the resolution of 1902. The Committee decided that, in view of the new regulation fixing the relations of the secretaries and the chief inspectors, it was not necessary to come to any decision on the complaints of Mr. Lemaire against Mr. Purser, or of Mr. Purser against Mr. Lemaire.

18995. This is 1902?—Yes. The new regulation made it clear that Mr. Lemaire had no authority over Mr. Purser.

18996. Nor Mr. Purser over Mr. Lemaire?—Yes, that is so.

18997. Then as a result of that, if I am informed aright, there was a decision by the Board that the offices of secretary and chief inspector were perfectly independent?—Yes.

18998. Now, in the face of that incident, is it any wonder that when that and similar incidents were known, the teachers did not more largely send up modified programmes?—I don't think it had anything to do so it.

18999. You see all these things get out and get talked about?—Father Longhery's programme, as modified by Mr. Purser, was not refused; I think it was sanctioned.

19000. The material point that I wanted to get at was this, that there was a dispute about a modified programme, that the secretary took one view and the chief inspector took another, and that as a result of that difference of opinion the Board decided that these two offices were quite independent of one another, and that decision was adopted in 1902, and so far you agree with me?—Certainly.

18701. And you stated that that regulation was repealed in 1904?—Mr. Lemaire stated it, and when I was asked whether it was so, I agreed with him.

18702. Then if it was repealed in 1904, was the fact that it was repealed communicated to the other members of the staff, or is there any notice to that effect?—I could not tell you that.

18703. Because I am informed it was not?—I cannot answer whether it was or not. It was the duty of the secretary to communicate these things to the other members of the staff, but I cannot tell whether he carried out his duty or not. Certainly it was his duty to inform them.

18704. You submitted a memorandum which you stated was not written by you to Mr. Purser and to Mr. Downing for their criticism?—No; I did not submit it for their criticism, but for their information.

18705. They informed us that it was for their criticism?—That is not true.

18706. Now, as a result of that criticism, Mr. Purser was suspended?—By the Board.

18707. It was by the Committee of the Board?—By the Committee of the whole Board, which reported to the Board.

18708. You informed us that you have the power of suspension when you are acting alone, that you see that a Committee of the whole Board?—I was the Office Committee, which is not a Committee of the whole Board.

18709. But that you had the power of suspending him?—You are talking now of before 1902?

18710. Yes?—I think I had the power to suspend, pending the consideration of the Board.

18711. Quite so; that is what I want to get at. And you further stated that that suspension was not valid until confirmed by the Board?—Certainly.

18712. And you went on to state further that in case the Board did not adopt your view of the suspension the officer, therefore, would not be suspended at all?—Certainly.

18713. Now, Mr. Purser was suspended by the Committee of the Board. That was on a Saturday, and I am informed that the suspension was removed at a meeting of the Board on the following Tuesday on a proposition made by yourself, and therefore the suspension of the Committee was not adopted by the Board?—It was adopted, because the powers of the Committee of the whole Board are the same as those of the Board.

18714. I do not think so?—They certainly are.

18715. If a Committee is appointed it must report to the Board?—The Committee of the whole Board has the same power as the Board.

18716. And then you are drawing a distinction between the Committee of the Board and yourself acting as a Committee?—Certainly; the Committee of the whole Board is the whole Board. It is a Committee of the whole Board, and I have always treated the Committee of the whole Board as being the Board. Any recommendation of the Committee of the whole Board is a recommendation of the Board.

18717. Now I shall pass on. I have in my hand the letter that was written by Mr. Wyse, and published in the Irish Independent on the 31st of October, 1911, in which he says: "In Mr. Purser's own interest, as his position was already in jeopardy on account of his previous suspensions by the Board for insubordination, and the Resident Commissioner was most anxious that a third conviction for the same offence should not prevent him recommending Mr. Purser for full pension." Assuming that you are correct, which I am not going now to dispute, he was suspended on that occasion, although his suspension only lasted from Saturday till Tuesday?—Saturday till Tuesday; that is quite true.

18718. And it was removed on your own motion?—Yes.

18719. What was the occasion of the second suspension?—That is an error.

18720. Was it not a grave error to publish to the world?—I do not think so, as Mr. Purser would have corrected it, if he thought it worth while. That letter

20th June, 1915.]

Mr. W. J. M. SPARKES, M.A., LL.D., examined.

[Continued.]

was written very late one evening when I had got it into my head that Mr. Purser had been suspended for not carrying out an order of mine in 1903; but the Board's action on that occasion was a censure, not a suspension.

18721. So then you admit there was no second suspension?—I do.

18722. Now, with reference to this case of censure in 1903, will you tell the Committee, if you please, the circumstances?—Mr. Purser was directed to inspect some schools in the North of Ireland.

18723. In Derry?—In Derry, in company with another inspector; but he wrote a letter that he would not carry out my order unless it was submitted to the Board.

18724. Mr. COMPTON.—You have not that order?—I have not got it here, of course.

18725. Mr. HANNA.—I intended giving notice about this point to say that I was going to raise it; but I did not think I would be questioning this evening. Perhaps I could refresh your memory on it. Mr. Purser was instructed to investigate some matter or hold an inspection in some case in the County Londonderry?—Yes, with another inspector; that is my recollection.

18726. And then he got a file of papers, and he wrote to the secretary asking for instructions, as he did not know definitely what he was wanted to do. Then he left town, leaving his address from day to day. The secretary then, I am informed, wrote a letter giving him definite instructions, and that letter went down to the hall, and remained on the mantel-piece in the hall for a few days, the porter expecting to see him passing in and out. He wrote from the country again explaining that he had not got his instructions. The terms of that letter I know nothing about, but that that letter came up, and the matter was brought before the Board, and he was censured, or, at least, as I am informed, a censure was passed on him?—Quite so.

18727. And then he got the letter; the first letter had come to him, and seeing that the second letter might be misinterpreted he wrote up explaining the circumstances, and you then, I am informed, wrote to him to send up the envelope of the letter to see what the Post Office stamp corroborated his statement, and when the Board found that it did, the censure never issued. Am I right in that?—I stated in my direct evidence exactly what happened. Mr. Purser's letter was submitted to the Board, which ordered his censure. Mr. Purser then wrote a further letter explaining that he had not got some letter which he mentioned. This was brought before the Board, and the censure was removed; but he was informed that his first letter was an improper letter. That is what I said in my direct evidence.

18728. I am not questioning that, but was the censure ever formally communicated to Mr. Purser?—I could not say that without enquiry. I took my information from the minutes of the Board.

18729. Well, I am informed it was not?—I do not know. A censure was passed on Mr. Purser at one meeting of the Board and removed at the next meeting; but the Board said that his letter was an improper one. If Mr. Purser did not get the censure, it was due to the delay of the Secretary in issuing it.

18730. But does it not appear rather sharp to censure an officer like a chief inspector without giving him an opportunity of explanation?—That is a matter for the Board.

18731. But you prefer not expressing an opinion on it?—I say it was the act of the whole Board. But there is no doubt of the impropriety of his first letter.

18732. You characterised Mr. Purser's conduct as being insubordinate?—When?

18733. On many occasions?—Yes, I certainly did.

18734. And I think you said yesterday that you regarded your two chief inspectors as more or less inefficient?—I did not say inefficient; that is not the way I put it, I think, but very unsatisfactory.

18735. You told us Mr. Purser was known in the office as the Heathen Chinee, with an eye or two up his sleeve?—Yes.

18736. Now, in face of all these things, was it not remarkable that you proposed him for Secretary in 1903?—I can give you the reason for that, because I have it in writing, written down at the time in a memorandum which I drew up for Sir A. MacDonnell. I wrote: "The idea then struck me that the best solution would be for Mr. Purser to take the secretaryship, and Mr. Stronge the chief inspectorship. In this way Presbyterian claims would be satisfied, and I thought Purser would be a better secretary than chief inspector." A secretary under one's own eye is a different person from a chief inspector going about the country. Mr. Louisa or Mr. Dwyer could do very little harm, when they so inclined, because I have my eye on them.

18737. Was he a candidate for the position?—You cannot say that anybody is a candidate for the position of secretary; but I asked him whether he would take it. I got a letter from him in which he stated on what conditions he would take it.

18738. Yes, exactly, but then he could not be regarded as a candidate under the circumstances?—Not strictly; but any person who tells you he is willing to take the post is more or less a candidate. At any rate, he said he was willing to take it on certain conditions.

18739. Is it fair to ask you to tell us what were the conditions?—The secretaries at that time were paid £200 a year, and Mr. Purser said he would not take it at less than £300.

18740. Anything else?—He insisted that neither secretary should be subordinate to the other.

18741. The Bantoe or Bant.—You do not seem to have had a very high opinion of Mr. Purser at the time?—No.

18742. And still I think you mentioned the other day that you yourself proposed him for the office of secretary?—I did; quite so.

18743. Was there any inconsistency in that?—Not at all, for the reason I have stated to Mr. Healy.

18744. It struck me as peculiar?—I suppose that was why I recorded my reason at the time.

18745. Mr. HANNA.—Could you colligate us as to who was the author of the memorandum?—I have more than once said that it would be like dissecting the Bible, because there were at least twenty hands in it.

18746. And you could not pick out which was which?—I could not. I could probably tell you the parts I did not write myself.

18747. Were you responsible for the grading of teachers instead of classification?—Certainly not.

18748. Or for the 36 years?—That was necessitated by the amount of money we had.

18749. But that memorandum proposed to save £50,000 a year?—What?

18750. It proposed to save £50,000 a year?—Like most estimates, it was very wide of the mark.

18751. But there was £50,000 cut off from the expenditure then, at least it was stated in the memorandum?—Yes. We had to get the pill in order to make it attractive to the Treasury. As a matter of fact, the object of saving money was to pay the increments. The validity of the scheme depended upon the savings, because it was clear that at the end of three years we should have had to add large sums of money to pay the increments.

18752. But it is stated in the document that when the scheme would be in full operation there would still be a saving of £50,000 a year?—But that was to pay the increments.

18753. But when it would be in full operation with the increments?—I do not think so; I should like to see the document. I do not know what you mean by "in full operation."

The Bantoe or Bant.—It would take thirty years to give all the teachers their full pension.

18754. Mr. HANNA.—Here is the paragraph, paragraph seventeen. (Document handed to witness).—Yes, it appears to mean that.

18755. I do not think it is possible to put any other meaning on it?—I agree with you; I think it does mean that.

18756. The Bantoe or Bant.—That is when the scheme would be in full operation?—Yes.

18767. You were not wise financiers?—We were adroit financiers, if we were not wise.

18768. Mr. HENRY.—“Were all the teachers paid at the maximum rates of each grade, and were the grades full, the total cost would be £1,123,880. On the other hand, were the teachers paid at the minimum rates of each grade, and were the grades full, it would be £799,000. The cost would, it is estimated, work out in practice ultimately to about £900,000 per year.”—I do not know how the author of the memorandum expected his saving was to be realised. At any rate, his financial hopes, if he had them, were blasted within two years, or even within one year.

18769. The HONOR OF BOSS.—I think £1,120,000 is going directly to the payment of teachers?—Yes.

18770. Mr. HENRY.—Were you responsible for the portion of that memorandum which says that the systems then in operation in the schools were antiquated?—I was not responsible. I will say perfectly frankly, and I hope I have been frank in everything, that I was new to the work when these schemes were elaborated, I know very little about it. Having been appointed by Lord Cologan, as I said, not in accordance with my own desire, I came into a system which had been condemned by the Manual Instruction Commission; I came in as the colleague of a number of gentlemen who, having been on the Commission, knew a very great deal more than I did about the system they were going to introduce, in fact half the revolution had been carried out before I came on the Board at all. You may have seen from the interview given by the Archbishop of Dublin to the Evening Telegraph in March, 1900, in which he denounces clearly what the various steps were. He stated that Mr. Rodington's death caused considerable delay in the working out of the scheme of reform, but that everything was soon got into working order, by means which it would not be becoming in me to particularise. Then, though I was responsible for the administrative machinery, I am able to say with perfect frankness that I am not responsible personally for a single idea, either financial or educational in that memorandum. It was drawn up in explanation of certain resolutions which I proposed, but most of it had already been agreed to in principle, at any rate, by a large number of the individual members of the Board.

18771. The CHAIRMAN.—Before your appointment?—Yes.

18772. Mr. HENRY.—I have a personal reason for asking the question. That memorandum was never published, but certain other documents based on it, and I was responsible for training students in school organisation in the college, and I was informed that most of the systems that were then used were out of date and antiquated, and I know not what. Well, I have here an extract from Mr. Cussen's report, the seventy-sixth report, page 95:—“A great majority of the rural schools have two teachers, and the classes are arranged in four groups, so that each teacher has at the same time one group at desk work and another on the floor at oral lessons, and then they change places alternately at the end of the lesson.” Mr. Fenton, in the same district, says, “This tends to improve the discipline and greatly increases the efficiency of the teacher's work,” and further he states that Mr. Dale reports favourably of it. Now I find in all the inspectors' reports that the system of organisation which they are recommending at present is the very system which is condemned there as inadequate and out of date?—Is not the organisation which the memorandum condemns that of teaching the children in small drafts?

18773. Oh, no. “The National Schools are at present organised on the systems known as bipartite and tripartite. Under all these systems the different sections change their relative positions after each lesson. The lessons are usually for half an hour's duration, each so that there is a good deal of marching and noise between lessons, and in badly managed schools a good deal of confusion. The different sections are engaged at different parts of the programme at the same time.” And then it says that these systems may be feasible in large schools, but that even in such schools in England and Scotland they are discarded, and quite out of date and old-fashioned?—Yes.

18774. And the systems old-fashioned and out of date in 1900 are the systems which the Board force on all the schools at the present time?—There is a cycle in the affairs of men. Systems arise and fall. We are now making a return to the Golden Age. I said in a speech that I made before the Technical Association last year that all the principles we are now trying to introduce into the schools were practised in the Ice Age. At that time men knew practically what they wanted from education; for the test applied by life was sharp and to the point. If Mountie man was not able to grapple with an ichthyosaurus he would have had a bad time of it, however great his knowledge of arithmetic might have been. Hence their education was eminently practical, in fact such as I should like to introduce at the present day.

18775. You would like him to have a hatchet?—The place of the hatchet is taken now by the bull-dog revolver. But the idea was there. In the Ice Age they were brought up with a trained capacity suited to the sort of life that they were going to lead.

18776. Well in that memorandum there was a promise held out to the teachers. “It is also desirable,” it says, “that the inspectors of National Schools should be recruited largely from the ranks of National teachers in order to give encouragement to the latter as a body.”—Yes.

18777. And then it goes on to say that “the inspector being the adviser and the helper of the teacher in the future it will be necessary for him to know the technique of the business.”—If you ask me with regard to the authorship of that document, I think it is more probable that I wrote that sentence than almost any other, but I will not swear to it. It is certainly in accordance with my view.

18778. Have you endeavoured as far as you could to carry that out?—By appointing National teachers?

18779. Yes?—Most decidedly.

18780. What proportion of them?—Recently?

18781. Yes?—I cannot tell you.

18782. The CHAIRMAN.—You have appointed them as inspectors?—Yes. I cannot tell you offhand how many teachers we have appointed, but I can tell you what our policy is. We summon as many well qualified teachers before the Board as we can find, and, other things being comparatively equal, we give the advantage to the National teachers.

18783. The HONOR OF BOSS.—I think it is desirable that where there are so few prizes in the profession encouragement should be given to the teachers?—I quite agree, and we are giving it.

18784. The CHAIRMAN.—The trouble is the initial salary?—Yes, we lose our best men through the smallness of the initial salary. For example, we appointed Mr. O'Neill in Brunswick Street; but after some hesitation he refused the appointment.

18785. Mr. HENRY.—I heard that stated at a meeting of an Educational Society, and Mr. O'Neill, who was there, said he was not offered the appointment?—I think you must have misunderstood him. You can take it from me officially that Mr. O'Neill was appointed.

18786. Mr. Purser was Chairman, and Mr. Purser, in proposing a vote of thanks to Mr. O'Neill, mentioned that Mr. O'Neill was a teacher who was selected for the position of inspector without application. I think those are the words he used?—I don't think that is accurate. Mr. O'Neill was an applicant, and appeared with other candidates before the Board.

18787. Now in this summary of improvements that you have effected in the schools since you have been appointed Resident Commissioner, you claim in one place that the teachers are given freedom of organisation. Are you aware now that that freedom of organisation is not permitted by some of the inspectors?—Not in accordance with my desire.

18788. I am not saying that?—I am not aware that it is so.

18789. I know many cases. I have opportunities of hearing from our past students, and from others, too, and I know as a matter of fact that there are a good many cases (and I do not want to mention the name of any inspector or teacher) in which the inspector lays down a hard-and-fast line that a certain system of

26th June, 1915.]

Mr. W. J. M. STANKE, M.A., LL.D., examined.

[Continued.]

organization must be adopted. Now do you think it is wise to hamper the freedom of the teacher? Do you recollect what I said the other day when I was asked by Sir Samuel Dill whether the inspectors carried out the spirit of the 1911 circular?—I said that I believed that in some cases they did not. The spirit of that circular, and of every other circular, is to give freedom to the teachers.

18790. I alluded to you on the first day that I thought those circulars were admirable, but that the fact that they were issued again and again seemed to imply, to my mind, that they were not being obeyed, and your answer was, "That is exactly my position; I have been disobeyed"?—Yes. But I don't think I put it exactly in that way, although no doubt it nearly comes to that. What I said in answer to Sir Samuel Dill, and what I say still, is that officers often find it very difficult to adapt their views to a new situation.

18791. Now I am going to ask you a hard question, and I hope you will not take it in an offensive sense. Is not the policy that you have been inculcating all through your examination one which, if carried out, must lead to the inspectors disobeying you?—What is that?

18792. That the mark made by an inspector is not to be altered?—I would not go so far as to say the mark made by an inspector is not to be altered, because I often refer cases on appeal to the chief inspectors, who do alter the mark.

18793. But you have laid it down?—I have laid it down as a principle that appeals are not to be encouraged. But why should that lead to the inspectors' disobeying me? I do not see the connection between the two.

18794. The connection is this, that if I were in the position of an inspector, and if I knew my marking as inspector would not be allowed by the head of the department to be interfered with, would it not necessarily follow that I would mark irrespective of any dread of reversal or reversal, and if, on the other hand, I felt that my mark was liable to be altered by the chief inspector or senior inspector, would it not make me weigh and consider, and say, "This has not only to satisfy my judgment, but it must satisfy the judgment of others as well"?—I think there are grave objections to revising the inspectors' marks as a matter of course.

18795. I do not think there is anything that we can put forward that an able man like you could not make objections to?—I am not very fond of making objections. Indeed, if I have one fault, it is that I am much too conciliatory; I am always too delighted to find myself in agreement with anybody.

18796. What strikes me is that, so long as inspectors have that power, where the mark is not liable to be revised, so long will you have this trouble?—What trouble? Do you mean disobedience or insubordination?

18797. A discontented country?—Not if you abolish the merit marks.

18798. Well it will still remain even if we have no merit marks. There will be reports, and those reports ought to be subject to revision?—I noticed at the beginning of my examination here that you were inclined to approve highly of some remarks that I made some years ago.

18799. Years ago?—About giving independence to the teachers.

18800. Exactly?—Why should not the poor inspector have his independence?

18801. I would give independence to the teacher, and I do not want to give licence to the teacher?—I quite agree. There is a very great difference between licence and independence, although they shade off into each other.

18802. He must show that his independence is used for the benefit of the children and of the schools?—Certainly, and he is not to allow himself to be swayed by the fads and idiosyncrasies of the inspector.

18803. But they are there?—No doubt there will be faddists so long as this planet is peopled by men and women. The question you raise is one which I have thought over for years and years, and discussed with

all kinds of people. Why should the Irish inspectors be treated differently from the English inspectors, who would think it an outrageous thing if a superior officer came into their districts and altered the marks of schools with which they themselves were much more familiar.

18804. That is not the point I am raising. The point I am raising is this. When a teacher feels himself on himself aggrieved by the report of a school, and when the teacher feels that the school is entitled to a better report, then in case of appeal I contend if a higher officer is sent down, that, after reviewing the whole circumstances, he ought to be in a position to alter the character of that report?—But suppose the higher officer is not so good a man as the officer appealed against. Seniority, I am sorry to say (I am getting senior myself), does not imply greater wisdom.

18805. Well, I don't know?—All of us in this room, except Professor Kettle, would be glad to be able to agree with you.

18806. I think only people under 30 are strongly wedded to that view?—I have a great belief in youth.

18807. These objections of yours reach further than you apply it, for it means that the people you are making choice of as inspectors in the higher offices are the wrong people?—Certainly, that was so when we appointed purely on seniority, but as we appoint mainly on merit now, I think we are getting better men.

18808. Can you not raise the initial salary of the inspectors?—We have applied to the Treasury, to whom we have pointed out that we are losing the best men among the teachers by not being able to pay them more than £150 a year. Whenever there is a post vacant under the Intermediate Board, many of my best inspectors ask me for permission to apply for it, as being a better job. If, as in England, the initial salary were raised to £320, we should be in a better position to attract the best men. There is an enormous difference between £150 and £320. £150 may be starvation pay.

18809. The CHAIRMAN.—What is the increment of the inspectors?—It is £15 up to £320.

18810. And it takes a man ten years to reach £320?—Yes.

18811. Mr. HENRY.—Then the point is not met to my mind. Is it no objection to say that the junior inspector might happen to be wiser than the senior or chief inspector in a case like that, and I think the teacher is entitled to that protection?—I do not see how he is entitled.

18812. He is entitled to get justice?—But what is justice? Do you mean the teachers' idea of justice, or the inspectors'?

18813. But clearly he is entitled to have his school marked on merits?—As an abstract proposition that is undeniable. If you were omniscient and could tell me in any case that a man has suffered injustice, I would go through fire and water in order to right it, but it is quite a different thing if you tell me that a man thinks he has suffered injustice.

18814. You will try to right injustice when it is proved?—When I am certain of it.

18815. I want a senior officer to be sent down, and to see whether the man has or has not suffered an injustice, and if he has suffered an injustice that it should be righted?—Although I constantly act as you recommend, there are many objections to it from my point of view. I am not certain that the opinion of the senior officer on the work would be power to justice; there is no reason to think so. We say the facts of a case are ascertained by the House of Lords, but it is quite possible that the House of Lords is the worst part of the machinery of appeal. Its only merit may be that it has been agreed upon as a final court.

18816. I am sure you will not dispute that it would be a matter of some importance to have a body of contented teachers?—Certainly, I admit that.

18817. And if the right of appeal were granted to them and the right of revision, and if that would tend to the contentment of the teachers and the smooth working of the system, would it not be desirable to have it?—If in every case in which a teacher appealed

against his mark he had a right to demand that the mark should be revised, I think the merit would be very bad; I think it would destroy the inspectors.

18808. And I think, on the contrary, and I am speaking of it from the teachers' point of view, that if the right of appeal were granted and conceded to the teachers in all cases, there would be very few appeals?—On the other hand, I think there would be very many. The way to deal with this problem is to obviate the necessity for appeals by getting rid of the merit marks. Let us see how that works. I think there will be very few appeals indeed if that is done, and if a rational system of inspection is carried out, such as we have been trying to introduce, but which has not yet been fully realised, since in many cases our policy has not been really understood either by the teacher or the inspector. In my opinion, the inspector is still too much inclined to employ mechanical methods. He takes his note-book in his hand, and he will ask a certain number of questions in arithmetic, geography, and reading, and then having assigned marks to each subject, he adds up the tot, and thereby decides whether the school is "good," "very good," "fair," "bad," or "middling." Such a system is far too mechanical. It is also objectionable, in that it inevitably leads to the constant changing of the merit marks, as the children, however well they are taught, answer well to-day and badly to-morrow, and I think it is hard lines on a teacher that his salary should be reduced because the children cannot be persuaded to answer on one particular day in the year.

18809. With regard to the tone circular, I was very much pleased to hear you say if I apprehended you rightly, that the tone of a school depends to a large extent on the character of the teacher?—Yes. Search for your good teacher and then leave him alone where you have found him.

18810. Now, in the one case you submitted to Mr. Purser as a thing that should be taken into account, the past record of the teacher, which, I believe, was a little bit variegated?—Not variegated, unrelieved, unmitigated, black.

18811. That you mentioned in describing him, and I am not going to dispute that at present?—If I did, I was too favourable to him.

18812. You contended that it was right for Mr. Purser to have taken that record into consideration?—Yes.

18813. Very good; now let us go down to Clonmel for a moment. If the tone of the school depends on the character of the teacher, and if the merit marks are not to be altered so long as the tone remains constant, and the tone will remain constant under normal conditions while the teacher is there?—I think so.

18814. Why should that sudden fall of 20 per cent. in the marks in Clonmel be allowed to pass without some attempt being made to right it?—Because I did not know of it.

18815. But you now do?—That is another matter. Sir Hiram Wilkenson made an appeal to me the other day, which I don't intend to forget. I am sure you understand the extraordinary difficulty of the situation. Certain things were allowed to happen in the Clonmel district, and when they had happened it was a terribly difficult thing to redress them. Some might say that Mr. Brown was wrong and Mr. Welby was right, but that does not settle the question, because the teachers were not responsible for the easy marking. If any one of us were told that his character and everything about us was excellent, he would believe it, even if it might turn out that another person would form an entirely different judgment of his merits.

18816. I want to apply that to another case. I have not the documents, but I think I am accurate in what I am about to state. It is the Ballyvallon school taught by Mr. Ferr, one of Mr. Woodward's schools. The teacher of the school got "excellent" for a great many years—seven or eight—and then an repairs had to be executed in the school, the school was closed for a week to put in a new floor, and they were working while the repairs were being executed, but the school

had to be closed for a week to put in the new floor. Mr. Kelly, the inspector, got notice of the closing of the school for a week, and he visited the school the first day the school opened?—Yes.

18817. He visited the school that day and the teacher was engaged in making arrangements where he would place his classes, because he had got some additional space; and then some months afterwards Mr. Kelly visited it again, and they had a little annual concert, with a little theatrical display in the school, to provide money for maps and other things of the kind, and they had to rehearse two days before this display, and the children were all full of their little parts in the school play, and as a result the mark of the school was lowered. The teacher appealed, and Mr. Kelly's defense was that Ferr, the teacher, was collaborating with another teacher in the production of books which might have diverted his attention from the school, and that he had got such a long succession of "excellent" that perhaps he was lulled into a feeling of security that no inspector would have the moral courage to lower the mark?—Is that in the report?

18818. That is Mr. Kelly's reply?—I should like to investigate that. I do not remember it.

18819. There you have a school that had got a long succession of "excellent," and it was visited by an inspector under peculiar, and I would say abnormal circumstances, and the merit mark lowered. Was not that certainly a violation of the spirit of the circular on tone?—If your account is true, it certainly would seem to me to be so; but I should like to see the papers.

18820. Here are the inspector's observations, which the Chairman kindly handed to me:—"The principal was collaborating in the preparation of texts in arithmetic, which have since been published, so that it is not probable that his mind was diverted, to some extent, from school work at the time. His own daughter, who had never been mistress, was appointed as assistant, and her lack of experience militated against the success of the teacher. A long succession of 'excellent' reports might have lulled the teacher into a false sense of security, under the idea that no inspector would have the moral courage to interrupt the tradition in the 1911 circular."—It is certainly laid down that the mark of a school which has continued for a long time should not be changed without the gravest reasons. As to the difference between "excellent" and "very good," I should not mind very much, because no money depends on it; but a reduction from "excellent" to "good" is a different thing. I don't approve even of the reduction from "excellent" to "very good," because it certainly is not a compliment to the teacher.

18821. There was one thing I was rather pained to hear you say the other day, that reprimands are nothing?—I qualified my statement. What I said was that reprimands in themselves were nothing. The important thing is what the reprimand represents, that is the report. I said that Mr. Wynn invariably read the reports and was not mechanically guided by the reprimands recorded on the back of the documents. I said at the same time that if the teachers objected to reprimands I should be delighted to abolish them.

18822. To me, at all events, my professional reputation is more than money?—I am glad to say that happened before my own time. The reprimanding of a teacher of your ability was an outrage.

18823. I got one for obeying the head inspector. That is the solitary one I got in my life. I think we should be very glad to hear that from you about abolishing reprimands?—I do not attribute much importance to them, except in the case of positive offences, like falsification or drunkenness. In fact, I said, paradoxically if you like, that they were a privilege of the teacher, in that they let him know exactly where he was.

18824. Now, when the 111 Belfast teachers appealed, had they not a right under the rules of the Board to have their cases examined individually—on an absolute right under your own rule?—I am afraid such a case was never contemplated when drawing up that rule. This is a case where there is insecurity in a multitude. Appeals might be so numerous that you could not deal with them.



20th June, 1913.]

Mr. W. J. M. STANLEY, M.A., LL.D., examined.

[Continued.]

18325. Then the rules should be modified?—Besides the Belfast teachers were told that they ought not to send up their cases in a way in which they could not be dealt with.

18326. But there has been no precedent before that of teachers being prohibited from sending up their cases?—There was the case of the Meath circuit which Mr. Parnes dealt with, and they got nothing out of it. It is hard to deal with a large number.

18327. I agree that it is difficult?—It is impossible when you have to deal with such a large number, and the teachers refused to select their best cases. They said they could not do it.

18328. Mr. Parnes's marks differed from those that had been given to the schools to the extent of 46 per cent.—I do not admit that. I read out what the marks were, and I should say that on the balance there was no difference between those of the senior inspectors and the chief inspectors. Indeed, if there was any difference it was against the teachers.

18329. I do not think that?—I do not know how you get your 46. Apparently you get it by leaving out all the cases where the difference is against the teachers; but I think the cases for and against the teachers ought to be allowed to balance each other.

18330. Now, take Craggah school. Mr. Parnes gave it "very good," and the mark for 1910-11 was "good." Well, that is a difference?—You are only taking those in favour of the teachers.

18331. Dunstons Boys' was "very good," and the last mark on it was "good." That would be in the teacher's favour?—It would.

18332. And then Hollymount school was marked "fair," and it is marked "good" by Mr. Parnes. That is there?—Yes.

18333. Clough school is marked "middling," and he puts it a little higher than that?—I think you need not take that one way or the other. "Scarcely fair" is "middling."

18334. The Southwell school is marked "very good"?—Yes, but Mr. Parnes apologises for the "very good" by saying that he spent only forty minutes there.

18335. And Irish Street, Killybegh, is marked in his counting as "good"?—No, I do not think that you should count a "strong fair" as "good"; if you leave Craggah. Hynds given that school a "strong fair," which he treats as not equivalent to "good."

18336. And Parnes makes it "good," and we have 6 out of 13, and that is 46 per cent.?—I think most of your instances are what may be called hot balls.

18337. But still the fact remains that Mr. Parnes's marking on these schools is 46 per cent. of the cases submitted to him was in favour of the teachers?—And in 54 per cent. of the cases he was against the teachers.

18338. I should say in 54 per cent. of the cases he was in favour of the inspectors' marking?—Yes; that comes very much to what I was saying. If you lump all those together you will find roughly that the 40 and 54 about balance, and that Mr. Parnes and Mr. Hynds on the whole agree with the marking of their subordinates. With respect to Mr. Welby, in the Clonsilla circuit, I disagreed with him in 21 cases out of 70; in 10 cases in favour of the teacher and in 11 against the teacher.

18339. You disagreed in 21 cases?—Yes, I did. I stated that from my point of view in some of the cases I thought the mark too high.

18340. In all these cases, whether up or down, I count them as showing the necessity for revision. The chief inspectors differed from the other inspectors, and as long as there is a difference between them the chief inspectors' mark should have the superior weight?—Quite correct; I agree. Who is to answer for Mr. Parnes and Mr. Hynds?

18341. Mr. HARRISON.—Was the difference in time between these visits at least a year?—It was a considerable time.

18342. Mr. HENRY.—This question of the time has been raised. Now, you agree that a school ought to be marked on its tone?—Yes.

18343. And that the tone depended on the character of the teacher?—Yes.

18344. And, therefore, the difference of a few months one way or the other ought not to make a difference in the marking?—It ought not, but it does. I am afraid that one inspector does not yet inspect in accordance with the spirit of the circular. There is still too great variation in the marks of the schools from year to year, whereas the character of the teacher does not change, and he works on hard in one year as in another. The inspectors cannot be giving due weight to the permanent aspects of the schools, or they must be treating the merit marks with too close a view to mathematical accuracy.

18345. You mean there by "mathematical accuracy" that they must have a mathematical standard that they apply to the schools?—I mean that, as they attempted to do in the report of the conference in 1904, they are giving mathematical values to the merit marks, e.g., "excellent" equal ten, "very good" equal eight, etc.

18346. I think the numbers are an abandonment?—I think the numbers are just as difficult to assign as the epithets.

18347. The CHAIRMAN.—I must say that I would rather have the numbers?—But there is this danger in the case of the use of numbers, that the inspector is very liable to assign so many marks to this subject, and so many to that, and to calculate the value of the school by adding all the marks together. If this is done, I would abandon the merit marks in despair. As I have said, I never approved of these marks, but I tried to save them by means which, if properly interpreted, would have secured that a school marked "good" or "very good," would have retained that mark, unless there was a very strong reason for reducing it; if your wishes had been carried out it would have been possible to save the merit marks; but if the inspectors inspect in a mechanical way, as I have been told they do, they will assign mathematical values to the various aspects of the school, so that if the lot comes out as 70 they will give "good," and if it comes out as 80 they will give "very good," you will have variations every year in the marking, and consequent dissatisfaction on the part of the teachers. This is not the spirit of the circular of 1911; but inveterate methods cannot be changed in a day, nor even in two years. The circular was drawn up for the purpose of obviating such abuses of inspection as occurred in Belfast and Tipperary. Whether it will succeed in doing this remains to be seen. In consequence of the unrest during the last couple of years it has not yet got a fair chance.

18348. In connection with the removal of inspectors from one district to another (and I do not want to reflect on any inspector) there has been a tendency since long before you came into the system at all for an inspector going into a district to look at some aspects of the programme, which perhaps were not worked as fully under his predecessor as they would be under him, and to overlook some other aspects. I do not complain of that, for it would be natural for a man to do that, but would it not be easy to issue a regulation that the state of things in the districts ought not to be interfered with by him without giving the teachers due notice of his requirements?—Quite easy.

18349. The CHAIRMAN.—I thought you said you proposed something of the kind?—That is the reason I say it is quite easy.

18350. The BURNER or ROSS.—To make a regulation is easy, but to have it carried out is another matter. Ten years ago I made a regulation that the altering of a mark by an inspector on his first visit should not count against the teacher if the mark went back to the old mark next year. Was not that a step in the right direction?

18351. Mr. HENRY.—It was a step, but I think it was a wrong step if you will permit me to say so. At any rate it was recommended by the Teachers' Organisation.

18352. Still you have the fact that the low mark remains as a professional blot on the teachers?—Do you think so, if the original mark is restored next year?

13853. I do?—And if it does not count against him?

13854. I do; and even though the higher mark on the school is allowed to date back so far as increment and promotion are concerned, still the other marks remain, and anyone asking for the mark of the year would be told the mark that remained still?—Yes, but the teacher has not suffered.

13855. He had not suffered pecuniarily?—I have been treating the mark as confidential. Mr. Coffey says he knows a case where the mark was read from the altar. Is the mark on a school well known?

13856. It is.—Who tells it?

13857. Well, I think the managers and teachers talk of it for one thing?—Yes, they do when they get a good mark.

13858. They won't talk about bad marks till it becomes whispered about that a number of them have got bad marks?—Yes, and then there is the safety of the multitude. Instead of hiding their dishonesty they set about collecting the cause of bad marking, and they set a high value of instances, as in Belfast and Glasgow.

13859. Now turning to another aspect of the question, we have it from the examiner that he issues censures and reprimands on his own authority?—That is quite wrong. I mean it is not official.

13860. I heard your explanation, but it still remains that he brings the letter to the secretary to be countersigned?—Yes.

13861. And there is a pile of letters perhaps so high to be signed?—There may be.

13862. And the secretary, as long as he is human, cannot examine all these?—No; in the case of delegation of authority there is always that danger.

13863. And is it right to have an untrained man (I am using the word in the technical sense) issuing reprimands?—The reprimands do not involve any judicial activity on the part of the examiner. They follow, as far as I can see, directly from the reports of the inspectors, so far as the official precedents permit. The inspector is the person responsible.

13864. Yes, that is so as long as the inspector makes a recommendation?—A recommendation is not necessary. Suppose it is reported by the inspector that the teachers make no preparation for their work, that the reading is monotonous and uninteresting in a school, and that things are going on in a very unsatisfactory way, if this is the first time that these things have been noted, it is very likely that, in accordance with precedent, the teacher would get an admonition; if in the next or the year after the same faults are noted, or if something additional crops up, it is very likely that when the examiner has before him the admonition of the year before, he will write to the manager and say, "Remind the teacher that he has not remedied these faults, and let him be censured;" if this goes on for the third year, and he fails to improve, he will say, "In view of what has happened in the previous years, let the teacher be reprimanded." The discretion employed by the examiner is of the very slightest description. Practically nothing is done except on the information supplied by the inspector.

13865. But still he issues the censure?—It is the secretary that issues the censure.

13866. And there is no check on him except that the secretary has to sign that letter with a bundle of other letters?—Yes, but I think I said before that never during fifteen years has any teacher ever told me that he objected to the way in which those censures, etc., were managed. They are a survival of old times, and I am perfectly willing to get rid of them.

13867. We had a case in Trim where a reprimand was sent down, and the manager refused to administer it, so he said it was unjust and undeserved?—Was that on the inspector's report?

13868. Yes, I am not disputing that. And then the Board threatened to remove the school from the list if it were not administered?—I do not remember that.

13869. And then the manager went to the teacher?—When was that?

13870. Well, it may be eight or ten years ago. He then went to the teacher and said, "I am going to administer a reprimand to you because I am threatened,

but at the same time I declare it unjust and unmerited;" and surely a reprimand issued under such conditions would do mischief instead of being a benefit?—I never heard of it. As I said before, I am not in the least desirous to keep up the reprimands.

13871. And would you be inclined to give up these reprimands altogether?—Yes, and to give the substance of the report of the teacher. Would that do so far as inefficiency is concerned? Of course, they should be kept up in the case of positive offences, such as falsification, etc.

13872. Now supposing after thirteen years you were to have the chief inspectors at the office?—One chief inspector is always at the office; and I constantly have interviews with them.

13873. Are you satisfied with the working of that portion of the system, with the noting of the reports and with the dealing with the reports, that it is as well done as it was in the older times?—Certainly.

13874. We never had appeals in the older times such as those from Belfast and Glasgow?—Circumstances have changed. I have given reasons why the upheaval in Tipperary occurred. Certain facts were not known to me that ought to have been communicated. With regard to Belfast the difference of marking was not very serious. Besides, circumstances have changed. In all departments of life there is a more aggressive spirit prevailing now than used to be the case. I do not think it was due to the chance of the chiefs of inspection from the office.

13875. Mr. Hynes stated that if the chiefs had remained at the office, in his opinion there would not have been that divergence of merit marks?—Well, you must take Mr. Hynes's opinion for what it is worth. I would not agree with him.

13876. I would attribute a great deal of importance to the opinion of a man of his experience?—But I would not agree with him. I have stated that when the chief inspectors were in the office the noting of the reports was done by Mr. Finzell, and the supervision over him was of the slightest.

13877. The CHAIRMAN.—And he was a clerk?—Yes, and he was not responsible to us for the action he recommended.

13878. Mr. HANLY.—Now about the regulation as to the preparation of teachers for work, are you aware that that has been made an engine of oppression for a large number of the teachers?—Indeed, I am not aware of it. An old teacher does not require preparation for work, but a young teacher does.

13879. I was speaking to an ex-student of ours who is a Bachelor of Arts since he left us, and a Bachelor of Science, and he got into trouble with his inspector, he told me, because he had not made preparation for giving a lesson on long division?—That is silly, isn't it?

13880. Well, that is the very reason I am bringing it under your notice?—With regard to everything that is to me as a fact, I always put in the proviso, "if it is true."

13881. Oh, I am telling you accurately?—How can you vouch for the accuracy of anything that you are told? I do not mean to make a reflection on anybody. I am putting it merely as a hypothetical proposition, when I say that if, in the case of a man of high qualifications, an inspector insists that he should make elaborate preparation for work which he is already master of, in such a case the inspector has no common sense.

13882. Would there be any objection to supplementing your instructions in such a way as to prevent such a thing by putting in some qualification?—I think we did that.

13883. Not that I am aware of?—I think we made a qualification that in the case of teachers of high attainments and long experience minute preparation for work should not be insisted on.

13884. Mr. COFFEY.—Where is that?—I cannot keep the whole office in my pocket; but there is a circular to that effect.

13885. Mr. HANLY.—But it does not convey it sufficiently to my mind?—What would you suggest, for I am always ready to accept suggestions? Do you not think that a great lot of difficulties are caused

by people, whether through temperament or through training or anything else requiring a regulation for everything they do. Some people are not happy unless they can synthesise and categorise the whole of life in such a way that they have only to put a book in their pockets, and follow certain regulations to the day of judgment. But why won't the inspectors (I say it again hypothetically if they don't), why don't they exercise a little common sense, it is really dreadfully hard to anticipate everything that may occur to a person who is a congenital idiot.

18880. Quite so?—And what is the use of multiplying circulars and regulations when some inspectors will tell you that they are already so many that they cannot remember them?

18887. But there is a regulation requiring preparation for work?—No doubt, preparation is required.

18888. It is absolutely necessary in some cases, but the regulation has been applied in cases where it is not required for all lessons?—It is very hard to deal with isolated cases. Suppose we sent a circular round requesting the officers of the Board to employ common sense?

18889. Now in moving through the Clonsilla circuit, were you in the Tipperary schools?—Not at that time, I think. I have been in the Tipperary school, but not on that occasion.

18890. What impression was made on your mind with regard to that school? The boys' school?

18891. Yes?—Well, I saw the Tipperary boys' school, as well as I remember, about June, 1909—do you know the date?

18892. I do not know the date?—I did not think it a very good structure.

18893. Because I am told that you made an observation that good work could not be done in the school owing to the structural arrangements?—I remember that it was a big room in which four teachers were teaching together.

18894. And the teacher complains that since that observation was made the mark has been kept permanently down?—My intention was the very opposite. Do you really believe humming like that?

18895. Mr. COWLEY.—With regard to the Knicker school?—Certainly, I remember it well, an admirable school.

18896. And didn't you think the mark was high there?—It was "very good."

18897. Wasn't it higher than you put on the school?—I would not give the Knicker school "good." If I had the marking of it I would have given it "excellent."

18898. Well, Mr. WOLFE had given it lower then?—As well as I remember his mark was "very good."

18899. And you would give "excellent"?—I would.

18900. Mr. HENLY.—What is the rule with regard to punishment so far as the punishment book is concerned?—I do not know whether I can answer that. Do you mean that punishment must not be inflicted until ten minutes have elapsed? I know that.

18901. And then a notice should be made in the book, and the book submitted to the manager on his first visit to the school?—I have not seen the regulations recently. They are not in the code; but in the punishment book.

18902. Do you remember the case of a boy punished in Kentstown school?—I do not.

18903. I have a letter by Mr. Lomas dated the 16th of January, 1913, referring to previous correspondence, and saying that the manager should have been consulted before the punishment. The regulation is that the manager is to be acquainted with it on his first visit to the school subsequently. And then it goes on to reprimand the teacher?—I should have to make inquiries before answering your question. It does seem curious that the manager should be consulted before the beating.

18904. Another point of importance is, as to giving the teachers notice of inspections. I remember you said to me that you were deaf to reason on that point?—Did I? I am never deaf to reason, provided I am certain it is reason.

18905. Is it not a serious thing for the teacher to have an inspector coming in and holding an inspection when he has perhaps only a few of his pupils present?—These things have occasionally happened, but I certainly would not allow a reduction in the mark in such circumstances.

18906. I have here before me a letter from Killyhall stating that the inspector went to the school when there was a fair in a neighbouring town, and very few pupils were present. I think the mark was reduced, and then the teacher appealed against it?—If it was reduced he would be sure to appeal against it.

18907. The suggestion that the inspector fixed the inspection for the day on which a fair is held in Newkeshawry, and that he knew that the attendance would be low, cannot, of course, be regarded as at all warranted?—They constantly make such imputations. They charge the inspector with selecting a very wet morning when very few children would come, or a day after a holiday when he knows there would be nobody there. I had a case before me lately where a merit mark had been reduced, although only a few children had been present on the day of inspection; but I did not allow the mark to be changed.

18908. Mr. HENLY.—Does not that show the necessity of giving notice to the teacher for the main inspection of the year?—No; I do not think so. I admit your premises, but I deny your conclusion.

18909. Is it not desirable that all the children should be there?—We have dealt long ago with difficulties of that kind. We said in a certain circular that the marks should not be reduced when few pupils were present or at the beginning of the year. You have shown much ingenuity in leading me to the conclusion which you are anxious to draw; but you have failed to convince me that the annual examination should be notified beforehand to the teacher.

18910. I would like to know this—what is the difference between an investigation and an inspection?—An inspection of a school?

18911. Yes?—An inspection of a school is held when a man visits a school and inspects its condition.

The CHAIRMAN.—Do you mean re-inspection?

18912. Mr. HENLY.—Of course, that would cover re-inspection?—An investigation is held when a man is directed by the superior authority to inquire into the state of the school from a certain point of view. In the case of an investigation the inspector has generally to consider whether the mark given by the last inspector was justified. A re-inspection is not necessarily an investigation; but if it takes the form of reviewing the work of the school, so as to justify it, or to recommend its alteration, I call it an investigation.

18913. Yes, but I do not think in the history of the National system you would find that called an investigation?—At any rate, that is what the Board calls an investigation.

18914. If a teacher appeals, and if an inspector is sent down to inspect the school, would you call that an investigation?—In the case of an appeal, it is possible to order a re-inspection or an investigation. It is a re-inspection if it is decided by the higher authority that the school shall be inspected a second time, and the re-inspection is carried out without reference to the previous mark on the school; it is an investigation if it is decided by the higher authority that an inquiry shall be held into the previous mark of the school. For instance, Mr. McNeill's inspection of Clonsilla school in March, 1912, was a re-inspection, but not an investigation, as he made no report on Mr. Cowen's marking. Mr. Purser's inspection in January, 1911, was an investigation, as it was largely concerned with Mr. Cowen's estimate of the school. In undertaking this without orders, he usurped the functions of the higher authority.

18915. Mr. COWLEY.—Where is that higher power vested?—It depends entirely on what the question is. Sometimes the higher authority is myself, sometimes it is the whole Board, but ultimately it is, of course, the whole Board. I am not like the sun; I am like the moon—I shine by borrowed light.

## THIRTY-FIRST DAY—TUESDAY, JUNE 24TH, 1913.

At 23, Kildare-street, Dublin.

Present:—Sir SAMUEL DILL, M.A., LL.D., LL.D. (Chairman); Sir HIRAM SHAW WILKINSON, LL.D.; Mr. HENRIAGE E. B. HARRISON, B.A.; Mr. JEREMIAH HENRY; Mr. WALTER MCMURROUGH KAVANAGH, D.L.; Mr. THOMAS MICHAEL KETTLE, B.L.; and

Mr. ARTHUR J. DONNELLY, M.A., B.Sc., Secretary.

Mr. DAVID FRIBELL, Accountant, National Education Office, examined.

19316. The CHAIRMAN.—How long have you been in the service of the National Board?—I have been thirty-one years in the service of the Board.

19317. And in what capacity did you begin?—I began as a second division clerk, and then I was subsequently promoted to what is known in the service as a temporary staff officer's position, and then at a later period I got promotion to a permanent staff position as book-keeper, and next in authority in the accounts branch of the office to the accountant.

19318. Was that under Mr. Young?—No, after Mr. Young's retirement, and in consequence of the vacancy that was then created.

19319. Who was your chief then?—Mr. Naish.

19320. When did you attain your present position?—Only within the last month, from the 1st of June.

19321. Then your experience does not go back very far?—Well my actual experience as accountant is, of course, very short. I have been engaged in the accounts branch for the last ten or eleven years.

19322. It goes back to 1900?—It goes back to 1900.

19323. You have minute experience of the finances of the Board back to 1900?—I have.

19324. You have put in our hands a general statement of your duties. You have the general supervision and control of the business of the accounts department?—Yes.

19325. And you have to prepare and submit the annual estimate to the Resident Commissioner?—Yes.

19326. The estimate of the amount of the Parliamentary vote required?—Yes.

19327. And to sign the cheques?—Yes.

19328. And to secure that no payment is made which has not been authorised by the Board?—Yes.

19329. And then you have to watch over the expenditure under each sub-head, and to satisfy the Resident Commissioner respecting it, and bring specially under his notice any action taken or expense authorised which would tend to cause an excess over the amount provided?—Yes.

19330. And you have also to call the attention of the Resident Commissioner to any measure which the Board may desire to adopt as to its probable effect in creating a new charge upon the vote?—Yes.

19331. And then you have to prepare and submit to the Resident Commissioner, who is the accounting officer, all correspondence in connection with the accounts department?—Yes.

19332. And you have to prepare a return provided in the rules and regulations on all questions relating to the payment of teachers' salaries and increments, I suppose?—Yes.

19333. Well those, I think, are your chief duties?—Yes. I have prepared a short statement dealing with the manner in which the Board's estimate is prepared, and particularly in reference to a point that Sir Hiram Wilkinson brought under my notice, and that is the question of the circumstances in which it becomes necessary for us to surrender balances.

The CHAIRMAN.—And that is what has misled the teachers so much, the word "surrender." For they think that you actually return the money.

19334. Sir HIRAM WILKINSON.—You have been able to prepare that statement?—I have. Shall I read it over or hand it up to you?

I think you had better read it.

"I beg to submit for the information of the Committee the following statement as to the manner in which the Estimate of the amount of the Parlia-

mentary Vote required each year to meet the expenses of primary education in Ireland is prepared, and in regard to the circumstances which render it practically impossible to secure that there shall be no unexpended balance at the end of the financial year to surrender to the Exchequer out of the Vote granted on this Estimate. The Estimate for the expenses of the Commissioners of National Education in Ireland, in common with all other Civil Service Estimates, is presented to Parliament by the Treasury. Early in October each year the Treasury issues to the various Departments having a Vote in the Estimate a circular showing the sum provided for each sub-head of the Vote for the financial year then current, and requiring that the figures for the coming year be stated. General instructions are given emphasising the need for great care in the interests of economy in public expenditure, and forms are supplied on which the details of the Estimate have to be furnished, with figures for the actual expenditure under each sub-head during the half-year just expired, and the completed Estimate is required to be submitted to the Treasury on or before the 1st of December. No provision may be made in the Estimate, as thus submitted in the first instance, for any payment for which Treasury sanction has not already been obtained. Any new services or improved rates of payment which are desired, but not yet sanctioned, must be dealt with in a separate communication, in which full details have to be given of the immediate and probable ultimate increase of charge which may be expected to arise from the proposals, with an explanation of the circumstances in which it is considered necessary to put forward these claims. After consideration of the proposals thus submitted, the Treasury notifies approval or disapproval of the various claims put forward, and the Estimate originally submitted in respect of the amount required under sanctioned regulations is returned for revision, so as to include provision for the new expenditure. The Vote for Public Education, Ireland, is at present granted under the following sub-heads:—Administration, Inspection, Training Colleges, Model Schools, National Schools, Grants for Scholarships from Primary Schools, Manual and Practical Instruction, Teachers' Residences, and the Grant-in-Aid for the Teachers' Pension Fund, and most of these sub-heads contain a number of subdivisions showing in detail the various services covered by them with the expenditure under each subdivision. With the exception of the Grant-in-Aid of the Teachers' Pension Fund, the expenditure under every one of these sub-heads is necessarily of a fluctuating character, making it impossible to predict with any certainty the amount which will mature for payment within a coming financial year, terminating sixteen months after the Estimate has been submitted. Take, for instance, the first subdivision of the sub-head which provides for the payments to National Schools, viz.: that which deals with the salaries and other grants for all principal and assistant teachers, and the capitation payments to the conductors of Convent and Monastery National Schools. When it is remembered that the number of assistant teachers in respect of whom claims for payment will be established during a coming year will vary with the fluctuations of the number of pupils in average daily attendance at the schools, that this average attendance is liable to great variation in consequence of the weather conditions and the prevalence or absence

24th June, 1913.]

Mr. DAVID PRINGLE, Assistant, *continued*.

[Continued.]

of epidemic sickness, that a comparatively small increase or decrease in the average attendance of pupils may make such a difference in the number of assistant teachers as to affect the amount of the payments by several thousands of pounds, the difficulties in the way of accurately forecasting expenditure which will need to be met by the Board in any particular year will be realised. A considerable amount of the payments are in the form of capitation grants on the average attendance of pupils, and there are many other circumstances which may vary the amount of the payments, and which cannot be accurately gauged when the estimate is in preparation. Choice has to be made between an estimate prepared as carefully as the circumstances admit with provision which is considered to be fully adequate to meet all the expenditure that is likely to arise under the sanctioned regulations, and one calculated to be sufficient to meet only the bare minimum of the anticipated expenditure, and likely to necessitate a supplemental estimate and vote at the close of the year. The Government and the Treasury do not approve of a supplemental vote if it can possibly be avoided, and the money so provided does not become available for expenditure, as a rule, until towards the end of the last month in the financial year. If payments of salary to teachers for service completed before the first of January had then to be deferred until near the close of March, much inconvenience and dissatisfaction would arise. The adoption of the course hitherto followed by the Commissioners, which results in a small margin of vote over actual expenditure is obviously preferable for all parties concerned, as it ensures that every claim for payment to the teachers and others under the sanctioned regulations which matures for payment within the financial year can be fully and promptly discharged when it falls due. It must be remembered that the money voted by Parliament for any year is not placed at the absolute disposal of the Commissioners to expend as they may think fit. It is available only so far as it may be required to defray such charges as may come in course of payment during the year in respect of services which the Treasury have sanctioned, and under regulations which have received Treasury approval. If the vote based on the original estimate is found to be inadequate to meet such claims, the additional sum needed may be provided by a supplemental vote, and if the vote as first provided proves to be more than sufficient for all the actual payments under the sanctioned rules, the surplus is required to be surrendered to the Exchequer. This procedure is not special to the vote administered by the Commissioners of National Education, but applies to all Civil Service Departments. The amount of the surpluses thus surrendered to the Exchequer in respect of public education in Ireland for the eight years ending with 1911-12 was considerably less than one per cent. of the sums voted, being £86,351 out of a total of £12,566,880. During that time the Commissioners have been pressing the Government and the Treasury for sanction for many new services and increased payments to the teachers, for which they have not yet succeeded in securing approval. It was not in their power to use any portion of the money which they surrendered to the Exchequer to pay for these proposed but unsanctioned services. If they did so, all the payments thus made would be disallowed upon audit. I submit herewith a copy of the estimate for the Commissioners' expenses as sanctioned by the Treasury for the current year, and of the last available appropriation account—that for 1911-12. With the latter will be found the explanation submitted to the Comptroller and Auditor-General of the circumstances which led to the variations between the vote and the actual expenditure.

18985. The statement that you made with regard to what the Treasury require is in accordance with the report of the Committee of the House of Commons on estimates?—It is.

18986. And they laid down the same rule with regard to what must be done in order to obtain Parlia-

mentary sanction for any money to be expended on the public services?—Yes, that is so.

18987. Then directly you deal with two parties. First of all you deal with the Treasury, without whose sanction you cannot expend a penny of public money?—Yes.

18988. And you then deal with the Comptroller and Auditor-General, who will not allow you to have expended any money for public service without having the Treasury sanction for it in some form or other?—Yes, if we made such a payment, the Auditor-General would disallow it unless we could show that it had Treasury sanction.

18989. So that first of all you have to get the Treasury sanction and then to satisfy the Comptroller and Auditor-General that you have obtained that sanction for every item that you have in your accounts?—That is so.

18990. How did the word "surplus" come in—where did you find it originally?—Well, I could not exactly say how the word originated, but it has been in common official use for a very long time, and it appears on all our printed forms.

18991. Does it appear in the Comptroller and Auditor-General's statement?—It does.

18992. It says: "Not surplus to be surrendered."—Yes, and at the end of the Appropriation Account, that the surplus of so-and-so, being the balance of the vote of so-and-so for the year ending 1911, has been surrendered.

18993. The meaning of that is this, that there are some votes of Parliament made in compliance with the Act of Parliament which do go over from year to year (I have in my mind some of them), but unless they are specially stated so in the vote the Comptroller and Auditor-General won't treat those as "stock" I am referring now to a building grant. Parliament in the Act said that a certain sum of money was to be given to certain places for the purpose of building, and at the end of the first year the Comptroller and Auditor-General raised the question whether the unexpended portion of this whole sum was to be surrendered or whether it could be carried on to the next year, and in view of an undertaking by the Treasury to get the Parliamentary sanction for allowing the amount to be carried over it was carried on to the following year. You understand that?—Yes.

18994. What you have put in is the estimate for the coming year?—Yes, that is the current year.

18995. And you have put in also the Comptroller and Auditor-General's report for the year ended 31st of March, 1911-1912?—The latest that is available.

18996. That is only the latest available?—Only lately available. In fact I have had to send specially for it. (Documents handed in.)

18997. Now, there is, as you have said, in this Comptroller and Auditor-General's statement an explanation of the causes of variations between the expenditure and the grant?—Yes.

18998. And the details are given there explaining how those variations have taken place. For instance, in the case of administration, there was a saving, and it is mentioned how it came about; and then in the fifth item under "administration" there was an expenditure of £269 14s. more, and the following explanation is given which illustrates the item that is taken by the Comptroller and Auditor-General:—"The cost of advertisements in the newspapers on official business mainly connected with vacancies for inspectors, organising teachers, and model school teachers proved to be considerably more than was expected when the estimate was framed." The Comptroller and Auditor-General, I understand, required you to obtain the sanction of the Treasury specially for that excess over the amount that you had estimated?—Yes, before the Comptroller and Auditor-General will pass the Appropriation Account we must produce a written authority from the Treasury for each individual sub-head that shows an excess payment over the vote.

18999. As a matter of fact, for the year now last past you spent £608 4s. 9d. less under the sub-head E (1), that is National schools, principals assistants, etc., in all the model schools and teachers of schools paid by

24th June, 1913.]

Mr. DAVID FRIMMEL, Accountant, examined.

[Continued.]

capitation, including the school grant of £240,500 for 1911-12; that is, the sum you estimated was £1,366,000 and the actual amount expended was £1,366,448 18s. 3d. showing that you expended less than the amount you had asked for to the extent of £904 4s. 9d.; and then it gives this explanation:—"The payment of salaries and residual capitation grant for the year went more than was anticipated when the estimate was framed owing to the fact that there was an unexpected increase in the average daily attendance of pupils at the schools, but the increased payments to the teaching staff from this cause were slightly more than counterbalanced by a falling in the fees paid for instruction given in Irish, mathematics, and cookery, in which fewer pupils were presented for fees than was anticipated." Yes, that is the explanation.

19080. So that you were very near your estimate, and that is the explanation how in one particular you expended more, and in another particular there was less expended?—Yes.

19081. Then if we go back to the year before that, we find that there was a greater difference between the estimate and the expenditure, that is for the year ending 31st of March, 1911. I have here the Appropriation Account of the same granted for National Education in Ireland. You have not put that in?—No, I only dealt with one.

19082. I have a copy here and it is a public document. Now, under sub-head E. (1) the amount estimated was £1,007,000, and the expenditure was £1,000,406 18s. 2d., so there was therefore less expended by £6,593 6s. 10d., and this is the explanation of the cause of variation between the expenditure and the grant under that sub-head E. (1):—"About £5,800 of this saving is accounted for by the fact that very many teachers who had formed classes for instruction in Irish and mathematics or extra subjects in the early portion of the school year and had notified their intention to present pupils for fees in those branches failed to continue such classes throughout the year or neglected to comply in other respects with the requirements essential under the regulations for securing payment of fees." And then a saving of about £12,500 on the estimated expenditure for salaries and capitation grant payable to the teachers is due to the unhappy fact of diminished attendance of children at National schools through the exceptionally inclement weather which prevailed in Ireland in the earlier months of the year 1910: "the diminished attendance leaving a smaller payment of capitation grant than would have been paid under normal conditions, and causing also withdrawal of salary from assistant teachers, and in many cases preventing schools from qualifying for additional assistant teachers." And that is the explanation for the year ending 31st of March, 1911?—Yes.

19083. As I understand your statement, it is this, that you are called upon to make a preliminary estimate and a final estimate, that is to say you make a preliminary estimate at an earlier period in which you have to make your estimates according to the amounts already granted by the Treasury, that is to say of the rates already granted by the Treasury?—What actually happens is this, that both proposals so far as much the same time, but they have to be dealt with separately.

19084. They have to be dealt with separately?—The first one, which we generally call the automatic estimate, deals solely with ordinary proposals for expenditure in the coming year under sanctioned regulations. That goes on one document, and then at the same time we send forward our requisition in regard to services as yet unsanctioned, but for which we desire to obtain Treasury sanction. Then the Treasury deals with the second communication of our first and considers our proposals in the usual way. Some are sanctioned and some are rejected, and I am sorry to say that there are more (in amount in any case) that are rejected than are approved; and they send us back then a notification of the additional services which we have requisitioned and which they approve, and at the same time they return us the automatic estimate which went forward and ask us to revise that by introducing and adding to it the new services which they now sanction.

19085. In some of the cases very numerous details are given, as is usual in the case of administrative salaries, because they are few; but can you give us a statement showing how, for instance, the estimate for the present year was made out—can you give us the automatic estimate and the final estimate showing how you made up the sum under E. (1). It would be the details of the number of teachers who are to get salaries at each rate?—Well, I think I had better explain to you that my predecessor did not prepare the estimate in that particular form. Perhaps it would be better if I would explain to you how he actually did prepare the estimate?

19086. Yes?—We have not the salaries of the teachers so arranged that you can say in advance that any particular teacher will have a fixed salary of so much in a particular year, because, as you know, the salaries of the teachers are liable to alteration at any date during the year by the addition of increment or by the award of promotion, so the way that we proceed is this. We make up the estimate in the month of November. By that time we have already paid practically all the salaries for three-fourths of the year that is then current, and we are in a very good position to estimate with close accuracy what the payments for the fourth quarter will amount to, that is the coming quarter, so in that way we know with a near approach to accuracy what the actual expenditure on salaries of the teachers will be for the financial year that is then current but approaching a close. That has for many years been taken for the foundation figure on which to proceed to fill up the estimate for the coming year. Of course, the accountant has before him the figures for a long series of years, showing the variations in the vote under these sub-heads, or rather the expenditure under the sub-heads, because we are not allowed, as you know, to proceed then by the vote, we must proceed by what the thing actually cost, by the actual expenditure. Then the accountant with these facts before him proceeds to arrive to the best of his judgment at the sum by which the vote for the coming year (for the payment of the teachers) will exceed or be less than the actual cost for the year that is current, and it is in that way that the figure was arrived at. Of course, he has at any time, so far as is needful for him, available for reference on the latest returns made up the number of teachers recognised in each grade and section of a grade, but it would be extremely difficult to proceed on that alone. He considered, as the result of his experience, after giving mature thought to the matter, that the best course was to adopt the plan that I have outlined.

19087. But the estimate is made with a view to expenditure under regulations sanctioned by the Treasury in full?—Yes.

19088. Could you supply us with the regulations under which you act in view of E. (1) (you have got, of course, the Act of Parliament giving the capitation grant)?—We have our sanctioned rules.

19089. Can you send us the sanctioned rules?—When I refer to the sanctioned rules I mean particularly the code of regulations of the Commissioners of National Education.

19090. Quite so. Perhaps I might explain it in this way. Could you furnish us at any convenient time with the numbers that are sanctioned by the Treasury in one (one) and one (two), and whether there is any limitation in the second class?—I can supply you with that now, as I am quite familiar with the figures.

19091. If you could give them, it would be convenient?—Well, there is no limit under the Treasury regulations to the number of teachers who may be recognised in the third grade, but there are limits to the numbers who may be recognised at any time in each of the higher grades.

19092. That is the second grade, and the second of first and first of first?—Yes. Now, the limit of the number of teachers in first section of first grade (men) is 340. The limit of numbers for second division of first grade (men) is 300. The limit of numbers for second grade (men) is 2,500. Then we come to the women. The limit of number for first division of first

24th June, 1935.]

Mr. DAVID FRIZZELL, Accountant, examined.

[Continued.]

grade is 370. The limit of number for second division of first grade is 450. The limit of number for second grade (women) is 2,600.

13663. And you could not put 2,001 women in that grade without having the Comptroller and Auditor-General surcharge you?—Yes, he would surcharge even if we put one extra.

13664. And I understand you have applied from time to time to the Treasury to increase the numbers in the first grade?—Yes, for several years past the sanctioned numbers have not been sufficient to provide places for either section of first grade men who were otherwise qualified for promotion.

13665. And with regard to second grade I understand that you are not quite full up?—Oh, we are not nearly full up. There is a most ample provision in second grade.

13666. So that if teachers qualified by seniority, merit, and numbers in their schools, you could supply them all with salaries?—Yes, in the second grade.

13667. But all those who have qualified according to your rules for second grade are receiving salaries of second grade?—Yes, that is so; and with regard to the first division of first grade a similar state of things is approaching in the case of women to that which exists in the case of men. The women are now very closely approaching the limit of numbers in the first section of first grade.

13668. The CHAIRMAN.—You are near the limit?—We are very near the limit of numbers at present.

13669. Sir HIRSH WILKINSON.—In the payment to teachers of their quarterly salaries, would you just state what the routine is?—The Commissioners issue to every school sometime towards the close of a quarter a form on which the manager is required to give particulars with regard to the average attendance of pupils for that particular quarter that is just ending. He is also required to set forth the teaching staff, to give a return of their absences during the quarter and the causes of their absences; to give a certificate that during the quarter the school was conducted in accordance with the requirements of the Board's rules. He has to furnish that return and sign and certify a claim for the amount of salary that is due to the particular teacher in respect of the services given by him or her during the quarter that is being dealt with. The latter certificate is signed both by the teacher as applicant and by the manager as guaranteeing that it is correct and accurate.

13670. Can you supply us with copies of these forms?—I have brought the salary claim, but I have not with me the form of quarterly return, but I can readily get it.

13671. In the case of an increment being given to the teacher that is notified, is it, to the manager?—Yes, I believe it is notified to the manager. I do not personally deal with the award of increment. That is done in another branch of the office. I am only personally concerned with the payment of increments accruing from the award already made elsewhere in the office.

13672. But the fact of the award having been made is communicated to you for financial purposes?—It is.

13673. And unless the manager had an intimation of that sort he could not frame the application for payment?—Well, he might possibly frame an application for payment, but, of course, the claim when it is received in the office is subject to a very close scrutiny and examination to see that it is accurate in every respect, more particularly that the amount of salary or increment claim is in accordance with our sanctioned regulations in respect of increment and everything of that description that has been awarded.

13674. I suppose you could obtain for us a copy of the form intimating to the manager (although it is not in your own department) that increment has been awarded?—Yes, I can do so.

13675. Your business is to carry out the rules and not to question whether the rules ought to be different from what they are?—My business is to be satisfied that all increments sanctioned by the Board are duly paid, and nothing more and nothing less.

13676. Now I am going to put a hypothetical question to you, and as a matter of routine. If the Commissioners of National Education were satisfied with the following certificate, as indicating the right of a teacher to an increment that had become due otherwise, that is to say: "I certify that this application is just and proper"—if the Commissioners were prepared to take that as a sufficient certificate for the fact that the teacher was entitled to increment, there would be no difficulty, so far as your office is concerned, in arranging your form so as to pay the increment on your receiving from the other department an intimation that spent from that certificate the increment was due?—I don't quite follow, Sir Hiram.

13677. At the present time the increment is awarded after the inspector has made his report?—Yes.

13678. And after the teacher has got a certain number of merit marks?—Yes.

13679. I am now asking you not whether you think the merit marks ought to be abolished or anything of that sort which lies outside of what you consider your functions, but if the Commissioners were satisfied to abolish the necessity for merit marks, and to take in lieu of merit marks a certificate from the manager that increment has been properly earned, that it is just and proper to give the increment, there would be no difficulty in your department?—Not if we were in a position to know that the Treasury had sanctioned the adoption of such a procedure, and provided the money to meet it.

13680. At the present time are you able to say how many teachers who by seniority and numbers in their schools would be entitled to increment are deprived of increment by reason of not obtaining the proper merit marks?—I am not in a position to say at this moment; I am not in a position to furnish that statistic, but I understand that a return on these lines is in course of preparation on a requisition from this Committee.

13681. So that your estimate might possibly have to be increased a little if the payment of increment was made upon the certificate of the manager instead of upon obtaining certain marks?—I think there is no doubt that our estimate in that case would have to be very largely increased.

13682. What is your reason for thinking that? As I understand your proposition for discussion is that the responsibility for judging the merits of the teacher for an increment should be transferred from the Board and its officers, the inspectors, to the managers of the schools.

13683. Not finally, but that in the absence of any report from the inspectors to the contrary the certificate of the manager should be taken that the teacher was entitled to it?—Oh, well, even in that case there would still have to be a considerable addition made to the vote, because the present scrutiny on which increments are awarded is very much more strict than that would be.

13684. But we cannot really estimate what it would be without the details?—Not at this moment.

13685. I believe the Bishop of Ross handed to Dr. Sturdie a revised scale of salaries\* with a view to equal annual increments, and I understood it was to be submitted to you for your remarks. Have you had an opportunity of considering it?—The Bishop of Ross had an interview yesterday with the Resident Commissioner, and he brought over with him a copy of his latest form of this particular scale of increments, and the Resident Commissioner sent for me and I had an opportunity (of course, a very hasty one, necessarily) of looking through the scale, and I have a copy of it here with me.

13686. And would you kindly give us what suggestions occurred to yourself with regard to that proposed revised scale of salaries?—Do you mean that I should give my suggestions as to how the scale strikes me?

13687. Yes?—Well, the first thing I observe is that it is proposed both for men and women that while they would get an addition of £6 to their initial salary as set forth in the existing scale, they would remain for seven years without any increment. Well, of course, it at once occurs to me, from my general knowledge of the Civil Service, at present in any case, that that is a very

\* Vide q. 13634.

unusual proposition, and I fear that when it came to be promulgated there would be very considerable dissatisfaction with it.

13988. A suggestion has been made with regard to that with a view to fixing the limitation of the period for which no increment would be given as five years, with a view to the elimination of such teachers as may not have proved themselves capable of efficiently carrying on their work, that is to say that the teachers would receive a higher initial salary than at present, but that the higher initial salary should be so framed that it would continue only for five years, and that at the end of five years their efficiency should be tested or considered in some way, so that only the probably efficient ones might receive increment after their first five years. If that could be arranged, would that seem to you to fall in with the Civil Service idea?—Well, of course, it would lessen the objection to the proposal, but as far as comparison with the Civil Service is concerned I am not aware of any branch of the Civil Service where a person is kept for five years on an initial salary without increment. There are cases of higher appointments where, towards the end of a man's official career, you will find salary arrangements like this—£700 for the first five years and afterwards £800; but I am not aware of any case where a person in the Civil Service is required to remain on a commencing salary for the first five years.

13989. You think that the period of five years is too long?—Well, I do not wish to enter into a discussion on educational measures, but I am only mentioning it as it occurs to me.

13990. From the Civil Service point of view?—From the Civil Service point of view.

13991. Mr. HADLEY.—There is one question I would like to put. What way would you look at that proposal supposing the time for which the teacher would be excluded from increment would be the time that he had not got a diploma—of course, I know that would lessen the period?—That would, of course, considerably lessen the period, and, of course, anything that would lessen the period—

13992. Would lessen your objection?—Might lessen my objection.

13993. And what strikes me is this, that as probationary teachers (because that is all they are) they could not apply for or get an increment until they had got a diploma, and that would be a further stimulus to exertion on the part of the teacher, and I think you would have the the training collapse in favour of a recommendation like that, because it would be a spur to the teacher to get the diploma?—That would certainly seem to be so.

13994. But how would it affect the financial stability of the scheme?—Well, you see, that when you come to discuss the question of financial stability of the scheme, when an accountant comes to deal with it, it is a most intricate matter, and it takes a very long time to complete, as there must be calculations made and worked out. Any criticism that I may now offer upon it in a casual way cannot be very conclusive. Of course, there are certain aspects of the matter that one could deal with at once.

13995. Sir HIRSH WILKINSON.—Perhaps you will be good enough to give us suggestions that occurred to yourself on such a review of the scheme as you have had time to devote to it?—Well, I jotted down here roughly a few points that struck me, and looking at the period of years laid down in the scale, I notice, as I have mentioned already, this point about the proposed very long delay of the first increment. Then the next thing I noted was that in regard to women the proposal is that the annual increment in the third grade shall be higher than in the second grade, or second of first grade, or for several years in first of first grade, and it at once occurred to me that that is a procedure that is rather out of the common as compared with our general experience.

13996. You have pointed out that the increment in the early stages is higher than in the later stages?—Yes.

13997. And that in the ordinary Civil Service increment increases in the higher stages?—Yes.

13998. Mr. HADLEY.—But it is only right to say that what His Lordship was aiming at was to spend approximately the same amount of money in each grade, and to make the period in which the teacher would occupy the grade the same as at present?—Oh, yes; I am quite aware of that.

13999. And it is in that, I think, that the variable increment is done?—The way it strikes me is what would happen supposing that this becomes an accomplished fact, and that all the teachers are required to adopt it. It was rather from that point of view that I was discussing it.

14000. Mr. KETTER.—Do you see a vista of resolutions of the Teachers' Congress?—I confess that I do.

14001. Sir HIRSH WILKINSON.—Then will you proceed with your suggestion?—I find in the first section of first grade, men, the proposal is that there shall be an annual increment of £3 for eight years, followed by a single increment of £12. Of course, I see at once the reason of that proposal is to keep the expenses within the grade equivalent to what it is at present, but it might be looked upon in this light also, that you establish a fifth grade, as it were, one in which all the men would have a fixed salary of £183, or else that you still keep the grade as it is and declare that the ninth year of a man's public service is worth four times as much as the eighth year. The same observation, to some extent, though not so markedly, applies to the proposal with regard to the first division first grade women, for there are six increments of £3 each, followed by three increments of £5 each.

14002. That is in the first of first?—First of first (women). The proposal is that there shall be six increments of £3 each, followed by three increments of £5 each.

14003. Yes; that would, of course, so far be in accord with Civil Service ideas, that is, the increasing of the increment later on?—Yes; except there is just this, that I have to make about it the same remark that I made about the men, that it would practically constitute the body who would be in receipt of an increment of £5 for the last three years into a new section.

14004. Yes, but that is looking at it from an accountant's point of view?—I am not really looking at it so much from an accountant's point of view, and I see that the scale is designed so that taking it as a whole there is not a very material difference between its cost when it is worked out and the cost at present. But I rather think that we would find it difficult to depend on some points when its proposals would come under discussion.

14005. An accountant naturally looks at a new thing as being created whenever the rate of increase is altered?—That is when the rate of increase is not constant throughout the grade.

14006. Mr. HADLEY.—I think that objection of yours points to a very grave objection that would be raised on the part of the teachers, namely, that as the number of teachers that are admitted to the top grade is very small, the period being so remote, 36 years?—That is so.

14007. That the number that would come in for this large increment would be almost infinitesimally small?—Yes; there is, of course, a great tendency to fall out and not actually complete the time that would bring them to the top.

14008. It is a very grave objection to my mind?—Then, of course, there is also the point that there is a proposition that the initial salaries should be raised by £5.

14009. Sir HIRSH WILKINSON.—That is your next point?—Yes, I find when I refer to the last available statistics that we had something like 2,700 teachers in receipt of the minimum salary, so that this proposal alone would involve an extra cost of £16,000 per annum. Following out the same idea, I find that increase will arise in other directions. I see that for second grade men the maximum salary is proposed to be increased by £1, for second division, first grade, men, the maximum salary is proposed to be increased by £1, and for second division, first grade, women, the maximum salary is proposed to be increased by £1. Now, I am aware that at the present time we



have a very considerable number of teachers who are in receipt of the existing maximum salary of their grade, and who, when this regulation would come into effect, would have given three years' service in receipt of the maximum, and so, of course, it is inevitable that everyone of those persons should immediately get £1 increase, and that would amount for not less than another £1,000, to be added to the £16,000. Of course, a point that I was greatly concerned with, as an accountant would be, to have the scale so arranged that, without hardship, all existing teachers be required to adopt it, because, of course, you can understand that when we have to deal with the payment of 13,000 teachers, and when we find that there are teachers who are more than 40 years in the service, it would be a very disturbing element if we had to try to carry on concurrently two systems during a period which may possibly extend to 40 years.

14010. You could not practically attempt to carry on a concurrent system, in fact?—Well, I fear that it would be out of the question for us to carry on two concurrent systems.

14011. I understood the Bishop of Ross did not propose to carry on a concurrent system. He recognised that there would be some difficulty in the transition from the old system to the new system, so that any observations with regard to that are very forcible, and any considerations of that sort would have to be dealt with.—Yes.

The CHAIRMAN.—I think I am right in saying that the Bishop proposed on the last day suggestions for adjustment.

Sir HIRSH WILKINSON.—He suggested that adjustments might be made with a view to all teachers old and new coming under them.

The CHAIRMAN.—But those suggestions, if I remember rightly, were very definite.

14012. Mr. KERR.—They were. You will find that the salary is the same under the improved scale?—Well, of course, I pointed out to him yesterday, and I put the question to him, had he in his mind that the scheme might have to be worked concurrently, and he said not, and then I put the question to him, how in the third grade would he propose to find equality for the men who had already passed over the first period, and he admitted that to some cases such as that there should be an artificial adjustment that could only be applicable to the old-time teachers, and he mentioned one or two ways in which that could be done. One was that those teachers might, at a particular point receive double increment, but when I reflect, as a person to some extent responsible for the administration of the payments, on what a tremendous burden that would place upon us, with the risk of over-payment and the increased risk of error in our accounts, and controversy with the Audit Department over it, I confess that I apprehend trouble on this point should the scheme be adopted. I have been thinking over this scheme, and one or two points occurred to me that did not come before me in my rather hasty talk with the Bishop of Ross, to which, possibly, his lordship did not advert.

14013. Sir HIRSH WILKINSON.—Those were those points?—I do not think that he had perhaps sufficiently before his mind that the average for retaining the salary of the grade differs from the average that is required to obtain an increment in the grade. Now, for instance, an average of 70 is required to obtain an increment in the first section of first grade, but that increment once obtained is not taken away from the teacher as long as the school keeps up an average of 35, which is an enormous difference. Now, it sometimes happens, I won't say very often, but anyone can see that it might occasionally happen, that a teacher who has a school on the border line between 60 and 70 makes a great effort for one year to secure the average of 70 to get promotion to the first section of first grade, and at a later period may not be able to keep up the average, as population may decline or additional schools may be established, and there may be many reasons why the teacher may not be able to keep up the higher average. I can illustrate what is in my mind by taking a particular point of the scale. I find here that in the thirty-fourth year of service persons who normally

proceeded from the beginning of the third grade and got all his increments in due course, without special grade promotion, till he came up to the thirty-fourth year of service, could be in receipt of a salary of £175 on the existing scale; but under the scale proposed by the Bishop of Ross in the same year the salary would be £167. Now, having got that salary of £175 on the present scale, he is sure of it for the rest of his official career, certainly as long as he has an average of 35; but on the altered scale proposed by the Bishop of Ross he has only a salary of £167, and if the average happens to fall below 35, he can get no further increment, and he is fixed at £167 for the remainder of his time.

14014. That is applying the present rules with regard to the numbers necessary to obtain increment, and the numbers necessary to retain increment, that if those rules were applied he would get £167 and could not get any more?—Assuming that his attendance fell below 70 he would be fixed at £167 for the remainder of his official career under the Bishop of Ross's scale, whereas under the existing scale he would be entitled to £175 as long as the school kept up to 35. Of course, one can easily see that a considerable number of cases of that kind might arise and that it would be regarded as a hardship.

14015. Your experience of the claims that are made by teachers who were in the service before 1900 would lead you to believe that a teacher arriving at that time of service would present his claim for the £175 as being entitled to it under the old rules?—I certainly believe he would. He would represent that "I entered your service subject to a scheme of rules which would have afforded me a salary of £175 at this particular point of my service, taking into account the manner in which I have discharged my duties, and the average attendance that has been maintained at my school, and now I find that you propose to give me only £167."

14016. Was there any other suggestion that occurred to you with regard to the scale?—Of course, there would be difficulty about it in regard to the increased expense. Annual increments must either be given, say, on an automatic system, or they must be given through an administrative system that would cost a great deal more, or at least would cost considerably more than the system of triennial increments. Under the triennial system each man's position is only reviewed every third year, but if you are to retain the same degree of efficiency in reference to annual increments each one must be considered every year. While, of course, compared with the total payments to teachers, the additional administrative expense might not be great, yet it is a figure that cannot be left out of sight. The staff dealing at present with increments triennially would not be able to apply an equally searching test for annual increments.

14017. The annual increments were suggested as one of the means by which the triennial test might be dispensed with?—Of course, I can see that if you raise the condition of efficiency you will necessarily add very considerably, when you are dealing with the pay of 18,000 individuals, to the ultimate total charge on the State.

14018. In your administrative branch the number of the staff get their increments on a certificate that their service has been approved?—Yes, that is so.

14019. And nothing further?—Oh, I think there is something more than that; there is a rather searching certificate prescribed in the case of Civil Servants. When a man gets an annual increment of salary his claim is dealt with on what is known in the service generally, I think, as an increment docket.\* That docket has to set forth a certificate of efficiency during the past year from his immediate superintendent, that is, the man who is acting as head of the room in which he is working. It has to be certified then by the next higher official.

14020. No, I beg your pardon, that is not required. The Order in Council requires two certificates and only two. I will read the Order\* in Council, which defines exactly what is required and nothing more:—"Annual increments of salary shall not be allowed to any officer at the date from which in ordinary course it would become due without a certificate from his immediate

\* Vide Appendix XXVI, (B).

24th June, 1913.]

Mr. DAVID FREEMAN, Accountant, examined.

[Continued.]

superior, countersigned by the head of the Department or such person as he may designate for the purpose, to the effect that the service of such officer during the year preceding the date of such certificate has been approved of." So that there are just two people who are required under the Order in Council to certify, and these seem to me to be the necessary people to certify, especially if the place is large. The certificate has to be signed by the immediate superior, and then it has to be signed by the head of the Department; in other words, as head of the Accounting Department you would sign it and the Resident Commissioner, and if you like to have half-a-dozen initials put in that is not necessary by the Order in Council?—Well, the actual practice I know in my department is this. The increment desired is certified by the head of the department in which a man is at work; it is certified by the secretary to the Commissioners; it then comes to the accountant, who formulates the regular Order awarding increment, and submits it to the Resident Commissioner for his approval, and it is finally in that shape approved by the Board.

14021. Yes; but your action is purely automatic?—I do not understand.

14022. I mean that suppose it is another department than your own, the people who have to determine whether the person is to get his increment are the head of the department and the Resident Commissioner?—Yes, I understand that. My action in dealing with it as accountant is automatic.

14023. Of course, in your department you are head of your department?—Yes, that is so.

14024. But I mean the issue may be obscured by a number of certificates of officials?—And, of course, it generally will become necessary in order to carry out the requirement of the Order in Council. The particular man who will sign may not himself have a minute knowledge of the individual to whom the increment is due, and it will be necessary to have a certificate that the man is all right from the minor superior, who is in possession of minute information.

14025. He may take any of those he likes, and, of course we all know that there may be doubtful cases a conference with other people in order to find out whether or not the certificate ought to be issued, but it is his immediate superior and the head of the department, who are specified by the Order in Council. The head of the department in this case is the Resident Commissioner, of course?—Yes.

14026. And the immediate superior may be doubtful sometimes, but it is the immediate superior whoever he is?—There is an intermediate person in any case, with personal knowledge of the efficiency of the clerk who gets the certificate.

14027. Then I may mention another point here that scarcely comes within your branch, but yet it is well that it should be kept in mind as a case of persons coming under the Order in Council. There is this proviso, that "if at the date when the increment would in ordinary course become due a certificate cannot be given, the head of the department may specify a period from the expiration of which, if the officer's service in the meantime has been approved, increment may be allowed, and may from time to time extend the period as fixed. If the officer's service after the grant of the deferred increment shall continue satisfactory, the head of the department may, if and when he thinks fit, increase the salary to an amount not exceeding that at which it would have stood if no increment had been withheld or deferred. Any such increase shall be reported to the Comptroller and Auditor-General." Now, the result of that proviso is this, that if a man loses an increment for a time, he only loses his increment for that period and no longer, whereas under the rules of the Board, if a teacher loses his increment of £67, the loss of that increment may cause him a loss in the course of his career of over £119. I do not know whether you are aware of that?—Well, I assume you have made the calculation; I have not.

14028. The calculation has been submitted to us by others; it is not ours?—Well, I suppose it will be sufficient to admit that a man might lose a very considerable figure. I am prepared to admit that there might be a very considerable loss.

14029. I mentioned it to you, because Mr. Lomas, in speaking of this matter, seemed to think that the staff in the office were subject to much more onerous conditions than the teachers, and I wanted to remove any misapprehension on that point?—Well, I should like to say that the increments of the office staff are very far from being automatic, while not wishing to contend that they are as strict in some respects, possibly, as the regulations for National school teachers work out.

14030. I take it that those who have got the control of the work of the office see that service is rendered for increment as well as everything else?—Yes, that is so.

14031. I was not for a moment wanting to depreciate the office staff, but merely pointing out that there is under the present rule a result that is much more serious for the teachers than it would be to a member of the office staff if he loses his increment?—Yes, that is so. Of course, such a case as that you assume is not universal in its application; it refers only to a person who, having been temporarily inefficient, recovers and maintains his efficiency.

14032. Yes, but in the case of a teacher who recovers he suffers?—Yes, there is no going back for him, and being put in as good a position as he would have been.

14033. No, and that matter has been before the London School Board, for instance, and they provide that if a teacher's increment is taken away it is only the amount which he loses for that particular year, and that he does not suffer the consequences which would result from the application of the rule that the Board have at present with regard to increments. You quite see that it is a very serious matter?—Oh, I quite see that it is a serious matter for an exceptional individual.

14034. Was there any other point that occurred to you?—I think there was no other point that occurred to me in connection with the Bishop of Ross's scheme, so far as I have been able to examine it; but it is only a very tentative view that I have been able to give, and it is because a question of submitting the scale for the approval of the Treasury very much more minute and searching inquiries would have to be made.

14035. The Chairman.—So that no safe conclusion could be reached for practical purposes without a very long and thorough investigation of all the details and possibilities?—Yes, that is my opinion, and the most cursory examination shows that it must lead to considerable expense, and there would be very considerable difficulty in making it applicable without hardship to all existing teachers.

14036. Mr. HENLY.—In reference to the initial objection that you have, that is, as regards the seven years, would you see any objection to keeping the teacher without any increment till that teacher has got a diploma?—I know it would make an arrangement of the sort most difficult?—Well, I think it could be better defended, because one can say that a trained teacher has obtained a diploma he is a probationer.

14037. He is a probationer pure and simple?—If a workable scheme should be framed on that principle to carry out the idea of the Bishop of Ross, that it should not cost more, the whole scheme would have to be re-cast from that point of view, but it would, in my opinion, be open to much less objection than the proposition now before us.

14038. Mr. HANMER.—What is the shortest probationary period now?

Mr. HENLY.—In two years they are supposed to be fully trained?—The diploma may be gained in two years, but it must be gained in five years.

14039. In five years or not at all. Then the only other question I have is this. As you have pointed out certain objections to the Bishop of Ross's scheme, which to my mind are real objections, would it be consistent with your position as accountant to the Board to give us such modifications of that scheme as would seem that what we have been aiming at, that is, annual increments, without exceeding the present grant, could be carried out, that is, a modified scheme such as you might be able to suggest with the expert knowledge that you have, and that, of course, no member of this Committee could have?—Well, that is a question that I am not now prepared to give an absolute

24th June, 1933.]

Mr. DAVID FREEMAN, Accountant, continued.

[Continued.]

answer to. You see, to prepare such a scheme as that would require a very considerable time, as it would be a matter requiring much reflection, and I take it that in order to be of value to you it should be submitted at a comparatively early date. I can see that there would be difficulty in doing that.

14040. But I suppose you can see that there would be advantage, too?—I suppose so.

14041. Mr. KERRIN.—It would not be quite fair to ask you. Would it not seem to commit you to a policy that you have not expressed your approval of?—I think that an official in my position is in a difficulty with regard to the preparation of this scheme, and that weight, which it would really not deserve to have, might be attached to it as coming from an official. To be really valuable, it should be exhaustive.

14042. After the very clear statement that you have put in I do not think it is necessary really to go over a great deal of ground, but with a view to make the situation perfectly clear, I might, perhaps, ask you a question. The total expense of primary education is, of course, a question of public policy, to be determined by Parliament?—Yes, it has ultimately to be determined by Parliament.

14043. In fact, it has ultimately to be determined by Parliament?—Yes, that is so.

14044. The position of the Treasury is really, to put it briefly, that it controls the technique of expenditure, it controls the expenditure of money voted by Parliament?—I suppose technically that is so.

Sir HENRY WILKINSON.—No money can be voted by Parliament unless the Government ask for it, and the Government won't ask for any money, as a rule, unless the Treasury have, in the first instance, sanctioned it and approved of it.

14045. Mr. KERRIN.—But with regard to the growth of the education vote you have told us that there is a part which expands automatically, for instance, if a teacher should be moved from a lower grade to a higher?—Yes, and obtain increment within the grade.

14046. And that expenditure has been previously approved by the Treasury?—Yes.

14047. And consequently that part of the vote grows automatically?—It grows automatically; but even the expenditure required to meet that automatic growth is subject to the criticism and review of the Treasury. We send forward what I call our automatic estimate. We have to set forth, under each sub-head there, how much our proposal differs from that previously put forward by increase or decrease, and if there is an increase we have to account for that increase and to give a full explanation of it, and satisfy them by the regulations. Even on the automatic expenditure, they exercise that degree of criticism and control.

14048. But in the case of any new departure in educational policy, involving a new head of expenditure, the criticism of that is much more minute?—Oh, very much more minute.

14049. You say in your statement relating to that particular point, that is, a new departure in policy, involving a new expenditure, that after consideration of the proposals thus submitted, the Treasury notify approval or disapproval of the various claims put forward. Now, as a matter of fact, this is a point that Sir HENRY is making, and I want to make perfectly clear. If the Government of the day go to the Treasury and say: "We approve of this new educational policy, and we want this additional expenditure on education," the Government of the day could get it, whatever the attitude of the Treasury might be?—Well, I take it that like all other public departments the Treasury is really controlled by the Government, and if the Treasury got positive directions from the Chancellor of the Exchequer they are under the necessity of carrying them out; but what I would like to emphasise is this, so far as we are concerned, that the Commissioners of National Education under the regulations may not put their demand before Parliament or the Government of the day; they may only present them through the Treasury. As a matter of routine we present all our regulations through the Irish Government. We do not even go directly to the Treasury. We submit them to the Irish

Government and the Irish Government submit them to the Treasury, and the Treasury present the proposals to Parliament.

14050. That is the form and official mode of transacting the business; but if the Commissioners think they need more money in order to make primary education thoroughly efficient, of course they can adopt a resolution at their Board meeting, and send it to the Chief Secretary, and interview the persons responsible for the Government?—Yes, it is open to them to do that.

14051. You see, we want to fix responsibility where it really lies. The National Board, I think you very clearly explained, has been blamed for matters for which the Treasury was responsible, and I now suggest that the Treasury is to be blamed for things, the ultimate responsibility for which lies with the Government of the day?—Well, I do not say that the Government can escape responsibility.

14052. Of course, it is clear that no constitution could work for which the Treasury was the ultimate Court of Appeal and not Parliament?—Oh, of course, Parliament must be the ultimate Court of Appeal.

14053. So that it is a matter of public policy, and in case the expenditure was thought inadvisable, the Government could have its way against the Treasury?—As far as I know, that is so.

14054. Mr. KERRIN.—The business of the Treasury is in object to all new expenditure irrespective of its merits. I quite agree that it is a most valuable function, but the responsibility lies with the Government of the day. Now you have explained (it was not necessary to explain it to us, but apparently necessary to explain it to a considerable number of people) what the surrendering of the surplus in actual fact means. Perhaps you would throw additional light on that?—Very well. In the month of January, a Treasury circular is received in every spending department, inquiring whether a supplementary estimate will be required to complete the expenditure falling due within that particular year, and if so laying down the date by which it must be in, and the particular form in which it must be given, or, in the alternative, whether the money voted is now found to be in excess of the requirements, and if so to state the approximate amount of the anticipated excess. Well, supposing that in the month of January, when we can generally tell pretty closely what our expenditure will be during the year ending 31st of March, we reply that we believe the vote will exceed the actual expenditure by £6,000, the usual practice in that case is for the Exchequer to retain that £6,000 from our vote; it never issues to the Paymaster-General at all; it is only technically surrendered, because as a matter of fact the money has never come out of the Exchequer.

14055. The CHAIRMAN.—Is it necessary to use the word "surrendered"?—Well, it is on our forms; I am not speaking for our department particularly; it is in all Civil Service departments. We have got to keep our accounts in a particular form and render them in a particular way, and we are not at liberty to make changes; we must proceed in the approved method.

14056. It has been stated that the word has created a misapprehension on the part of the teachers, or a great many of them, who believe that the money is actually paid back to the Treasury?—I believe that misapprehension prevails.

14057. Mr. KERRIN.—I think it might be brought out more clearly that the total amount of the surplus surrendered for eight years down to the present year was less than one per cent. of the total vote?—Yes.

14058. Less than one per cent.?—Of course, considerably less than one per cent.; and as far as the teachers themselves are concerned, if you only take the surplus of money appropriated for payment of the teachers the surplus surrendered would be much more slight.

14059. The CHAIRMAN.—There is no separate account showing what has been surrendered under the head of Salaries of Teachers?—Well, there is. By comparing the payments for salaries as entered in the Appropriation Account you can arrive at what was surrendered in respect of the payment of principal teachers and assistant teachers.

24th June, 1918.]

Mr. DAVID FRIZZELL, Accountant, examined.

[Continued.]

14090. You can do that?—Yes. You have it in what Sir Hiram read out in the last Appropriation Account dealing with the money appropriated to payment of principal teachers and assistant teachers.

14091. And capitation grants to schools?—Yes. In that particular year there was only a surrender of £800 or so out of a vote amounting to £1,300,000. In that case I have to admit that the estimate was suddenly closer; it is a degree of perfection that could not be expected as a rule.

14092. Mr. KETTER.—Sir Hiram brought out another point on which there exists a misapprehension as to money being surrendered to the Treasury in respect of one branch of the service when needed for some other branch?—Of course, it is not possible to transfer money provided for a sanctioned service to meet expenditure on an unsanctioned service. Perhaps I had better make myself clear about that. Subject to making no payment that was not consistent with the sanctioned rules, we might apply with the express sanction of the Treasury an overplus of money under one sub-head to meet a deficiency under another. For instance, if you examine the appropriation accounts for the particular years in Sir Hiram's possession, you will find under the head of incidental expenses of the Office there was an unexpected increase in the cost of advertisements and the provision for that incidental expenditure was not sufficient to meet the actual payment, and that, as a fact, the actual payment exceeded by £100 the provision in the vote. Well, we proceeded to make this payment because we were conscious at the time that we had a satisfactory explanation, and that every payment we made could be defended on the existing rules; still we could not ultimately present the accounts to the Auditor-General without the Treasury's sanction.

14093. You could not take any steps like that?—We could not without the Treasury's sanction.

14094. And you had to proceed under the rules previously sanctioned by them?—We have to proceed under the rules previously sanctioned.

14095. With regard to the details on which the Treasury has exercised its control, it is stated here that the standard numbers in the grades are fixed by the Commissioners after consultation with the Treasury?—That was originally so.

14096. It says here that the number of teachers recognised in each grade "is fixed from time to time by the Commissioners under arrangement with the Treasury"?—Yes, and having been so fixed we are not at liberty to increase any of them without at first obtaining the express sanction of the Treasury.

14097. And the last word lies with the Treasury? The last word, so far as we are concerned, lies with the Treasury, and Rule 108(c) says, "The Commissioners reserve to themselves the right to alter the rate of salary for continued good service from time to time subject to approval of the Lords of His Majesty's Treasury?—Yes, there is the same restriction there.

14098. And with regard to the average attendance which is a determinant of the teachers' income, can you tell me the history of the rule bearing on average attendance—that is also sanctioned by the Treasury, I presume?—Yes, that is also sanctioned by the Treasury, and cannot be altered without Treasury approval.

14099. In that respect also the last word lies with the Treasury?—The last word lies with the Treasury.

14070. One special matter of complaint was brought before us by Mr. Forth, of the Technical Institute, Belfast, about having an elementary evening class and the capitation payment for this. Can you tell me whether capitation and the financial arrangement with regard to elementary evening schools are in the same position as the arrangements with regard to other schools?—The same rules with regard to Treasury powers apply to evening schools that apply to day schools. We cannot alter the rate of payment for evening schools without first getting the sanction of the Treasury.

14071. Mr. Forth said in that particular case that though in the year 1905 the National Board had £25,000 included in the Civil Service estimates for the schools out of which they spent £11,000 and returned £13,000

to the Treasury, but the extraordinary thing about it is that the financial scheme was arranged by the Board in consultation with the Treasury?—Yes, that is so.

14072. And not a penny could have been expended except with their sanction under that rule?—No money could be expended without their sanction. What happened was that when the scheme for evening schools was first promulgated it attained a certain degree of temporary popularity, and I dare say a good many of the teachers failed to realise the amount of work on their part required to earn the grant. In any case they tried for the first year, and that particular year the expenditure came to £25,000, but with actual experience they did not maintain their enthusiasm, and the payment in the ensuing year was very much less.

14073. Mr. HARRISON.—You were bound to make provision for the largest number?—We were bound to make provision for possible expenditure in our estimate, so far as we were able to judge it at the time.

14074. And had that been exceeded you would have had to ask a supplementary vote?—Yes, provided we had not savings in other subjects that might meet it.

14075. Mr. KAVANAGH.—You can transfer sums from one sub-head to another?—As I explained with the Treasury sanction, we have to get the Treasury sanction.

14076. Mr. KETTER.—The total vote is £1,737,000 roughly, and of that less than £30,000 is expended on office administration, £29,421?—Yes.

14077. As I work it out that is about 1.7 per cent. of the total vote?—Well a very small percentage; of course, I have not yet made out the precise figure. I think it was interesting to bring out this circumstance, because I have seen it stated, for instance, that the administration in Ireland is very much more expensive than, say, in Scotland; but it must be remembered that we take the primary education administration in its entirety, whereas in Scotland there is a very great number of school Boards. Ours is a great central system having the entire expense of education, and if you want to really compare the cost of the two systems, you must take the cost of the central administration in Scotland, and add the cost of the local school Board, and I think if you do that you will find the Irish administration is very much cheaper.

14078. The CHAIRMAN.—And the same would hold in England?—The same would hold in England, but we are much more frequently compared with Scotland on account of the closeness of the two populations.

14079. Mr. KETTER.—The teachers have asked for monthly payment of salary?—Yes.

14080. Would monthly payment of salary involve any increase in your staff?—Undoubtedly it would.

14081. A serious increase?—A rather serious increase.

14082. Still if the thing were right in itself, and conferred great advantages to the teachers, the mere fact that it would involve a certain increase would not be a reason for disallowing it?—I do not think the added administrative expense is the real difficulty at all. The real block is the difficulty in making provision for two months' payment that would have to be met in the first year, and then to that, of course, in all probability would have to be added provision for paying for eleven months the augmentation or Bursar grant, which is commonly paid in the month of April, and it would be difficult to defend continuing the payment of this grant annually if you institute a system of monthly payments.

14083. The CHAIRMAN.—We had an estimate of what that two months arrangement would cost?—I have not the figure with me, but I think it would be something between £200,000 and £300,000 in the first year. If I were coming back I would give you a closer approximation. It would be more than a sixth of the annual salaries if we were to pay this augmentation monthly, because you would have to pay that for eleven months in the year in which the monthly payments would be introduced.

14084. Mr. HEWITT.—What does the grant amount to?—The estimate for the current year for principal and assistant teachers and convent capitation payments corresponding is £114,500, and for the junior

assistant mistress who are voted for under a separate sub-head of the vote it would be at least £7,000, so that it is over £120,000 at present.

14088. The CHAIRMAN.—That would be added to the £200,000, which would make £320,000?—It would not amount to so much as that, because we would not propose to pay the precise sum representing one-twelfth of the annual salary for each of the first two months of the quarter. Under the monthly system of payments that were set up in the Civil Service, the first two months you make payments on account. You do not pay exactly the twelfth of the annual salary. For the first two months the man receives 8 per cent. of his annual salary disregarding the shillings and pence, and the third month he gets the balance.

14089. Sir HIRSH WILKINSON.—May I point out that in the Consular Service in China and Japan, at any rate, the salaries are paid monthly, but not upon that system. Each month is reckoned by itself, and a complete month's payment is made. A difficulty naturally arises with regard to fractions, perhaps pence, but nothing more, and there is a difficulty in calculating the income tax. You have to make calculations on income tax for each month; but in the case of the teacher he would be relieved from any difficulty with regard to income tax?—Certainly; we do not assess the ordinary National School teacher for income tax.

14090. So that I really suggest that if you had monthly payments to the teachers that system of making a difference between the first two months and the final months would not be necessary?—Well, I would like to say that in our calculations with regard to the probable cost of introducing monthly payments to the teachers we assumed that the Civil Service system, as in force in Ireland, would be followed. There are about 18,000 individual teachers, monitors, etc., to be paid, and to arrange for a payment of shillings and pence for every month in the quarter would add greatly to the office work.

14091. Mr. KERR.—There are more difficulties of administration, but if you had Parliamentary sanction for making the change from quarterly to monthly payments it could be done?—Undoubtedly it could be done.

14092. The working of the scheme of the Bishop of Ross, you pointed out very clearly, would also create difficulty, but would not any change in the payment of salaries create very great difficulty?—Any new scheme of salaries must present difficulty.

14093. Very serious difficulty?—It must present difficulty, and in my humble opinion must also lead to increased expenditure. Any workable scheme must lead to increased expenditure.

14094. But suppose the present system is held to be unsatisfactory neither of these objections is a conclusive reason against a change for the better?—Certainly not, provided the necessary funds can be obtained.

14095. Provided the necessary Parliamentary sanction can be obtained?—Yes.

14096. Can you tell me on the average what percentage of the teachers obtain their increments?—I am not in a position to give you the exact figure.

14097. Can you ascertain it for us?—I mentioned before that, I believe, a return is being prepared showing through a whole series of years how many teachers have been receiving increments.

14098. Here you anything to do with the Pensions Office, as you mention that there were a number of teachers who had dropped out of the service before they reached the attainable maximum?—No; we do not administer the Pensions Office. The Teachers' Pension Office is administered in a small separate department in Dublin Castle. Our only connection with it is that out of our vote we pay a grant-in-aid towards the financial support of the Pensions Fund. I may mention that the grant was £18,000 a year, but quite recently an addition of £25,000 has been made, raising the entire grant-in-aid to £43,000 a year. I believe the intention is to provide towards a better scheme of pension, and that such a scheme is at present under consideration and in course of preparation.

14099. Can you, from information which is at your disposal, say what percentage of teachers do run

through all the grades up to the maximum?—I do not think I could. I do not think that we have any statistics, but, of course, a return on that line I also could be prepared. I do not think we have any available statistics on that point.

14100. At any rate it is not by any means universal for men or women-teachers to continue in the service for the full time?—It is certainly not universal.

14101. Is it general even?—Well, I should think, having regard to the ordinary incidents of life, that one could say it was general.

14102. The CHAIRMAN.—I think you will find the number in each year and the districts of the country as the report of the Board?—We know as a matter of fact the number going out every year, and why they go out, and, of course a person might elect to be pensioned who is efficient before reaching the age at which his retirement becomes compulsory.

14103. Mr. KERR.—With regard to this change between the triennial and the annual series of increments, am I right in understanding that it was the Treasury that was responsible for the triennial system, and that in fact it was an annual scheme that was prepared by the Inspector or the Board?—I am not prepared to give evidence on that point, because I was not concerned with preparation of the scheme.

14104. In considering your own attitude from the accountant's point of view towards the suggested annual scale, the first point that was made by Sir Hiram seems to require some explanation. Sir Hiram suggested that the manager's certificate as to the efficiency of the teacher should warrant the payment of the increment. I understood that the proposal was that the Inspector should still be the person responsible, but that those merit marks should go, and that the schools should be divided into classes satisfactory and unsatisfactory, and that a school certified to be satisfactory by the Inspector should get its annual increment practically automatically, and only the percentage classified as really unsatisfactory should be deprived of the increment?—Yes.

Sir HIRSH WILKINSON.—Might I explain how this arose. I was presented to-day with a form upon which the principal and assistant teachers got the salaries, and it is given under a certificate from the manager that the amount claimed is just and proper. It seems to me that that followed the lines of the Order in Council very much, because he could not certify that it was just and proper without approval of the teacher's service, and I did not suggest in that that the powers of the Inspector should be diminished in regard to reporting to the Board as to the nature of the teaching in the schools or the conduct of the teacher in regard to the class, but that this certificate might be taken as operative values before it reached the Board some statement by the Inspector made in consequence of his visits was submitted to the Board, which, with the refutation of the Board being transmitted to the accountant, would make the accountant say, "In reply to your application for salary for such-and-such a quarter (the last quarter) you have included the increment, and the Board have decided that the increment cannot be given in consequence of the Inspector's report."

14105. Mr. HERR.—In reference to the point raised by Mr. Forth, you have a copy of the code there?—Yes.

14106. Kindly look at Rule 208?—Yes.

14107. Now you have an evening school with an average attendance of 20 pupils?—Yes.

14108. If 30 attendances were made, how much would that teacher earn taking the higher grant of 17/6?—If the average attendance is 20 and the number of attendances is 30—There must be 70 meetings in a town to warrant a full payment of the fee. But the minimum number of meetings for a reduced grant must be 45. That is the rule, so that there would not be any payment at all.

14109. The question Mr. Forth brought out was this. If we take 30 attendances he would be entitled, on an average of 20, to get £17 10s. 5.—Yes.

14110. And if he continued for five more attendances, and that the average then fell to 10 for those, the total amount that he could earn would be then £10 1s.

or thereabouts. That is his point, that when you reached a certain time if the attendance began to fall it reduced the average attendance for the whole period, and the longer you keep the school open the less you earn?—Well I suppose there is a good deal to be said in defence of prescribing a reasonable minimum number of meetings as necessary to establish a claim for payment, and to be included in the calculation of the average attendance.

14108. Mr. KERRIN.—Does the Resident Commissioner rank as a civil servant?—Well, I think he does. His salary is borne on the Civil Service vote.

14109. Mr. HANCOCK.—Is it a pensionable office?—The office is pensionable.

14110. When there is a case of the accounts of a school being wrong, is the teacher liable to fine?—Yes.

14111. How is the amount of the fine determined?—The amount of the fine is determined by the executive officer dealing with the matter, having regard to the gravity of the offence.

14112. And the executive officer would be one of the secretaries?—The executive officer would probably be one of the secretaries, but, of course, the matter is subject to the regulations of the Commissioners, because every fine is inflicted on the Commissioners' Order.

14113. It does not come before you?—No.

14114. It does not?—No, it does not, but when the amount has been determined by the Board it comes to me to make certain that the penalty is recovered.

14115. But in no case does it depend on your recommendation as to what the amount of the fine should be?—No.

14116. Mr. KAVANAGH.—With regard to the Bishop of Ross's scale, do you know how many teachers leave within the first seven years?—I could not say.

14117. That would be important, would it not, if the initial salary was raised, as many teachers might leave before the seven years, and carry away with them a large salary?—Yes; I pointed that out yesterday in discussing the matter with the Bishop of Ross. I do not know the exact figures, but I think there is a tendency to increase in that direction. We know, in fact, that a great many of our teachers at present are emigrating to Canada.

14118. The CHAIRMAN.—That is principally the northern counties and Antrim particularly?—Yes.

14119. Mr. KAVANAGH.—Would it not be possible to begin to claim the increment two years sooner?—Well, of course, that would involve a re-estimating of the figures.

14120. Altogether?—Yes, it would, for these figures are very intricate.

14121. The CHAIRMAN.—Is there any other point you wish to mention?—I should like to make myself sufficiently clear on the point as to the person responsible for determining the amount of a fine inflicted upon a teacher. Suppose the matter comes under the consideration of the secretary, he estimates what, in his judgment, the amount of the fine should be. It then goes to the Resident Commissioner, and is subject to review by him, and finally comes before the Board, and is subject to their acceptance.

14122. All fines are put on the agenda of the Board?—All fines are put on the agenda paper, and the Commissioners are supplied with the particulars with regard to the circumstances for which the fine is imposed.

14123. And the offence for which the fine is imposed?—Yes, quite so.

14124. Mr. HEALY.—Is there a discussion at the Board unless an individual Commissioner wishes to raise it, or it is taken as a matter of course?—I am not in a position to give any evidence on that.

14125. Sir HIRSH WILKINSON.—On the subject of averages the attention of the Resident Commissioner was called to the point, and it was suggested to him that in the case of schools having more than 200 days attendance, their average may be reduced just in the same manner as in the case of evening schools, as pointed out by Mr. Healy, and Dr. Sturkie informed us that a proposal had been made to the Treasury to

take the 200 best days, but the Treasury declined to do this.—Well I have no doubt that Dr. Sturkie was right, but I could not of my own personal knowledge say.

14126. I observe in the estimates for the coming year that under E (30)—"Grant towards medical treatment of school children and services ancillary thereto." It appears that there was a vote for £7,500 in 1912-13, and there is an estimate for £8,000 for 1913-14. Can you tell us how much was expended of that in 1912-13?—I believe that there was only about £200, a little less than £300.

14127. Can you explain that?—Yes, I can explain that. The Commissioners applied for a provision for the payment of the dental treatment of National School children with the idea that the whole of the expenses of this system of treatment would be provided out of the money voted by Parliament. The matter came before the Treasury, and when their decision was announced the vote of £7,500 was provided, but it came with a stipulation that it could only be spent so far as an equal amount was provided from local sources for the purpose for which the vote was given—that is, suppose, for instance, that a scheme for the dental treatment of children in a village was estimated to cost £100 for that particular village, we might only pay £50 of that when there was a corresponding sum from local sources. Of course, in this country, where there is no power to levy a school rate, when the matter came to be worked out as a practical measure, it was found that the condition attached by the Treasury to giving the grant was such as to make it to all intents and purposes a dead letter. It was ineffective.

14128. And you scarcely expect then that the £5,000 now voted for next year will be expended?—Well I scarcely expect that it will be expended, but I know that there will be more in proportion spent out of it than was the case last year, because we have had a longer time to attempt to organise it to the best of our power. And while I am on that point I should like to mention, as affecting this question of the surrendering of balances, that you will find in the vote for 1912-13 that there was a sum of £10,000 for scholarships for boys from secondary schools. This money was given by a supplementary vote at the end of the Parliamentary session, and it did not appear in the Commissioners' original estimate at all. That was a matter such as Mr. Kettle mentioned. It was a case where the Government considered that the money should be provided, and as the result of a Parliamentary debate it was decided that such an amount should be made available for that particular year, but it was part of the provision that the figure of £10,000 was not to be an expanding figure, but the ultimate cost of the scheme. The scheme that was proposed was a scheme for a scholarship extending over three years for each pupil enjoying the benefit of it, and, of course, when you come to think of it, the possible amount of expenditure for the first year would, in any circumstances, be much less than the £10,000 voted; but, in fact, we could not spend any of it in that year, because some portion of the school year was already gone, and necessarily the formulation of a scheme would take further time, and it made it absolutely impossible to bring into operation so far as that year was concerned. And yet the money is there, and we are under the necessity of accounting for it, and it will appear in the report of the Commissioners as money provided by Parliament and not expended.

14129. Can you give us some particulars with regard to the dental treatment, as schemes have been already provided for the expenditure of a few hundred pounds?—Well there have been a few cases where local persons have contributed, and, of course, as soon as we became aware that the money was provided, we took steps to notify the managers and others; and I might say that we tried, in the first instance, to induce the Treasury to withdraw the condition of providing half the cost from local sources, on account of the difficulty that would give rise to in Ireland; we tried to induce them to alter the condition, that there should be a corresponding local contribution, but when we realised that they were determined in the attitude,

24th June, 1918.]

Mr. DAVID FRISSELL, Accountant, examined.

[Continued.]

we did the best we could, to get local schemes established and carried out to spend the money in the way that the Treasury contemplated, and in a few instances schemes were enabled to be put forward where local people took a very strong interest in the matter, and succeeded in establishing dental clinics for the treatment of children attending National Schools. They provided a dental equipment for the clinic, and they arranged for the services of the dentist, and guaranteed a certain rate of payment to him, and undertook to provide half the cost. It was a condition at first that the scheme should not only be approved by the Commissioners of National Education, but also by the Treasury.

14130. Each scheme?—Each scheme in detail, but after a few cases had been put before the Treasury, and when they realised what a complicated matter it was, they relaxed a little, but they still retain from the Commissioners themselves the power of ultimately dealing with the scheme, and they require that not

only shall it receive sanction of the Commissioners, but also that it shall receive the sanction of the Irish Government.

14131. We know that there are in villages professional men who visit them from time to time, and make charges for each visit. If an arrangement were made with those men to examine the National School children for a certain sum per head, and to apply the necessary treatment, would a scheme of that sort meet with the approval of the Board so far as you know?—Oh, yes, it would, provided that it would be done at a reasonable figure. For instance, there is a scheme now being operated in Rathgar and in Tullamore district in Dublin under the auspices of the local branch of the Women's National Health Association. They have undertaken the responsibility for carrying it through, and have secured the payment of the dentist at a stipulated rate, and under this scheme we have undertaken to recoup them for half their certified expenditure.

Rev. E. W. HOBSON, Preceptor, Rector of Portladow, examined.

14132. The CHAIRMAN.—You came before us in the capacity of a manager of schools?—Yes.

14133. May I ask how long have you been manager?—I have been manager for, I think, nearly 30 years.

14134. In your present Parish of Portladow, how long have you been incumbent?—Since the end of 1890, you may say from the beginning of 1897.

14135. The parish of Portladow is very populous?—Very populous.

14136. And you have in that parish a considerable number of schools under your care?—Yes, I have seven: four town and three country. The country ones are very much smaller.

14137. Are the schools in the town large?—They are for Irish schools, but not in comparison with the schools in England. They are what we call large. In three of the four schools I have a principal and three assistants, and in one of the town schools I have a principal and two assistants.

14138. That would mean over 100 children in the large schools?—Oh, yes, I think so; i.e., the average.

14139. And well on to 150?—Oh, yes.

14140. And in the three rural schools I suppose the numbers are smaller?—Much smaller.

14141. Would they be one-teacher schools?—They are graded at that. The smallest has a principal with a sewing mistress, the old fashion; I don't know that it is carried on very much now. The third small school has a principal with a junior assistant mistress, and the Board is now insisting on there being a full teacher as the school has increased.

14142. Now what would be the grading of the principal teachers in the town schools?—I am afraid I could hardly say that.

14143. The first point that you referred to in the statement that you have been good enough to put in our hands is in reference to uniformity of inspection. I may at once tell you that we have had an immense amount of evidence on the subject, evidence generally tending, I think, in one direction, so would you mind giving us very briefly your own opinion on that?—In uniformity of merit marks.

14144. Yes?—Am I to deal with merit marks?

14145. You need not do so exhaustively, because we have the real facts before us?—That does not include my second point, the mental attitude.

14146. No, I will come to that presently?—Well, as to uniformity, there is the matter of uniformity of schools in single districts, and there is also the uniformity of schools throughout the whole of Ireland, and the latter is more difficult to attain than the former, I presume, but to my mind under the present system, I think it is absolutely impossible to expect uniformity. If you wish I will give you one or two instances to point my case.

14147. I think we have had a great number of instances?—I can tell you, for instance, of one school that got the Certificate and Bkirk Premium at one time, and under the next inspector it only got "good."

And again I can tell you of a school where many years ago the teacher (one of my own) got "very good," and his school has, I think, been very good ever since, but he has only since got "good," and therefore all incentive to work beyond what he conscientiously believes to be his duty is taken away. But I need not go further than these instances, because what I feel is this, that it is absolutely impossible to expect uniformity even with the most excellent inspectors, for all inspectors are human beings, and some may be less excellent than others; but supposing there is an inspector who is subject, we will say, to indigestion (it may seem amusing, but it is really a good point), he goes into a school and it may be a dull dark day, and everything to him looks "blue," and it is absolutely impossible considering the matter from the point of view of human nature that that inspector can possibly do justice to the school he comes to (I am not speaking of a single instance), whereas the next day he comes to a school he may be very much better and in capital spirits during the day, and everything looks bright. It is nearly impossible to separately assign merit marks with uniformity, and I think that especially when you have got such a variety of marks it is simply impossible to get uniformity.

14148. With all those minute marks?—Yes, and even with wider marks, because my experience of human nature is this, that it is impossible for people who will vary in themselves to assign merit marks with uniformity, and as regards the district there are other points that bear on this. For instance, if you take the whole of Ireland you will have differences in the ideas of inspectors, and a school that under one gets "excellent" will, under another inspector, only get "good." And then there is also a difference in schools in the same district. Now take one of my schools. The material that the teacher has to work on is far more favourable than in another of my schools in a very populous part of the town where the class of people is less well-off, and the whole circumstances are such that necessarily the ground on which the teacher works—namely, the pupils' powers and the whole surroundings—are distinctly less favourable than in the better class school.

14149. We are told that under Clause II of the general report the inspector will take into account adverse circumstances which include those that you are referring to, such as the social position of parents and home life, and so on?—I wonder if that is a new rule. It is a desirable one, and at the same time I think one that it is very difficult for the inspector to carry out.

14150. You have not observed whether that is carried out?—Well I did not, but I know that the feeling is very much that with which I am quite sympathetic, and which I can understand myself; for instance, in one of my schools, the better class one that I am speaking of, when the teacher of that school gets "good" for his successful work, I think that the teacher in the other school in the poorer part of the

town ought to get "good" for less successful work on the pupils. I think that is a very important point at least for towns; I cannot say that it would be the same for agricultural districts.

14151. Do I understand you to say that the teachers suffer owing to their pupils being drawn from that class of society?—Well I would not say definitely "suffer." I have not got the statistics or statements from the schools, but basing on that matter of uniformity I presume that what is implied by that new rule 11 is of a very vague order. The question is, whether the Committee would suggest the doing away with merit marks altogether, and then, if so, comes a question which occurred to my mind, and that is, if so, what are you to do to provide a stimulus? I confess that is a difficult thing, but the suggestion that occurred to me was this. I did not think it out sufficiently, but this is what I thought of. Would an "annual" increment, once the teacher had got it, be sufficient? You have a teacher in a certain position, and he gets a certain salary, and if you make him easy-going, he will jog along, so I think it would be well if it could be arranged that the annual increment should be a stimulus.

14152. Do you mean annual increment where the report is satisfactory?—Yes, that there should be a report that they had attained a certain position.

14153. Then with regard to the present system of inspection as compared with the results system, you have been a manager under both systems, I suppose?—Yes.

14154. And what remarks have you to make as to the relative merits of the two systems?—Well, without insisting particularly on a comparison, I think that would come under the head of the mental attitude.

14155. You make a distinction between the present system of inspection and that under the results system?—Yes.

14156. How does the present system of inspection compare with the last system?—One of my teachers who has taught under both systems spoke of the results system favourably, but he said the strain was too great. I do not think there is any desire on the part of the teachers to go back to the whole of the results system, but that there should be part examination.

14157. We have had it from great authorities that teaching tends to follow examination?—Yes, very much. Then, of course, comes the consideration as to how to take an estimate of the work done and the state of the school. Well with regard to the present system it strikes me strongly that it is quite unfair to take into account the state of the buildings and the equipment of the school in estimating the work of the teacher. To my mind it is more than unreasonable and absolutely unfair. The teachers have no direct, and not much indirect, power at all over the state of the building. I am speaking of the structure of the school and the school equipment or the cleanliness of the school. They have a little control over the cleanliness of the school, but then that is not direct. The teacher can complain to the manager if the school is in an untidy state, and if the manager has not got what the teacher complains of set right, then that condition of things would come into A and B, and it would, in my opinion, be absolutely unfair to brand the teacher with a bad mark for the unsatisfactory state of the school premises.

14158. Is it your impression that that is done?—Well the teachers are under that impression. There was some suggestion that that does not come under it, but other teachers contradicted that, and my impression is that it is so. Now here in Mr. A. Purser's answer in dealing with an excellent school I see that it is one where the whole programme is taught, and the best methods of teaching are used, and the educational equipment is ample and the house good, and there is order and tidiness amongst the pupils (and I think that is reasonable, because that after all is a part of education), and the house and premises of a good class and in good order. That carries out my impression.

14159. But as far as I understand some of the authorities have disclaimed any idea of making the teacher responsible in the marking for the building or equipment?—Then what does Mr. Purser mean?

14160. He is quoting from the conference of 1907?—If that has not been reversed then it enters so far, and the question is whether it enters further.

14161. It has been put to us as strangely as this, that so far from its being against the teacher, if the building was in a bad state, and the teacher was doing good work, it would be rather in his favour?—And those were the instructions to the inspectors?

14162. Mr. KERRIE.—That Clause 11 was intended to bear that meaning?—Yes, that was suggested to me. One teacher said it did not count against the teacher, and another teacher said it did when in conversation with me.

14163. The CHAIRMAN.—With regard to inspection under the two systems, you have been able to observe the two kinds of inspection before 1909 and since 1909. I thought you intended to compare them?—Well beyond these general remarks I am not in a position to do that.

14164. Have you been present at many inspections?—No, I very rarely attend them, in fact I never do.

14165. You get notice of them?—Yes.

14166. Very short notice?—Yes, I think it is intentional that it comes so late that I should inform the teacher. I cannot speak from being present. You are not in the habit of attending the inspection?—I am not.

14167. Have you any impression as to the effect of the working of the present system as compared with the results system on preparing boys for their future career in life?—I do not think I could speak with sufficient authority to make it worth while to trouble the Committee with remarks. The results system did very good work. Well, a teacher who has great experience thinks, and I have heard it said (though not making a contrast between this and the results) that pupils of the National Schools do badly, but that was such a casual remark that I do not put that forward.

14168. Some critics of the present system say that, compared with the results system, there is too little examination?—I should be rather inclined to say that too.

14169. Did you ever hear teachers say that?—No, I cannot exactly say I did, but from my own knowledge of University life, and so forth, I think you have too little.

14170. Have you heard the teachers complain that the inspector gives his award too much on mere impression?—Oh, that is a different point. In a certain measure that bears on a matter that I did want to refer to. When you speak of their report on a momentary impression, do you mean that that would be their report on the final inspection?

14171. There is a distinction drawn between inspection and examination. Mere inspection consists in rapid observation of the cleanliness of the school, the discipline, manners, and tone of the pupils and their bearing towards the teacher, the teacher's command of a class, the state of the records, etc., and it is said that a good inspector can in ten minutes form a judgment of the school in that way. That is pure inspection. And then they say that there is too little examination?—I am not quite sure about it. I did look into that, but I am not quite sure. One teacher of mine says there should be part examination. I prefer part examination to inspection alone, and it is better for the children. One thing again that I think is a very reasonable one to deal with is this. Among the teachers I think there is an impression that the report of the inspector is decided a good deal by the final inspection in the year, which I think they reasonably think a most inadequate position for the inspector to take up, and that he ought to include the last two preceding times that he has come to the school.

14172. That is what are called incidental visits?—Yes, I think that those should go along with the final examination, and as to examinations, for my own part I cannot imagine but that it would be well to have a certain number of pupils examined. You know there was a tremendous pressure that was put on the teachers under the results system, and I think that in a large measure the Commissioners have swung to the other extreme, and I think in the system they have adopted there is too little examination, whereas the *via media*



24th June, 1913.]

Rev. FRANCIS HOBSON, continued.

[Continued.]

is a thing that would have a great advantage. I do not see how you can possibly do without some examination.

14173. I do not think anybody contends that you can do without some examination, but the question is as to the amount of examination?—Quite so, yes.

14174. Some hold that every child should be examined by the inspector once a year?—Yes, I think that as far as the teachers are concerned they would recommend that.

14175. Then with reference to the manner and mental attitude and bearing generally of the National Board officials, the inspectors, will you develop what you intend to say?—I suppose I may speak to you plainly on the subject, because I think very strongly on that, but, of course, I am speaking generally. I think as to the whole bearing and mental tone, and so forth, of the whole of the authorities of the National Board, from the Commissioners down to the humblest person who is over the teachers, from my point of view it is absolutely wrong.

14176. Their attitude is wrong?—Yes, to the teachers. I know there are large exceptions, but what I feel is that the Commissioners themselves—and every office under the Board who is over the teachers—ought to get rid of the idea that they are educational policemen, and that is at present too much the attitude. That has grown to be, it has been put to me lately, the attitude of Tyrone House to the teachers.

14177. The attitude of policemen?—Yes, that is a phrase I heard the other day, and it exactly, I think, hits the point, the attitude of educational policemen, and I think it is a pity that the Commissioners do not realise this and give it up. When you consider the enormous importance of the education of a single child, and still more of the children of the Empire, that it means building the Empire up in its religious, moral, physical and intellectual aspects, I look on the teachers as holding one of the most important positions in the whole Empire that could possibly be obtained, and I would like to enable them in every way to do their work to the highest of their ability, and to encourage them by giving them a high view of their calling. That is one of the things that I think are of the utmost importance. Now I consider that what the Commissioners ought to have, and insist on everyone having, managers included (as far as they can, because we managers are only indirectly under them), is, that there should be a distinct feeling evinced in every possible way of sympathy between everyone who is over the teachers (be he a great person or a small person) and the teachers in their work.

14178. The inspectors have been instructed again and again by the Board in their circulars to regard themselves as advisers and helpers of the teachers. Do you mean that in your opinion that is not their present attitude?—That is an excellent rule, but it is not carried out sufficiently. I am speaking generally. I think we should all, we managers and all, act in that way. For instance, I have a parish where I have got on hands for more than is desirable containing 5,000 or 6,000 church-people, seven day schools and thirteen Sunday schools, and so forth, and the work of the schools is one that of late has been increasing, and my work has been added to very much, but what I feel is that the attitude towards the teachers should be one of sympathy. When I say that the attitude of the inspectors should be sympathetic, I do not mean to say that they are to be at all "soft." I think if an inspector is uniform in his standard and fair in his dealings, the teachers do not mind strictness so long as he carries out his duty in a sympathetic way, and I think there should be a feeling of co-operation between us all, including the Commissioners. I am speaking generally. Instead of that when the inspector comes in there is a feeling (speaking generally) of constraint and awe, and so forth. The teachers are afraid. Though they are a fine body of men, yet, being in the position that they are in, there are two things that they are afraid of—they are afraid of the inspectors' attitude to themselves in the schools, and they are afraid still more (the two are linked together) as to the report they will make of their schools.

14179. What do you mean by "attitude to themselves"?—There is one inspector who, now that he has got to be known, is one of the most genial and pleasant, and one of the ablest inspectors that the Board has, but I can tell you of another inspector whose attitude is chilling. I am speaking of the attitude to the teachers, and I do not know how to characterise it. I think it is perfectly absurd that a man, I do not care who he is, should have such an attitude towards the teacher, because my theory is that the whole system is absolutely wrong if it is not worked on the idea of a co-operative society. If we managers observe an attitude towards the teachers that would get them in fear or make them nervous, we know that we should hinder education. Now, it is just the same with the inspectors, and until they get rid of the attitude of policemen towards the teachers they never will have education on proper lines.

14180. You think education suffers from that spirit?—Yes, I am speaking of the feeling of the teachers, and from the information of some who have spoken to me, I think it is only natural and most difficult to guard against, but it has come down from the old times when feudalism was more powerful, so that the teacher is never sure till he gets to know his inspector.

14181. Have you any complaints of frequent changes of inspectors?—I cannot exactly tax my memory, but the Board have a variety of judges.

14182. Do you object to frequent changes?—Well I would not like to blame them for it, but I remember a case that occurred a short time ago, so that I can give you an instance of how inspectors come recommending this, that and the other thing to be done. One inspector recommended something that would cost about £100 to do in one school. He was changed, and another inspector came in shortly afterwards, and he did not refer to this, good, bad, or indifferent, but referred to something else that would have been less costly, and then since that one other excellent inspector came who was only with us a few months, and I think he made no recommendation in the case in point at all. But then is came again the point to which I have already referred, and to which I would refer again (I do not know whether other people who have come before the Committee have brought it forward) and that is the matter of sympathy and co-operation in these days when we are getting a sensible solid loyal democracy. That is the kind of spirit that you want the inspectors to show—to use the teachers as I try to use my teachers, as men of mind, and I do not come as manager over them. The inspectors want to get rid of that feeling, and the National Board want to get rid of it too, because the teachers are not treated fairly. It is not intentional, but they are not treated fairly. I do not see how in such a matter as education of children success can be obtained if the Commissioners do not themselves, and see that everyone else as far as they can influence them, work as co-operators working together as strictly as you please but sympathetically. Without that I do not say that you won't get education, but you won't get it of the proper kind. If the inspector comes with an unsympathetic manner and if the pupils are threatened, the unsympathetic manner of the inspector towards the pupils is bound to give the teacher a bad mark and to throw back education, and I think the pupils until they get to know the inspector are naturally in a state of nervous tension, and so on, and that I think is one of the things that go to the root of the whole position.

14183. Now you refer in No. 4 to general examination once a year?—Oh, yes, on notice being given. As far as I understand the teachers do not object to the notice being short so long as the day's curriculum is not interrupted. They feel is a decided hardship that the inspector should come in and upset the curriculum of this day and go back on last week's work, but I suppose the annual inspection is a different thing.

14184. Does this imply that you wish for extended notice as compared with the present system?—I think they get none. I think myself one of the disadvantages of the results system was that they knew the day of the examination, and there was the danger that they would screw up in the

24th June, 1910.]

REV. PERCIVON HOSKIN, examined.

[Continued.]

last few months and have a system of cramming; but where it is not absolutely against the rules if the present system could be improved by more examination of the pupils, I think a little longer notice would be desirable for the teachers, though, of course, there are disadvantages in that.

14185. A little longer notice would not give much opportunity for cramming?—Not but, of course, I can see that there would be disadvantages from the inspection point of view. In fact, from information I got from the teachers I can state that the teachers do not mind short notice or any notice if the day's curriculum is not upset.

14186. Now, No. 7 relates to the manner in which appeals of teachers are dealt with under the present system. Have you any experience of that?—I won't say experience, but I can give you the opinion of teachers I have spoken to about it. I think in one way it comes into a part of what I have been saying under No. 8, that is first of all the complaints are not numerous, because the teachers are afraid to complain (and I have felt this myself always, and I take it from what I heard some years ago, and in former parishes) that the teacher who complained must (unless there is some system provided to avoid it) be afraid that the inspector "would have his knife into him." What I have been pressing on the lines of co-operation would largely help to get rid of that, but there is something definite that I should like to draw attention to connected with appeals at present. An appeal goes up to the Board and it is sent to the inspector. Now, that is a thing that is most unfair.

14187. It is sent to him for his observations?—What is most unfair is that it is sent to him for his observations, and his observations go to the Board and the teacher does not see them. That is an *ex-parte* decision. I think that is part of the old system of feudalism of the Board.

14188. Would you send the inspector's observations to the teacher for his observations?—Well, practically, or some system practically identical with that, because I do not think the teacher gets a fair hearing; it is an *ex-parte* judgment that is passed on his appeal. I do not think that is what takes place in Courts of ordinary justice. If one Law Courts were carried on in the same way, I wonder where we would be. I do not see why the teachers should not be treated as fellow men and not as underlings and serfs. One of the teachers has said that: "The Board treated us as serfs," and it is terrible that such a feeling should exist.

14189. Mr. KERR.—Would you be satisfied with two statements on each side?—I am speaking generally, but I quite admit there must be a *tertium quid*.

14190. That is the practice of the Law Courts?—I presume that the practice of the Law Courts would be a good precedent to follow, but unless there is a satisfactory *tertium quid* of course it is not likely to be fair.

14191. Sir HENRY WILKINSON.—Might I make one remark about the Law Courts. There is an appearance of each of them before the Court, and in the old system of the Chancery in which the statements were all written there were much more numerous statements made?—That point is very much at rest. The only difficulty I feel about that is this, that if appeals were numerous (though some of them perfectly fair), and if they were dealing with comparatively small matters, it would be hard to expect the Board to have up the person who complained in most cases.

14192. I merely mentioned that element that where there were written statements they were more numerous?—But do you not think that there is something likely to divert the Commissioners from a proper conclusion if the complaint is answered by the inspector, and the teacher has no further say in the matter as to what the inspector said in his reply?

14193. Well, I cannot state any opinion upon the matter, but I have asked several witnesses who have raised the question whether they did not think that that was utterly wrong?—Oh, quite so; in fact, what Mr. Little said I think is the solution of the matter, that the practice of the Law Courts should be adopted. Otherwise I think it worse than the policeman; I think it is feudalism.

14194. The CHAIRMAN.—Have you anything more to say about equipment, cleanliness, and so on, as affecting the inspector's report?—No, except that I should like to impress very much that point about the buildings and equipments. You say it is wiped out, and if so easily got over. If it is not in practice, then it is impossible to press the matter. I say: "If it is not in practice." I had the idea that the report on a teacher (which means his income) is influenced by the state of the buildings and by the state of the equipment and in a modified way by the cleanliness of the school, which three things (except the third in a modified way) he has nothing directly to say to, and certainly very little indirectly, and I think it is a monstrous thing that there should be a possibility of docking a man's salary for something that he has nothing to say to.

14195. Are the teachers in your district wholly responsible for cleaning the schools?—Since the Board brought in this grant of about half the cost of heating it is not left to the teachers financially. Of course, I am sorry for the managers, and especially for myself in the matter, because I have to look to it now, but the teachers are not now responsible for this expense.

14196. And they are not liable for personal labour in cleaning the school?—There is a footnote in the rules which says they are responsible (and they do not object to that) for being superintendents as to the way in which the cleaners will do it, but in the other things I may answer for myself and my brother managers and the parish committee, and say we have to see after the money, and I think that fair to the teachers. The teachers may give a voluntary contribution, and I said to my principals: "You may ask your assistants what they wish to contribute for heating and cleaning, but let them understand that it is absolutely voluntary," and most of them do contribute, and I think to do it voluntarily is fair, because after all it is for the benefit of the schools and the children and they benefit by it themselves also.

14197. They themselves give voluntary contributions?—Yes. However, we are wandering from the point a little. As regards those other things, I cannot imagine that the Committee could hold that a teacher should have his reports (which means his income) depending in some measure on things that are absolutely out of his ken, and I think in the case of the cleanliness of the school if the teacher has complained to the manager several times and the manager has not acted, the teacher should go *seot-free* on that score.

14198. Mr. KAVENAGH.—I see you take the view that the salary should go direct to the teacher?—Yes.

14199. Is that a grievance with them?—I think they wish it. It came up in connection with the question of monthly payments, and I think they would like it. Also I wish to say for myself that I have far more on my hands than I care to have. I have 25 of a teaching staff, and for me to deal with that once a quarter is quite enough. Various things require my attention in the parish; and while I think, because the teachers wish it that it would be reasonable to give them monthly salaries I would be exceedingly sorry that we managers should be troubled with having to sign the monthly pay sheets.

14200. I see it is a managers' grievance?—No, it is not a managers' grievance at all. I am content and accustomed to do what has been hitherto the custom, namely to sign the pay-sheets once a quarter; but if the teachers get monthly payment, then as a manager I am not saying that I object to it at all, but I think it is a pity that the managers should have their work so largely increased. Of course, in a small parish in the South it is different, but really I am overworked in a working-class parish, and it would be serious to have to do that once a month, and I do not see why the Board should not provide for that. I do not object to it once a quarter, but for the life of me I do not see the need of my signing over once a quarter.

14201. But you are the employer?—Well, in a sense, but I am not going to take that proposition in full, because I protested with the Board in regard to some other things that they wanted to put on us. I protested about various things and I asked them to register my protest.

24th June, 1913.]

REV. PERCIVAL HOBSON, continued.

[Continued.]

14203. We have had it this morning that if the salaries are paid monthly it would mean an enormous increase of the staff in the office?—There you are; the managers do all the work. The Commissioners should get other people to help them. If the teachers wish for monthly payments, I do not see why the Commissioners should not give them to them and give it them direct, because I think as a rule monthly payments are more satisfactory for people of that class. And those salaries are small as compared with the salaries in England. I think they should get much more payment. In the North a gardener would nearly get as much. Take a case of a young man who would be in the second grade here who is now in London; I think he is getting £110 or £120 a year and he is not a principal. And if education is one of the most important things in the Empire you are building up, the vastness of the importance of the whole moral, religious, physical, and intellectual character of the child is such that I think those who are put into the position of teachers ought to get more than would be paid to a gardener.

14204. Do you think you would get a better class at a higher salary?—Well, I should think so; that would be a matter of business. You get a good class with you pay for one of the most vital matters in the whole of humanity, and in that case the better pay ought to attract better men.

14205. The CHAIRMAN.—I know from experience that in England there are university men working for wages not up to the wages of a Queen's Island man in Belfast?—I say that is one of the blunders the Empire makes. Its treatment of education is perfectly ludicrous.

14206. I think all over the country the payment of teachers is a perfect scandal?—I think throughout the whole of the British Isles they are trying to get £100 worth for £25, because I look upon education as such a vastly important factor in the Empire's welfare.

14207. Now, about the question of increments, I think you are in favour of automatic payments, that the merit marks should be reduced and the award of increment made practically automatic. You would reduce the merit marks practically to two, that is satisfactory and unsatisfactory?—I do not commit myself to that. I do not mean to say that I would reduce the required standard of efficiency in the school. I do not think that because a teacher has been ten years teaching he is therefore to get so much money, that if I am a teacher with an initial salary of so much, then after five years I am to get so much more, and after ten years I am to get so much more. What I say is that the teacher should be entitled, not through lapse of time, but only through efficiency of work, to an increase.

14208. It is a question of yearly increments instead of triennial?—Well, that was only a suggestion on the same lines. Increments, however it comes, is for efficiency, but then it would act as a stimulus to a teacher who might be a little slack without it, because at present a man may get "good," "good," and "fair," and then "fair" knocks him back to the foot of the three-runged ladder, and then he is working with a knife over his head, like Democles.

14209. It is suggested that a certificate should be issued by the manager on the report of the inspector?—I would strongly object to that. In my present position I really object to more work being thrown upon managers. In addition to bringing us into a position different to what we have that would throw on us a responsibility in regard to the educational fitness or efficiency of the school, which appears to be an intolerable policy when we are not professed educationists. I should be very sorry indeed that that should be done.

14210. Do you think a money stimulus is necessary to make the teacher do his best?—Well, I think human nature being what it is, it is only natural.

14211. I mean in the way of increment being triennial increment as against yearly increment, which is a smaller increment, of course; would it take away the stimulus from the teachers?—I think the annual increment would be a stimulus to a greater degree than the triennial, because in the case of the triennial he is

working with the sword of Damocles over his head. He may do well for two years and then the next year he is knocked out.

14212. And you think the annual increment would be a greater stimulus?—I think so.

14213. Would you explain what you mean by individual merit marks?—At present the merit mark is given to the whole school as a unit, and the suggestion is that each teacher should have his or her merit mark assigned, and that the report of that should be sent with each teacher's merit mark assigned to the manager and the principal. Take the instance of a principal with three assistants. As present the whole school is affected by one mark. Well, he may have two teachers who are not able teachers and one of his assistants may be very able, and the teacher's mark is tarnished by the appreciable inferiority of the two; but supposing you give them separate merit marks you see the weak points of the school.

14214. Mr. HENRY.—The teachers do get merit marks?—They may with the Board, but they do not come to the manager or principal.

14215. It is conceded?—Yes, it must be, apparently. We get them down dealing with the whole school.

14216. The CHAIRMAN.—But the teachers sometimes discover the mark?—But why deal in secrecy?

14217. Mr. KAYNAGE.—You were dealing with the school mark, not with the teacher's mark?—I am speaking of the report of such a school as "good," and so forth, whereas I say that the principal should get "excellent" or "good" or "bad" as the case may be, and such-and-such an assistant such a mark, each being individualised.

14218. Mr. KETTER.—That is assuming that you retain the merit marks?—Yes, assuming that you retain the merit marks.

14219. Mr. HENRY.—You have raised one of the most important questions that have come before us, and that is the question of co-operation between the teachers and the inspectors. Have you any practical suggestion to offer as to how that co-operation could be got?—I am afraid I have not thought that out sufficiently. If I was coming as a supporter of measures, it would need another visit. But I think it is worth the Committee's while to think over it, for I think until such a change is made there is a root error in the system of education.

14220. Do you think it is in any way due to the fact that the Commissioners are taken from a class so much above the class of children that the have to enter for?—I would not say so, absolutely; but I think you are coming something near it. For the life of me I cannot understand how some Commissioners are appointed, now that you refer to the National Board. After all, if I want to have my farm worked, I don't want to go to a spinning-mill head or a factory man or an engine driver. I go to a person who is expert in farming or who knows something about it. I think there is a very great deal in what you suggest. We think some of the Commissioners are most excellent men dropped from the sky. Some of them will be able to instruct you in anything but education; and that is the system we are working under, and no wonder the teachers are troubled.

14221. I understand that you are in favour of more examination of the pupils?—Yes; I would emphasise that. I think there should be a little more examination of the pupils; avoiding the results system.

14222. We had it in evidence that an inspector might make a report on a school after a visit of ten or fifteen minutes, without asking a question. Do you think that is a satisfactory arrangement?—I think it is absolutely unsatisfactory.

14223. Do you think it satisfactory to the parents that the children should not be examined?—I am afraid that many of the parents do not look into it enough.

14224. Do they not take an interest in their children's education?—I think they should; but I do not think they look so closely into it when they think that other people will look into these things for them.

14225. I have here the revised programme that was issued in 1900, and it is laid down here on that programme that all schools will as a rule be examined

24th June, 1913.]

Rev. FREDERICK HOSSEN, continued.

[Continued.]

fully once a year in the course that may be sanctioned for each. Would that recommendation, if carried out, satisfy you?—That they should be examined fully?

14225. Yes?—It depends on what the Board mean by "fully." That might mean every pupil, and I think it is objectionable to have a regular examination of every pupil on the part of the teacher. I am not so sure that it would be objectionable provided that it did not bring in payment by results.

14226. There is no question about payment by results?—No.

14227. That was issued in 1900. In 1901 they drew a distinction between examination and inspection by saying that in the annual visit to a school the time of the inspector should be divided between those branches. Obviously more time would be required for inspection than was formerly devoted to it. Careful examination must not be omitted, but ascertaining the proficiency of every pupil in every subject is no longer necessary. As a rule class examination will take the place of individual examination. Would that circular, if carried out, meet your wishes?—I think it would, in a great measure.

14228. As far as I can see the whole-school rules are admirable, but the concrete are very far from being so. It says in another circular with regard to incidental reports that there should be three at least in the year on each school, in addition to the report on the annual examination. So that I think I may take it that you would be in favour of the children being more fully tested than they are at this moment?—Yes. I am speaking now my own ideas. I think the Board were frightened at the way the results worked out, and like many other wise men they went to the other extreme. I think this system has improved cleanliness and neatness in the pupils, but while that is so I think this thing of examination of the pupils and getting to know how they are progressing in education is the foundation, but I would certainly have the other things as well.

14229. Supposing that you consider the examination of the pupils necessary, what time should the examination take place, or inspection plus examination?—I was hoping that would not be passed over. I am not quite sure when, and I believe there is a desire that it should be on the same day throughout Ireland. Now, the difficulty the Commissioners have to deal with is this, and it is absolutely unfair to the teachers. Is not identity of date what they are aiming at?

14230. I do not think so?—Well, for inspectors to come in in April to examine schools whose programme ends in June is a thing that ought not to be tolerated; and for an inspector to come in in September after the holidays when the new programme has just begun—I cannot imagine how the teacher should be treated in that way. The teachers are to have their salaries doled because the thing has not been sufficiently thought out by the Commissioners. I think it is an outrage. I should like to emphasise that point very much indeed.

14231. Would you be in favour of each school having its own school year, as schools have in England and as we had in this country up to 1900?—I have not had sufficient experience of that. If it worked sufficiently well in England, I think that is certainly a solution.

14232. But if it worked well with us up to 1900?—I have no objection to see that done, but I am sure the Commissioners must have had some wise ground for changing it, though we do not always attach such wisdom to changes the Commissioners make in the rules. That teachers should be treated as I have mentioned as to dates of examination is a thing that ought not to occur in any decent organisation.

14233. But supposing an inspector was going to test a teacher's work ought not to be to go at such a time that there will be a large attendance, so as to be able to judge really of the work that he has been doing?—Certainly. Nothing I said went against that. What I say is that if I am a teacher, and if I get a set day, e.g. in June, to finish my programme, and if Mr. A.B. comes in to examine my school in April, that is not dealing fairly.

14234. When the results system was about being introduced a circular was sent to the teacher of every

school in the country, and he was asked to specify the three months in which he had the highest attendance throughout the year?—Yes.

14235. And then the examination of his school was fixed in one of those three months, and the school having its own school year they began twelve months antecedent to that month, say, and thus the school year varied, so that each school was tested when they had the largest number of pupils present, so that that final test always took place in the last month of the school year, in fact the highest month of the school year?—Yes, at the end of the school year. You know another thing I think in regard to the present system is this, that where pupils have attended sufficiently badly I think they might reasonably be left out of the material on which the inspector has to form his judgment.

14236. Then would you be in favour of a list being prepared by the teacher and handed to the inspector giving the number of attendances of each pupil for the previous twelve months?—Either that or a rule specially drawn up by the Commissioners, saying that any pupils who have missed a certain number of attendances may be ruled out at the option of the teacher.

14237. The CHAIRMAN.—Dr. Starke said that under the present system any inspector fit for his business if he came in to inspect one month after the opening of the school year would be able to make allowances.—Dr. Starke made an excellent remark, if we were living in an ideal world. Did he really speak as a Commissioner? When you tell me an expert in education said a thing like that, he may have been too long in the office to understand human nature; but we clergy come in contact with human nature.

14238. Mr. HOSSEN.—Now, for this final inspection of the year should the teacher get notice?—That I find a difficult question to answer, and therefore I will answer for myself, because I see the pro's and the con's, the advantages and the disadvantages, and weighing those together I think that the teacher might get a not very long notice, but one which to avoid a personal mopping up of the desks too much.

14239. Here is the point. Sometimes an inspector visits for final inspection on a day when there is a bad attendance owing to harvest work or when there may be some amusement in the neighbourhood, and thus the teacher has not an opportunity of presenting all his pupils to be tested by the inspector. Ought he not to get sufficient notice to enable him to have the pupils present?—I think the teacher, just as I think the manager, should have been consulted with regard to the change in the results system, and I think the teacher should be consulted in regard to that smaller but very important matter that you are referring to. In the change from the results into the present system I do not think there was a single teacher consulted by the Commissioners, and I am not sure whether the managers were.

14240. Or the inspectors?—If the inspectors were not consulted it makes the matter even worse. I should say the Commissioners are excellent men, but not in every case excellent for education.

14241. The CHAIRMAN.—But they state distinctly in the evidence that they did consult experts, and I think Mr. Lomas gave a list of experts that they consulted before they introduced the system in 1909?—They consulted the experts, but they did not consult the people who should be directly interested. They did not consult any teacher in Ireland, and I should be inclined to think that they did not consult any manager. If I am wrong, then admit gracefully.

14242. Mr. HENLY.—And when they prevent the teacher from getting notice, does not that manifest distrust of the teacher at the present time?—Yes; at the same time from human nature we can see that there are disadvantages in notice being given too.

14243. And are they?—Well, if I am a teacher, and if I get a long notice, I can make special preparation.

14244. I am not asking for long notice?—What notice then do you suggest should be given?

14245. If I got three days' notice if I were a teacher, I would be quite satisfied.—That is very moderate, but what I would suggest from what you have just stated

is that it ought to be pressed very strongly that the teachers ought to be consulted not solely as to the three days' notice, but also as to the best period of the year.

14245. That is what the school year implies?—I thought you said the inspector could come on a day when the programme was not sufficiently gone through?

14247. Yes?—I should like to emphasise that point, viz., that I think it would be most desirable that the teacher should have some say within a limited period as to when the inspection should take place, and I think that notice would be perhaps reasonable too.

14248. Now, with regard to appeals, have you in your own experience ever sent forward an appeal as manager?—Do you mean a complaint?

14249. An appeal against the report of the inspector?—No, I have not. I think I remember an appeal or a complaint being made, but it is not worth while referring to it. It was about 20 years ago in a former parish of mine.

14250. You do not know how they are dealt with?—Well, the point on which I would press very strongly for a change is that the teacher does not know the inspector's reply.

14251. Now there is one question I would ask about that. Why should it be necessary to send the teacher's reply back to the inspector at all?—Oh, well, that is very much to the point, but the thing is that it can be sifted further on the principle that Mr. Kettle mentioned, that the reply of the inspector should be made known to the teacher and the teacher allowed to answer this reply. The result would be to have a little more detailed information on the subject. My point is that if the reply of the inspector is withheld from the teacher, it is unfair. My suggestion with regard to the teacher getting the inspector's reply would only carry your point one step further. If they say: "We won't send the reply to the teacher," then I should be inclined to say that the two sides should come in on the first show.

14252. Why should the inspector be allowed to supplement the matter?—Quite so, but I do not see any objection to that if the teachers were allowed to know the inspector's answer, and if the teacher is allowed to reply to this answer. Certainly the present position is unfair to the teacher.

14253. I understand you were in favour of annual increments?—Yes, I think so.

14254. But what condition ought to be fulfilled in order that the teacher should get the increment?—I think there should be a standard of proficiency.

14255. But with your experience as a manager, having seen large schools to deal with, what do you think would be a satisfactory condition to lay down as to when an increment should be awarded or when it should be withheld?—I am afraid I have not thought that out.

14256. There were two words used by Mr. Kavanagh, "satisfactory" and "unsatisfactory." Do you think it would be desirable to have those two words in the reports?—If you eliminate all the rest and put these in I think it would be very good, but then the question would be, what would be the qualification for "satisfactory," and what the qualification for "unsatisfactory."

14257. Would there not be a danger that if "unsatisfactory" were put into the report that school might be regarded as inefficient and ordered to be closed?—I do not think they would go so far without very strong reasons. I do not want to be drawn into a definition, because there would be a danger that a person who got "unsatisfactory" for two or three years might get it in another year when he did not deserve it, and I think there should be a standard of efficiency.

14258. You think that the annual increment would be even a greater stimulus to exertion than the triennial?—Well, in talking to two of the teachers of schools belonging to me they were anxious to talk this over, and I said "Very well. Human nature is such that there will be some teachers who will be slack, and who will say, 'I have got such an income and I can teach less'; and I said: "What stimulus will you apply?"

and one suggested the annual increment, and he, being a practical person, I think that is a point that might be taken into consideration as to stimulus.

14259. Have you many teachers in your service who would work zealously and faithfully throughout the year even if they were never promised an increment?—Well, I confess that, considering what human nature is, I think that if it was suggested that "you shall get so much extra payment," it would be a stimulus to nearly anybody in any profession.

14260. I think there are a good many people who would work without it, and I do not think in the scale of payments in the Irish Church they have provided increment for the clergy?—Well, that is a sufficient answer, and there are many of the teachers to whom the work of teaching is congenial and they deserve great applause for it; but I do not think that the mass of teachers are born teachers, and then they have the burden and the anxiety of their work, with the possibility of the inspector being cranky, and the parents of the children coming at them. They say you get used to hanging, and I suppose you get used to teaching; but the burden on the teachers is great, and I do not find them complain, even when there is a possibility of a parent coming round the corner, and saying: "Very little would make me go to the school and hit that man over the head," that is, the teacher who is standing at the school door. I think human nature is such that undoubtedly an increase of pay because you do things better is a stimulus, and I cannot get away from it.

14261. Mr. KERRIN.—And ought not the teacher to have an increment on the ground that it helps to enable him to meet growing domestic responsibilities?—You are quite right. It takes them 35 years to get the highest possible payment under the Irish National Education Board. A teacher may work faithfully, and after working 35 years, if anything happens, if he is struck down with paralysis, and so forth, he is turned out a pauper. I do not think it is creditable to the British Empire that there should be such a state of things. I think it is awful. I was speaking to a teacher the other day about what would be the result if that happened. It is awful.

14262. Mr. HENRY.—Is it not happening every day?—Well, I am thankful to say I have not had experience of it.

14263. The teacher is to train up pupils so as to make them ready to answer, and independent and self-reliant, and so on. Would he not want to be an independent teacher to accomplish all that?—Well, the assurance of increased payment tends to independence, and I think the more you get rid of this root error of not considering, in regard to education, that it is a work of co-operation, the more you bring out real education, and the more servile the spirit that is inculcated by the present system, whether intentionally or not, the less good it will make the education.

14264. You think the teachers have not that freedom and independence at the present time?—Well, I would not say at the present time, for in a certain sense the Commissioners have got rapped over the knuckles, and so forth, through the Teachers' Associations and so forth. I think the teachers are an admirable class of men, and it is wonderful how they combine a certain amount of respect, and so forth, to the manager along with independence, and I hope we shall try to get more and more into that brotherly way with them.

14265. Have you noticed in your experience any undue interference on the part of the inspectors with the teachers' methods or any contradictory recommendations?—Well, that is a point I would like very much to touch on, or one point in connection with it. I think, so far as it goes, it is a decided grievance that an inspector should come in and hear a lesson being taught and will condemn it. He may say: "That is not rightly done," and the teacher asks: "Where is the fault, where is the defect?" Instead of really showing the defect, he may say: "I cannot discuss the point with you." Now, I say that is absurd. One time an inspector was appealed to, and I think he said to the teacher: "You ought to do this in some other way," and she said: "How should it be done?" and he said:

"I confess I could hardly tell you." I hardly think a man like that is a man that would sit down and co-operate with the teachers. If an inspector says: "That is wrong, you have done that thing incorrectly," and he is asked "Where is the fault—it is not rightly done, but will you tell me how it should be done?" and he says he cannot discuss the point, that is, to my mind, perfectly absurd.

14264. Have you studied the observation books in your school?—No.

14265. Do you read them at all?—No, I content myself with the reports that come to us.

14266. The CHAIRMAN.—Do you wish to say anything more on the subject of paper promotion?—No, but I propose to speak about the return of the money to the British Treasury.

14268. That is a mistaken idea entertained by the teachers, that money is returned?—To make my point clear, I understand that this is the case, and you will say if it is wrong. I understand that when Department A has so much money from the Treasury and uses only a certain amount, the remainder that is over goes back to the Treasury, and at the same time Department C has not enough to do its work, so it goes without it because the Treasury won't give more, whereas one would have thought that the money would be available to pass on from one department to another.

14270. That can be done with the consent of the Treasury?—That is my point. Suppose different departments are provided for, and this department has got £20,000 and it uses £5,000, and £15,000 goes back to the Treasury, and another department wants money, it seems to me to be laughable. In the matter of money I should say the Treasury is chiefly to blame. I think it is absurd that money should be got from the Treasury for Irish education, and sent back to the Treasury, not because Irish education does not want it, but because a certain department of it does not. I think the National Board is not getting a larger sum from the Treasury than it did ten years ago.

14271. Is it?—Because it should get a very substantial increase, as our organization has been added to, and the teachers have increased in number in the last ten years, so unless there is a substantial increase they are starving education.

14272. Sir HERALD WILKINSON.—But there is an increase, and I may say, and I do it respectfully, that you share a misapprehension which is held by the teachers, as to the constitutional way in which the money is voted and expended, and I will endeavour to explain it very shortly to you to show you that there is such misapprehension. First of all, no money can be granted for such a subject as education unless the Treasury put it before Parliament. The Government, as has been pointed out to-day, may insist that the Treasury shall pay it, and the Treasury is part of the Government. The money is not voted simply for any department to use it indiscriminately. Not a single pound of the money that is voted can be expended unless subject to the Treasury regulations. The salaries of the teachers are prescribed by Treasury regulations; the increments are prescribed by Treasury regulations, and the conditions on which increments shall be given and promotions are prescribed by Treasury regulations, and the conditions on which promotion shall be given. And here is the estimate for the current year, and it is put down under the heads of administration, inspection, training colleges, model schools, National schools, grants for scholarships from primary schools, manual and practical instruction, teachers' residences, grants in aid of pension fund, appropriations in aid. If the Commissioners find that they do not want anything under the head B, for instance, and they would wish to expend it under E, for salaries of teachers, they cannot expend it for salaries of teachers save under two conditions. If they are expending more money than they have asked for they must get the Treasury sanction for using the money that has been appropriated to some other head under the head of salaries, and they cannot pay it for salaries except in accordance with a rule to which the Treasury has assented, because the accounts go to another authority altogether, different from the Treasury and different from the Board, that is, the

Comptroller and Auditor-General, and the Comptroller and Auditor-General will not pass the account or an item of the account unless the sanction for it, the Parliamentary grant, is there, and unless the Treasury regulation is followed, and if they give, say, a teacher £5 more than he was entitled to under the Treasury regulation, the Board would have to refund the £5—I am very glad to hear the explanation, but does the same hold in Scotland, Wales, and England?

14273. In every department of the public service?—Then that comes to what I said a minute ago; but I used perhaps the wrong word when I said the Treasury was to blame. Perhaps nobody is to be blamed. Of course, the change of any regulation like that of the Treasury would be a very serious thing, and perhaps one that never could be carried out.

14274. Now, about paper promotion, it was explained here this morning that with regard to the third grade the Board can appoint as many teachers as are required. With regard to the second grade the number is fixed, but at the present time there are not enough people qualified to fill the second grade numbers, and those numbers are not filled up. The numbers in the first of first grade and the second of first grade are also fixed by the Treasury, and these are filled up, and the Commissioners could not pay a single teacher in addition to those numbers, without having the sum disallowed by the Comptroller and Auditor-General. Paper promotion simply amounts to this that if there is a vacancy for a teacher in the first grade the person who is qualified for first of first grade will be entitled to get it in accordance with the order in which they receive a certificate to that effect?—Is this a new regulation?

14275. No, it is an old regulation, and from my own experience it applies to other departments of the public service?—I see.

The CHAIRMAN.—As I understand it the numbers in the second, and the two sections of the first grade were fixed in 1900 between the Commissioners and the Treasury, and they have remained unchanged since.

14276. Mr. KERR.—I think that the technical point that you are going to make is that the Government of the day could, despite those Treasury regulations, being responsible for the Government of the country, get Parliament to vote such money as was necessary?—I think the whole British Empire has taken too low a view of education, and it is absurd to pay teachers the same, in or about, as you pay a gardener, and much less than you pay a steward. It is intolerable.

14277. The CHAIRMAN.—You say that the great for education is by comparison with other departments shockingly small?—Quite so. The more you raise the social status of any profession the more they will be capable for their work; the more the whole tone of the work is raised. (Would you not agree with that?) And by improving the income of the teachers, of course, you help them in that way. As we have been on finance, might I mention this point, which is a financial one. I do not know that it has come before you, and although it is a small point, I think there is a grievance in it, that is the stampage of letters sent by the teacher to the inspector. The teachers must return three letters to the inspector in the year, and probably more, and they get no stampage, and the teachers of Ireland are out of pocket on stampage on letters to the inspectors to the amount of about £800.

14278. Mr. HARRISON.—Surely you can write to the National Board without a stamp?—Yes.

14279. Then why not address the inspector, care of the National Board, and as he is travelling about, he would probably get it?—Well, the educational policeman would have his trenchmen out if the teacher did anything like that.

14280. It is done in England?—I do not think the Board would tolerate a teacher addressing the inspector, care of the Commissioners of National Education. I do not think that the teachers should be expected to pay stampage on the business of the National Board to the amount of between £700 and £800 a year. Their incomes are not such as you would give a good gardener, and then you expect them to go to this expense.

14281. Is it quite fair to say that, because you are taking the initial salary of the teacher and the full salary of the gardener?—Oh, yes.

14282. That is quite fair?—No.

14283. The teacher has a good deal to look forward to, perhaps double as much as the gardener would?—I should qualify that by saying "initial salary."

14284. Are you sole manager of seven schools?—Yes, sole manager.

14285. Nobody else has any right to go into those schools and look after them in any way?—Well, the parents; but as an authority nobody, except, of course, the officials of the Board.

14286. How often do you visit the schools?—Well, of course, I get my courses to do the school work, i.e., the religious education, and then they visit the schools.

14287. Now, is that information that you have given me the result of your personal experience?—No, but information that I have obtained. I think that I have mentioned that anything I have said is after consultation with the teachers.

14288. So you have been really putting their view before us as your own view?—Yes, quite so, as supporting the teachers' case.

14289. Now, with regard to the final examination, you said the inspector ought to take into account the result of the previous visits of that year?—Yes.

14290. When he makes his report on the final examination, have you any reason to suppose that he does not do so?—I think the impression is that he does not.

14291. But you have no evidence?—No.

14292. But you stated that he ought to do it, and that presupposes that he does not do it?—Yes, it presupposes the general idea, and a suspicion which I think should be got rid of.

14293. You merely want to clear it up?—Well, to correct it, if it exists, as the teachers suppose it does.

14294. Now, you also told us that the whole attitude of Tyrone House towards the teachers was that of educational policemen. That, I take it also, is not the result of your personal experience?—Oh, no. I have not anything to complain of. I get the utmost courtesy from the Board myself.

14295. And from the inspectors?—Oh, yes, from the inspectors also.

14296. Of whom you have not met very many?—Well, I have met a certain number.

14297. You told us at the beginning that you seldom attended an inspection?—No, I do not go to inspections.

14298. And what opportunities have you of meeting inspectors?—Well, inspectors might sometimes call on me, not very many of them.

14299. Now, do you not think that, granting for the moment that there is something in that very sweeping statement about the attitude of Tyrone House being that of an educational policeman, do you not think that it is rather the result of the system?—Certainly.

14300. Have you considered that here we have a central authority with practically no buffer between the teacher and the National Board?—Well, of course, the manager is a buffer.

14301. Well, but now you are not unique, and you are a manager of seven schools and cannot often go to them, and you have very seldom met an inspector on his business, so that you cannot be a very effective buffer?—Well, if there is something that we object to, we are communicated with. They communicate with the managers, I presume, because we are in an independent position.

14302. Quite so; but to be an effective buffer in such a case, you must be pretty conversant with the system, must you not?—No, not necessarily; because the teacher will know the ins and outs of the system completely. Supposing the teacher is absolutely fair and the Board deals with him unfairly.

14303. But how is the manager to know?—There is something that the manager can look into, for instance, the rules of the National system, the broad rules, the substantial rules, and so on. If I deal with an actual case, I can, if I choose, write to the Board, and if I know the teacher is a respectable, honourable man, and he is a person who knows the system, I think I have a right to do so.

14304. You practically voice his complaint?—Certainly. I consider myself as manager, not merely manager, but certainly a protector of the teacher.

14305. But, of course, you have got very little authority yourself as a manager, although you have the appointment of the teacher?—In what way authority?

14306. Well, perhaps if I had said "responsibility" it would have been a better term?—Well, of course, as to responsibility it is a very responsible thing to make an appointment, because the teacher is the person on whom the chief responsibility falls.

14307. You have no financial responsibility?—We managers have now.

14308. To what extent?—Not much; but still, with a large number of schools in a working-class parish, a divided financial society is created with respect to such matters as heating and cleaning, and so on.

14309. Would it come to a shilling a head on the average attendance?—Oh, no; I do not think it comes to that.

14310. That is to say, on a school of 100 children you do not pay £5?—I think it very often nearly comes to a shilling a head, between voluntary contributions of teachers and everybody who chooses to give it. I think it would come in my parish to something about £60 or £80 a year.

14311. The CHAIRMAN.—And then there is the upkeep of the building?—Oh, yes; I forgot that, of course. The Board does not give us a penny towards the upkeep. My schools are not vested schools; if they were, it would be a very great relief to me. Well, the upkeep of the buildings (being not-vested), has affected us to such a degree that last year £300 or £700 was spent on the schools.

14312. Was that on the structure?—Some years ago we bought in water from Armagh. Yes; a few years ago Fintona brought in water from the Moone mountains, and that meant an enormous expense, and the schools are put in excellent order, as far as that is concerned.

14313. Mr. HARRISON.—You have commented on the want of co-operation between the inspectors and the teachers. Don't you think that that is perhaps partly owing to the exceedingly elaborate system which prevails here which obliges an inspector to grade the teacher by means of these merit marks, and which also impresses on him at the same time the duty at times of refusing a very important addition to the teacher's income, while the teachers themselves, of course, must always be extremely anxious to know what the inspector's report is. Doesn't a state of things like that necessarily lead to strained relations?—I suppose that is a factor, but I consider that it would be comparatively a very small factor. I consider that the whole atmosphere of the National Board of Ireland (I do not know whether it is intentional or not, but it is beyond doubt that it exists)—I consider the whole atmosphere of the National Board is wrong, that there is a feeling of awe on the part of the teachers as regards the authorities over them. I do not think that the teachers would object to an inspector being strict, but there should be a system, if I might almost say, brotherly co-operation.

14314. You throw the blame rather upon the National Board than upon the inspectors?—Oh, no; I put it on both. If we do differentiate I do not think by any means the secretaries come into that category at all. I think the state of affairs is due to a lack of this system of brotherly co-operation which is desirable on the part of inspectors, who have a most difficult work in the matter. The whole system is such that it is exceedingly difficult to correct, and I think one of the root errors of this system of education is this, that there is a feeling of awe on the part of the teachers as to how the laity will fall in the matter of appeals.

14315. Mr. HENRY.—Do you think the policy should be to trust the teacher?—(I may say in regard to schools that my courses take up the religious education in the schools.) I think there should be an inspection of everything, civil and religious, like in the army. I should like to refer to two other things that come under your reference. I would suggest to the Committee that it is a tremendous mistake that when a teacher is able to teach one language extra, besides English, he can

24th June, 1913.]

Rev. FRANCIS HOSKIN, examined.

[Continued.]

get fees only for one, viz., for Irish. If a teacher teaches Latin, French or German, he gets nothing extra for it, but he will if he teaches Irish. I think there are some things that are startlingly unbusinesslike in the National Education system, and I think this arrangement is absolutely unbusinesslike and absolutely unfair. I do not see how it is fair for me, if I am a teacher of Irish, to get an extra fee, and for my next door neighbour, who teaches Latin, to get none.

14317. The CHAIRMAN.—There was a controversy about that at the Board, and it was said to be very violent while it lasted?—It seems to me to be unreasonable, and it is in keeping with some of the things the Board does. It is most unbusinesslike. If I am a teacher, and I teach Irish, I get a fee, and there is another teacher who teaches some other language and he gets none. Then as to paper promotion, I did not follow very closely what was said, because it is a very complicated question. But I should like to say what I said in the letter to you, Mr. Chairman, that from the teachers' point of view I think that one of the best authorities you could possibly have would be Mr. Judge, the teacher of one of the schools in Poynton, who is completely in touch with the teachers' point of view.

14318. Do you think that we ought to have him here as a witness?—Yes. He has been in very close communication with Mr. Birrell on the subject, and I understand that there is some possibility next month that he may get what he is contending for. If the Committee would like to get information from the teachers' point of view on that particular subject of paper promotion, I think it would be well for you to have Mr. Judge before you.

14319. Mr. HENLY.—Has it struck you that as far as paper promotion is concerned it shows on the part of the National Board lately an anxiety to promote the teachers, only that they won't be allowed by the Treasury, for instance, that promotion is given when there is no room for them, owing to the standard numbers, and that they have recommended the Treasury to increase the numbers in the higher grades, and that the Treasury won't consent?—I think the recommendation of the Board is creditable, and the blame of the difficulty about the numbers, I fancy, largely, if not wholly, lies at the door of the Treasury.

14320. The CHAIRMAN.—As Sir Hiram told you, there are 2,000 places in the second grade, 500 places in the second division of the first, and somewhere about 900 in the first division of the first?—I said to a teacher I was speaking to about it that it was rather complicated, but Mr. Judge could give you information from the teachers' point of view, and if whatever Mr. Birrell says next month does not alter the matter, and if Mr. Judge is wrong, as might easily happen, still it

would be useful as regards the teachers that he should go into these complicated things with you, the Committee, that you refer to, and if he is wrong that he could let the teachers know, and that might produce a feeling of satisfaction.

14321. Do I understand from you that the teachers believe that the Board, if they choose, could get rid of this paper promotion?—Oh, no; by no means. I do not mean to imply that; only that if this is a mistake, it would be well that Mr. Judge should go into it with you, as one who knows the ins and outs from the teachers' point of view, and can give you information that you may not have, and if he is wrong he may be a means of carrying satisfaction to the teachers, because he is looked on as an authority generally on their grievances, and if he is wrong he at least is a channel in which they have confidence, and through him authoritative information as to the result of his appearing before your Committee would thus reach the teachers.

14322. I do not think anybody said that they had not a grievance; the only question is who is to blame for that, whose fault is that?—We all feel that it is the Treasury.

14323. Mr. HENLY.—Does it not strike you that it does not come within our terms of reference?—That is not for me to say. You are to rule it out, if it does not.

14324. Sir HIRAM WILKINSON.—Mr. Judge may know, at any rate, that the Board declare themselves in favour of the teachers, that more posts should be open for those who have now got paper promotion?—Yes.

14325. They have applied from time to time to the Treasury, and that is in their report, and if this gentleman is going to Mr. Birrell, Mr. Birrell is the channel through which the Government would move the Treasury to pay them?—I think there is this further consideration for the teachers to note, viz., that you, gentlemen, are willing to do all you can to produce satisfaction among the teachers, and I am sure that is your aim as far as you possibly can; and I am sure it will satisfy them if, as a result of your work (if you could possibly bring it within your terms of reference), this Committee would back up the Commissioners and Mr. Birrell in trying to get that from the Treasury, so as to rectify the difficulty about paper promotion, and for that purpose your Committee's report would be a tremendous help.

14326. Mr. HENLY.—But supposing we were to make recommendations that the National Board could not carry out, and then they would say: "We would carry out the recommendations of the Committee if we could, but the Treasury won't let us?"—But they won't deal with you as a whole. Won't whoever deals with your report deal with it in detail. Surely if there is one recommendation that they cannot adopt, they won't reject the whole report.

## THIRTY-SECOND DAY.—WEDNESDAY, JUNE 25TH, 1913.

At 23, Kildare street, Dublin.

Present:—Sir SAMUEL DILL, M.A., LL.D., LL.D. (Chairman); Sir HIRAM SHAW WILKINSON, LL.D.; Mr. HENRAGE E. B. HARRISON, B.A.; Mr. JEREMIAH HENLY; Mr. WALTER McMURDOUGH KAVANAGH, D.L.; and

Mr. ARTHUR J. DONNELLY, M.A., B.Sc., Secretary.

Mr. P. E. LEAMAN, I.S.O., L.R.C.S.I., Senior Secretary to the Commissioners of National Education, further examined.

14327. Mr. HENLY.—In your direct evidence you told us that in former days inspectors were of a poor class. Decidedly of inferior class?—I did not say the inspectors as a body.

14328. Does that apply to the inspectors of the present day?—No, distinctly no. I think the inspectors of the present day, taking them as a body (and I can speak of

inspectors for 40 years), I think the present day inspectors, taking them as a body, are superior to the inspectors of 25 years ago, as a body.

14329. To what do you attribute that improvement in the status of the inspectors?—Well, I attribute it largely to the present system of selecting inspectors. In days gone by, in the early days of the system, the



inspectors were not selected, so far as I have been able to ascertain, on any fixed principle. Sometimes one of the staff in the office was sent out as a superintendent, for they were called superintendents at that time. He was sent out to superintend the schools; and, in fact, that occurred in a good many cases. In other cases a teacher sent by a head inspector, or by a Commissioner, or somebody, was thought to be an eligible person for the inspectorate, and he got an appointment. Nevertheless under that system, there have been very many able men selected. Sir Patrick Keenan was one of those that were thus selected. Mr. Sheehy, Dr. Petton and others. Well, there have been some that were not equally good. Then we had the purely examination system, and under the competitive examination system (carried on by the Civil Service Commissioners) we got a considerable number of what we might call book-worms, men who were crammed with information, but who, when they came to the practical work of inspection, were not successful. We also got some under that system, whose personal appearance and whose manner was calculated to impress teachers.

14393. How long is the present system of electing inspectors in operation?—Well, it has been in operation for about 12 years.

14391. Now, do you think that the inspectors that you have got in the last 12 years under the present system are better than those that you got before under the competitive system?—Well, I think, as I said before, as a body they are. I think they are more practical men, and I think they are better mannered men as a body. I have not an extensive personal acquaintance with the inspectors, because they rarely come to headquarters, but those that I have met, with possibly one or two exceptions, were, I should say, better than the class of men I had seen in former years.

14392. You told us that the chiefs of inspection got most of the noting done by clerks?—No, I said most of the notings were made by clerks, and the same system prevails to the present moment.

14393. But the original chiefs of inspection were responsible for the notings that they made, or were up to 1900?—They were responsible. When they put their initials to the thing and signified thereby their approval of it, I presume that they became responsible, but the responsibility was to a certain extent limited. In the ordinary course their responsibility was limited by the fact that those notings when turned into letters had to go to the secretaries, and it was open to the secretary, signing the letters written on those notings, at any time to object to any noting and to veto it.

14394. Can you tell us was that done on many occasions?—I think it was very often done. I cannot say on how many occasions, but it was very frequently done.

14395. You have read Sir Patrick Keenan's evidence at the Povey Commission on the subject?—I read it some time ago. I have not read it recently; but I am speaking from my own personal experience of what was done at the time. I was very constantly in attendance on the senior secretary in regard to letters, and I recollect Dr. Newell frequently returning letters, altering letters, and refusing to sign letters, and the practice obtains to the present day.

14396. The CHAIRMAN.—Letters authorised by the chiefs of inspection?—Authorised by the chiefs of inspection; and, I think, if I recollect the evidence of Dr. Newell before the Povey Commission, he stated distinctly that he had a right to veto. I want to make quite clear what was the practice.

14397. Mr. HENLEY.—You are aware that the chiefs of inspection said that they were not consulted on the occasion of the drastic changes made in 1907?—Yes, I believe so.

14398. And you have stated in your evidence that Sir Patrick Keenan dealt with a number of subjects on which the chiefs of inspection were not consulted in his time?—Yes.

14399. One was the Compulsory Attendance Act. Now, why should he consult the chiefs of inspection on a matter of that kind, that lay altogether outside their sphere of work?—I could not say why he should consult them, but I believe that he did not.

14400. Nor on the denominational training colleges?—Nor on the denominational training colleges. I know all about that.

14341. But why should they be regarded as experts or advisers, or why should they be consulted on the subject?—Well, as chiefs of inspection of the system of education I should imagine that their views with regard to radical changes in procedure might be of interest.

14342. That was an addition to the work that was being done by them?—So far as the Compulsory Education Act of 1902 was concerned, of course, I cannot speak positively about that. Sir Patrick Keenan may have consulted them for all I know, but to my knowledge he did not consult them.

14343. I have taken down pretty full notes, and the impression that you left on my mind was that you were trying to give some justification for their not being consulted in 1902, and that you gave a number of instances where they had not been consulted previously?—Yes, that is so.

14344. And the point I want to ask you is were those subjects on which they had not been consulted previously subjects of which they had any official knowledge, or was there any reason why they should have been consulted as experts?—Well, I could not tell what was in Sir Patrick Keenan's mind. All I can tell you is the fact that they were not consulted so far as I know; but if you ask me my own opinion as to what I would have done under the circumstances I can give you the answer, but I do not think that is relevant to the inquiry. With regard to those big educational matters, very large matters, certainly as big as anything we had in 1900 (the starting of the denominational training colleges affected the undenominational principle on which the National system was based, and the system of training teachers that had been in vogue since the commencement of the system), I think there were large educational questions on which perhaps the chiefs of inspection might be able to throw some light.

14345. They were questions of policy outside the scope of their work, I think?—I cannot admit that.

14346. Now, you say in the older days, in the case of appeals, they were dealt with by the chiefs and secretaries. Do you think that a satisfactory mode of dealing with teachers' appeals?—I am not aware that I said so, so completely. The procedure with regard to appeals was something like the procedure at the present time. Of course, it depends on the nature of the appeal. What kind of appeal would you have in your mind?

14347. An appeal of a teacher against an inspector's mark. Take that as a simple case. If the Commissioners promise that matters of that kind will be investigated by them is it right to have that appeal settled without the matter coming before the Commissioners at all?—Well, that is a matter on which I do not like expressing any opinion, to tell you the truth. You can look at it from many points of view. Some of the Commissioners are educational experts and some of them are not; and I do not think a Board of 30 Commissioners could possibly, unless they sat every day and for seven hours every day, investigate those appeals from teachers. These appeals all contain details relating to the rules and regulations that even the most expert of officials do not always see from precisely the same point of view; and the people to deal with appeals of that kind in the most satisfactory way to the teachers would, to my mind, be men who had been dealing with hundreds and thousands of reports, who had official precedents to guide them, as well as the official rules and regulations, and who had all those rules and regulations at their fingers' ends. I think they would deal with those appeals, in the first instance, in a more satisfactory way.

14348. The CHAIRMAN.—Would you repeat that?—A trained official of long experience, experience extending over years in the office, and perhaps with a little experience outside, would deal in a much more satisfactory way with the appeals from teachers than even the Board sitting as a Committee. It is very hard for a Board of 30 Commissioners, who do not meet every day, and who have not time to read up every detail of the case, to form an opinion on a complicated

subject, when it is put before them by the secretary at the Board, and the secretary himself does not, as a rule, go fully into those cases. He reads them over and studies them carefully, and makes them up as well as he can, and he puts them before the Commissioners as clearly as he possibly can, but in matters of this kind, you must fall back on the man who is solely considering them in his room.

14349. Do you mean that in case these things are referred to the Board, the Board are largely at the mercy of the official who makes the report to them?—I do not like using the word "mercy," but that they are largely depending on him.

14350. Mr. HENRY.—You used the expression that you thought it was desirable that the work should be done by men who had experience of the schools and experience of office work, like the chiefs of inspection, but has not this work been taken away from the chiefs of inspection?—Well, not altogether.

14351. Well, practically?—No, I would not say practically, because in the case of appeals of the kind under the present regime, an appeal against the mark of an inspector is brought before the Resident Commissioner, the Resident Commissioner becomes responsible for the future action, and if he considers that it is a case that ought to be further investigated, he directs it to be referred to the chief inspector.

14352. But the ordinary routine is that in some cases the examiner can deal with this appeal?—No, not that class of appeal. The examiner does not deal with that class of appeal at all; but there are appeals of other kinds, minor appeals; a serious appeal of that kind is not dealt with by the examiner.

14353. The CHAIRMAN.—In what matter, for instance?—In the matter of an appeal against an inspector's mark. That is the kind of thing that I understood Mr. Henry was referring to, an appeal against the mark of an inspector, that the inspector marked unfairly, or was unduly severe, or gave "bad" or "mildling." That would go to the Resident Commissioner, and by the Resident Commissioner's order that would be referred to the chief inspector.

14354. And what would be the matter of the minor appeal?—Other trifling things.

14355. If a man was reprimanded for some small offence, not keeping his books properly?—Yes, matters of that kind. But these are not dealt with by the examiner finally; they are dealt with by the secretary.

14356. Mr. HENRY.—What appeals do examiners deal with, because we have got it in evidence that they refuse appeals?—Examiners?

14357. Yes?—Well, I do not like to say anything about the examiners; but perhaps you have got too much in evidence. There are restrictions on the powers of examiners, and further, nothing that the examiner does is final.

14358. I know that, but it only needs, in ordinary cases, the signature of one of the secretaries to make it final?—If it is a matter of a comparatively trifling character; but if it is a very serious thing, a thing that might affect the teacher's future in a serious way, it is customary for the Secretary to bring that matter up to the Resident Commissioner. When that comes to us the examiner very often makes particular points or states the facts of the case, and notes the file, "Secretary for Consideration," or some such words. When I get cases of that kind I put them aside till I can spare time, and I then take the file and go through it. I suppose Mr. Dilworth does the same. I try to form an impartial and fair opinion, and generally try to be as lenient to the teacher as I possibly can. I make up my mind what action to recommend, and I discuss the matter with the Resident Commissioner, who sometimes is inclined to be more lenient than I am. I know that frequently he has lent to the side of the teacher when I would be inclined to be a bit more severe. It is in the same way with office routine matters; it depends altogether on the particular case. If it is a case that is comparatively trifling, and there have been similar cases before (routine cases), the examiner makes a noting, and as a rule his noting is accepted, but when the teacher's interest is vitally affected, the case is very closely scrutinised.

14360. Would it not be better if those came in the first instance before the chiefs of inspection, who had experience of the schools, and of the reports, and know the bearings of the whole thing?—Well, I think an experienced examiner in the office, if he is a cultured man, or a man of fair education, and who has been for 13 or 14 years working in the office examining reports from the day he came into it till the day he is promoted to the rank of examiner, and who has a perfectly open mind so far as the teachers are concerned, for the teacher is only a name to him, is, I think, in a better position to come to a fair, honest, equitable decision on the case even than a chief inspector.

14361. Who might possibly know the teacher?—Who might possibly know the teacher.

14362. Would you think it a trifling matter for a teacher to be reported who had 20 years' good character, which would not count when he is to be judged by the examiner?—No; on the contrary, the 20 years' good service would count in that case, because the examiner has all the record before him, and the inspector who makes the report has not that before him. He comes into a district and reports a man for falsification of accounts, or perhaps for some trifling thing. Before that case is dealt with in the office, the examiner has the record there; he has the extracts from the permanent registers before him.

14363. Mr. PURCELL told us that even where the inspector makes a recommendation, he issues reprimands on his own initiative?—I think Mr. Purcell should not have made that statement. He cannot do anything of the kind. His noting does not become a request to a manager to reprimand his teacher until the secretary who signs the letter has considered it. I never accept the examiner's noting until I look into the case, and if I have a doubt about the case, I take it to the Resident Commissioner, and get him to countersign it before sending it out. But perhaps Mr. Purcell, being under examination, may have been rushed into that statement.

14364. The CHAIRMAN.—That reprimand cannot go out without your signature?—It cannot go out. Requests to managers to reprimand teachers only go on signed letters.

14365. Mr. HENRY.—But do not those letters come to you in a mass at the end of the day?—No; they come early in the morning, and I get the file of documents (they used to call them the viscera, which is an unpleasant word) on which action is taken. We have the whole file there before us when signing the letters.

14366. The CHAIRMAN.—You have the record?—We have the record.

14367. Mr. HENRY.—You stated that dismissal order were settled by the staff. Is that so still?—I say that dismissal orders may be drafted.

14368. The CHAIRMAN.—They have to go before the Board?—Yes. I do not think I committed myself to saying that dismissal orders were drawn up by the staff.

14369. Mr. HENRY.—"Settled by the staff"?—Not settled or drawn up. There is no doubt that every case of proposed fine or dismissal is specially submitted to the Board at one of its stated meetings, and along with the suggestion of fine or dismissal, there is a printed statement of the career of the teacher and the teacher's explanation. That statement is drawn up after the teacher has been asked to say what he can in his own defence. We do not submit it to the Board until we have asked the teacher for that. We tell him that there has been a bad report against him and that we intend to submit his case to the Board.

14370. You stated in your evidence that in 1900 46 per cent. of the teachers were in second class, with no hope of promotion?—Yes; that is so.

14371. And, of course, a considerable number in the third class?—Well, I did not say that the third class had no hope of promotion.

14372. I know you did not. Now, what percentage of teachers is in first grade at present?—Well, this is a table showing "the number of teachers in receipt of salary of the under-mentioned grades." Is that what you wanted?

14373. The percentage?—There is a total of 4,437 masters.

14374. How many are in the two top grades?—891.

14375. The CHAIRMAN.—That is in the two sections of first grade?—Yes, the two sections of first grade.

14376. What is the exact number?—891.

14377. Mr. HENLY.—That would not be 20 per cent. Now, would that percentage in the first grade be higher than it was in the first class?—Oh, there was a higher percentage in the first class. The standard numbers for first grade were based largely on the number of teachers in receipt of incomes as high or higher than first class?

14378. I think we have evidence of the numbers in the class, and they were much higher than the standard numbers?—There was a considerable number of teachers in the first class, and there are still a number who might be ranked as first class teachers who are in third class schools. This is, however, a financial comparison.

14379. The only point that I thought you were raising was that there were 45 per cent. in the class with no hope of promotion?—Yes, and no hope of increase of class salary.

14380. And that hope of promotion they have not got yet. I have here, of course, the report for 1906?—I would like to understand your point. Are you insinuating a financial comparison or an educational comparison?

14381. Only educational, as to the prospect of promotion?—Well, I look at the prospect of promotion not only from the educational but from the practical and monetary point of view, and I think that is the point of view that the teachers look at it from, and I say that 40 per cent. of the teachers prior to 1906—second class teachers—had no prospect of advancement of salary, and I think that is all I meant to say.

14382. And haven't we a very large proportion at present with no prospect of any advancement in income?—I do not think so.

14383. A large proportion of teachers of schools under 30?—Teachers that are in schools under 30 can all go up to an income that is as good as the old second-class income.

14384. Suppose they reach the top of their grade?—They have as good a chance now—

14385. What chance have they of promotion?—When they get to the top of their grade?

14386. Yes?—Well, they can look out for better schools. You cannot throw away public money. There must be some relation between the work done and the salary paid.

14387. I do not know anything about the migration of teachers, but is it the case that when promising men find themselves in a school of 30 they do try to get into a better school?—I understand that is the case.

14388. But the chances of migration are few? Well, that was one of the ideas under the new scheme. There were many ideas underlying the scheme, they were all beneficial ideas, and one was that a teacher of high educational attainments who found that he was pinned down to a little salary because he was in a small school, would naturally try to change from that school to a better school, and we thought that the managers of the country would appreciate high class teachers, and when vacancies would occur in their schools they would advertise for high-class teachers.

14389. Mr. HENLY.—But to a school with an average attendance of 95 or above, no one can be appointed who has not a diploma?—Yes.

14390. And that shuts out slotted coming out of training colleges and properly shuts them out from those schools?—Yes.

14391. The CHAIRMAN.—Do managers all over Ireland with schools above 65 advertise extensively?—Well, I see advertisements every week in *Bladine's* newspaper; but there is a peculiar condition of things existing in Ireland. A considerable number of teachers regard the teachership of a National school as an hereditary thing.

14392. That is an ancient Celtic characteristic since the early monasteries?—Yes, I dare say.

14393. Mr. HENLY.—You told us that under the results system there was an absence of uniformity amongst the inspectors?—Oh, indeed, there was.

14394. I think your words were that ——— was a scourge, and that the peculiarity of manner of ——— was that he would walk into a school and take of his stockings and hang them before the fire on a wet day?—Yes.

14395. And you mentioned another, ———, that took three days to examine a small school?—Yes.

14396. I suppose you would admit that there is an absence of uniformity still?—Well, I do not know; I am not in a position to speak about that, but I am inclined to think that there is much more uniformity now than there was under the results system.

14397. But there is no uniformity now, and I think that is generally admitted?—But I won't admit that.

14398. What about Clonmel?—I have read Mr. Wely's explanation of that. I have not read Mr. Brown's, and I do not know that Mr. Brown has given an explanation of it. I know that Mr. Brown was considered a very excellent inspector, and that Mr. Wely was considered a very excellent inspector; and, so far as I can see, not having visited the schools myself and having formed no opinion for myself, I think the explanation that Mr. Wely gave was very satisfactory from his point of view, and I dare say Mr. Brown's would be equally so.

14399. They did not agree in their standards?—I think there is too much importance attached to this word "uniformity." The idea seems to have got into the heads of the teachers or some sections of them that for the equitable award of payments there should be an absolute and precise uniformity of standard for determining whether a school or teacher will get "good" or "bad" or "middling." I think in about 80 per cent. of the cases of teachers their increments are given as regularly as clockwork. In a comparatively small percentage, no doubt, a very small percentage, I take it, the absence of uniformity may affect the increment of a teacher. In such a case the teacher has the right of appeal to the Board; those appeals are listened to, they are carefully investigated, as carefully as human beings can investigate them, and I do not see why we should be trying to attain what appears to be impossible in anything connected with human affairs, that is a perfect uniformity of judgment on any subject.

14400. You yourself emphasised the fact that there was an absence of uniformity under the results?—Yes, a gross absence, a conspicuous absence.

14401. We have evidence of the absence of uniformity, and does it not seem to point to a lack of control at headquarters at all times?—At headquarters?

14402. Yes?—I do not think so. The chief inspectors are immediately responsible for the outdoor work of the Commissioners, and there is a very careful code of instructions drawn up, a printed code, under which they work. They are entirely responsible for the outdoor work, and if there is any failing in regard to uniformity or to any other matter (I am not myself admitting that there is, for I know nothing about it except what I have seen in the case of Mr. Wely, but whether that is a case of difference of opinion or difference of standard I don't know), it is the chief inspectors who are responsible, and not the people at headquarters.

14403. Well, I am including the chief inspectors amongst those at headquarters?—Well, the chief inspectors are practically outdoor officers, and they are working largely outdoor.

14404. But in any case we have it that there seems to have been a difficulty in getting anything approximating to a uniformity of standard?—Oh, no; I think the inspectors approach very closely to uniformity of standard. You have two places in Ireland where the teachers are discontented. You have Belfast, where the teachers have always been discontented. They were discontented in the results time, and they objected to the inspectors' marking under the results system, and they were discontented with many of their inspectors. They were discontented with one inspector on account of his reports on the ownership of school houses.

14405. In how many cases did that arise?—In a considerable number. I remember a very serious report of Mr. John Moran, head inspector, about that. He said that Belfast was in a very bad way with regard

25th June, 1918.]

Mr. P. E. LEWIS, I.R.O., L.R.C.S.I., examined.

[Continued.]

to private ownership of schoolhouses. I do not say that Mr. Moran was not right, but I speak of his report.

14406. But the report as to ownership of schoolhouses has no reference, good, bad or indifferent, to the varying of standards?—No, I only give you that as an illustration of how the teachers in or around Belfast (whether there is greater sensitiveness among them, or energy, or what), are more on the alert against their inspectors than teachers in other parts of Ireland, and so far as my experiences in the office goes, they have been in a chronic state of discontent. I came recently across some old paper which showed a condition of things very much akin to what exists there now, in the time of the results system. The teachers said that the inspectors were too severe, and marked too severely. With regard to the other place, Clomalt, that is a matter that I do not like to express any opinion about. Mr. Bewne had the reputation of being a very good inspector. He may have been a bit lenient, and I am inclined to think he was too lenient, and possibly that would account for the difference.

14407. But when 140 "excellents" and "very goods" were reduced to 70, was not that a serious state of things?—Certainly, I think it was, if the schools concerned were identical, and if it affected the teachers financially.

14408. It was actually stated by Dr. Starke that he would review the whole case again?—If so, I need not say anything on the subject.

14409. The CHAIRMAN.—It has been said that you cannot reach uniformity all over Ireland, and with districts varying so much in characteristics you must expect a difference of standards?—I agree personally with that. I think that in striving after perfect uniformity we are following an ignis fatuus.

14410. I only want to ascertain if you would agree with that opinion?—That is my opinion; you may take it quantum valent. I am not an inspector, and my view is practically the view of the man in the street.

14411. Mr. HENRY.—The position that has been maintained here is that while a variation of standard might exist between Mayo and Belfast, still the same standard ought to be required from year to year in one district. There you should have uniformity, as you have the same schools, and the same teachers, for, of course, you know the changes in teachers in a district like that would be very small, and there ought to be a fair degree of uniformity there. I am not now comparing Clomalt, for instance, with Mayo or Galway?—But that there should be practical uniformity in the one place?

14412. Yes?—Well, one would expect to find an approximation certainly. Of course, you must compare the judgments of comparatively recent years; you must not compare schools of to-day with those of 10 or 15 years ago.

14413. Most decidedly not; I would compare the marking of this year with the marking of the year before or the preceding year at the utmost?—Yes.

14414. You told us that in the early days the office was hard on the inspectors?—I am not aware that I did; I think that referred to some of the duty performed by the chiefs of inspection. Of course, I have not seen my evidence; but speaking from recollection it was the chiefs of inspection I was speaking of. Inspectors, when they were appointed chiefs of inspection, devoted a considerable portion of their time, indeed one chief of inspection devoted all his time to checking the journals of his former colleagues, and checking the distances that they travelled, and the amount of their travelling expenses, trying to find a little flaw here and there. One of them had a little wheel machine, and he went over the routes on the Ordnance map, in order to discover whether an inspector had put down a charge for, say, 14 miles when he had only travelled 18½ miles; and he would put a long nothing calling for an explanation if he detected anything. I mention that merely to illustrate this fact that the chiefs of inspection, men as a rule advanced in years, had little knowledge of the work of the Education Office, with all its mass of precedents and changes of rules since 1831, and therefore occupied themselves with other matters of

which they had acquaintance. This knowledge of office work is not to be acquired in a day, or a month, or year. It takes years to master it. It is like a legal study, in fact. The printed rules, the office precedents, regulations, the files that are regarded as precedents, and all that kind of thing takes many years to study. I remember a man who was formerly in the office who became a barrister, and he said he would sooner go twice over the work of preparing for the Bar than the work of preparing to be a clerk in the Education Office, as there was such a variety of rules and precedents to be constantly kept in mind. The education system in Ireland is a system that has been built up, not from any definite plan in the beginning, but one that has been added to here and added to there, and it is largely owing to the method of its construction that it is able to exist in this country.

14415. You handed in an important memorandum in reference to the re-organisation of the system in 1899-1900. I understood you to say that the financial part of the scheme was based on a memorandum of yours?—Yes, and some other portions of it. I prepared the memorandum for Mr. Bodington. He asked me to prepare it as I suppose the Commissioners had difficulties of getting a scheme put before them. I was his private secretary at the time, and, of course, I knew a good deal about the manual instruction business. I had read all the proofs of the report, and I studied the evidence pretty carefully, especially the evidence given by teachers.

The CHAIRMAN.—Here is the passage in your evidence (reads passage).

14416. Now, you told us that Dr. Starke commenced to prepare this scheme\* in May, 1899, embodying the financial part of your scheme?—That was a working scheme, embracing both the educational and financial aspects. The Board asked to have a working scheme prepared.

14417. In May, 1899, Dr. Starke commenced to prepare his scheme, and then that memorandum was written by Dr. Starke, except inasmuch as it contained your financial scheme?—You are referring now to what was known as the confidential memorandum.

14418. Yes, that one (document handed to witness)?—Well, I have already told you fully about this. This scheme was drafted by me and it was submitted to Dr. Starke. It was known as the Resident Commissioner's memorandum. This scheme was submitted to Dr. Starke. I do not think it was prepared by me in its entirety, but a very considerable portion of it was prepared by me, and, as I say, submitted to Dr. Starke. Dr. Starke went over it very carefully, he submitted it to the other members of the Board, it was considered by nearly every member of the Board, certainly by a majority of them, and they made such amendments as they thought proper on it. The draft was then revised under Dr. Starke's supervision, and it was a second time gone over, and ultimately it assumed this shape, and was presented to the Board in this shape. With respect to the re-organisation of the inspection staff, that was a matter for which I could not exactly say who was immediately responsible; I think it was the Treasury who were responsible for it to a certain extent. There was a good deal of semi-official negotiation with the Treasury about the scheme at that time, and about the increase of salaries. They had to be consulted, and they had to be satisfied, of course, that the new scheme would not cost very much more than the old scheme.

14419. That is the salaries of inspectors?—The salaries of inspectors; and the other portions of the scheme from the financial point of view.

14420. Mr. HENRY.—I understood you to say quite distinctly in your direct evidence that you prepared a portion of it, and Dr. Starke prepared the rest?—I rough-drafted the whole thing and it was filled in. I prepared the skeleton, so to speak, and some of the flesh, but the flesh was mainly put on by Dr. Starke and other Commissioners, and it was rounded and made a perfect whole, as you see it.

14421. The CHAIRMAN.—That anonymous memorandum was the work of many hands?—It was the work of many hands, there was a good deal of the Manual Instruction Commission's report in it, and there was a

good deal of what was in reports of previous Commissions or recommendations of inspectors. One portion of it, I understand, was objected to, and that was the grouping of children, that the children should be taken in groups of classes.

14422. Dr. Starke told us distinctly that he was not the author of that?—I don't think he was, so far as grouping was concerned. I prepared a memorandum on the organization of the schools, based largely on reports of English and Irish school inspectors, and I think it was from that memorandum that the idea of grouping was taken.

14423. Mr. HENRY.—Very good. In this memorandum we find that principle of grouping introduced for the first time. Is that yours?—Yes, but the grouping of classes was not a novel thing.

14424. And we find the restriction of the standard numbers introduced for the first time?—No, that standard number business was insisted on by the Treasury; the Treasury insisted on that.

14425. It is to be found here for the first time?—Yes, in connection with a new scheme.

14426. And the 36 years for a teacher to get from the bottom to the top is to be found here?—Yes, in ordinary cases.

14427. And this saving of £50,000 on the estimate?—No, there is no saving; there was no saving contemplated. That £50,000 was to be got.

14428. That is not stated?—It may not have been stated so specifically, but the £50,000 surplus of one year was to go for increments in the next. There was to be no diminution of the vote whatsoever.

14429. That is not stated?—I may tell you that that was the plan, whether it is stated or not. Further, there has been no saving. We had to bargain for every penny from the Treasury, and the result was that the bargain was altogether on the side of the Commissioners.

14430. In what way did you fix, or was it fixed, that the number of teachers in the first grade should be only 290 men?—I think it was in this way. We got a return prepared in the office of the incomes of all the teachers, and we found that a certain number of them had incomes equal to what we give for this grade, and we took that as the number, and we added, say, 30 or 35 or 40 more places, so as to allow a margin for promotion. We left a very large number of vacancies in the second grade for this reason, that the Commissioners should be able to do a very generous thing, which I think they are doing now, and that in promoting a considerable number of the old third grade teachers into the second grade at once. We left a very large number of vacancies there for them, and the reason that the removals were not made in a wholesale fashion was really that we could not find eligible teachers, we could not get a sufficient number.

14431. In the third grade?—In the third grade, to comply with the conditions.

14432. And you have a great many vacancies in the second grade. I was speaking to Dr. Starke about it some time ago. He is so anxious to promote the teachers as anyone in the country, but he finds a difficulty. He cannot get the teachers with qualifications. The number of teachers that have only "fair" reports is alarming. We are advancing, there is no doubt about it, and I foresee in another decade or so we will have a very fine system of education, and a very fine staff of teachers. But a considerable remainder of indifferent teachers were allowed to continue in the schools on the introduction of the new system. Of course, when a teacher was paid by results the inspectors could not inspect the schools closely. They have had an opportunity of inspecting them closely since the new system, and the services of a considerable number of teachers who have not been doing very much useful work have been dispensed with, and the Commissioners have got along for it.

14433. The CHAIRMAN.—You mentioned the number of 200 as being fixed for the first division of first grade originally, and I understand that there are 340 there now, though I thought that the first number was fixed finally?—I do not like to commit myself to this, but I

think about five or six years ago there was a congestion in the upper places, and we went to the Treasury and they allowed us to add a few more.

14434. Mr. HENRY.—You only proposed 200 women in the first of first grade originally, and now we have 270?—Yes; well, there was a little expansion.

14435. So that your scheme was more limited than what the Treasury have actually sanctioned?—I do not follow your question.

14436. 200 was the number of men proposed for first division of first grade, and the number that the Treasury sanctioned, I think, was 350, and, of course, they finally asked the number to 340?—Our first proposal was that in the first of first grade for males we should have 300, and for females 270.

14437. But I have 200 here?—That is the first document; that is not the final document. That was the draft scheme as submitted, but all the details of that had to be gone over, and rules drawn up for the expenditure of the grant in 1901. I have here a confidential document that I would not be at liberty to hand in, there are suggested rules in it that were very carefully considered by the Commissioners, and most of the rules that exist at present were based on those suggestions. So far as the number in the grade is concerned, this is a memorandum of mine—

14438. I think if you quote them, you will be expected to hand them in?—Then I won't quote them.

14439. I am only speaking for myself?—But if you want your question answered I can answer it from this document. I take it that you want to get the facts; it is not a question of putting me in the wrong.

14440. No, not a bit of it?—If you want to get the facts, I will give you the facts; I have them here.

14441. The CHAIRMAN.—I rule that you can give extracts from that on your authority as an official.

14442. Mr. HIRSH WILKINSON.—Have we got the date of the paper that you have before you?—This is a memorandum submitted to the Commissioners, drawn up by me, on the 3rd of January, 1901, and it is countersigned by the Financial Assistant Secretary.

14443. The CHAIRMAN.—That is the final memorandum?—This is a memorandum submitted to the Board by me as Secretary, and on this memorandum the rules and the final arrangements as to salaries were based.

14444. Would you give us such extracts as you think proper from that?—In this memorandum we say: "The number in the grade above the third might, therefore, be provisionally fixed under the new rule 2 as under: Second grade, 2,800 males; 2,000 females; second of first grade, 500 males, 400 females; first of first grade, 300 males, 270 females."

14445. Mr. HENRY.—And that 300 has been raised to 340?—Yes.

14446. Mr. HARRISON.—Are those the figures that were proposed to the Treasury and finally accepted?—These are the figures that were submitted to the Treasury, and that were accepted, and they subsequently increased them. There was a clear understanding (Mr. Spring Rice carried on the negotiations for the Treasury at the time) that those figures were not fixed for all time, and that the Commissioners and the Treasury, as the exigencies of the service should require, should modify the numbers in the higher grades. We have had a very long correspondence with the Treasury, and with the Chief Secretary, and Parliamentary questions on the subject, the Commissioners are holding to that position still, and will be sending forward another letter to the Treasury immediately. The Commissioners have never surrendered their right to have a very large voice in fixing the number of places to be provided in the higher grades for the teachers. The Commissioners have been acting in the teachers' interests all along in this matter, and have been trying to get the Treasury to do what really the Treasury consented to do in the person of Mr. Spring Rice. Mr. Spring Rice is now dead, unfortunately; he was a great friend of the country at the time in the matter of this scheme, and it was largely owing to his personal influence that the scheme got through; the Treasury hesitated very much about it. They did not like to embark on a financial

25th June, 1913.]

Mr. P. E. LEWIS, L.B.O., L.R.C.S.I., examined.

[Continued.]

enterprise of this sort which they did not thoroughly understand, and they find that this scheme, which they understood would cost no more than the old scheme, has cost them half a million more.

14446. Mr. HENRY.—Was there a difficulty under the old system, owing to an increase in the classification of the teachers?—Yes; I went into that question the other day. The Treasury were already at that time beginning to put restrictions on the freedom of classification of the teachers. I made a rough estimate, that instead of having £500,000 of an increase in our estimates in the past 13 years we would have had only £200,000 of an increase had the old system continued.

14447. £114,000 of that has come from the Burrell grant?—That £114,000 was a direct consequence of the new system, and would never have come had the old classification remained in existence.

14448. Were you responsible for the portion of this document dealing with the re-organisation of schools?—No, I am not responsible for any of that, except in the way I have told you, that I outlined a scheme for the Commissioners, and that it was fully considered, and that scheme was approved by the Board.

14449. Is it not a fact that the two chiefs of inspection were suspended for criticising that document?—They were suspended not for criticising the document so much as for the way in which they criticised it. It was for their language in reference to the person whom they assumed to be the author of the document, that is, the Resident Commissioner (and I think you have the letters on the minutes). Mr. Downing was suspended by order of the Resident Commissioner for a most offensive letter, that I think I read out for you here, and you have it on the minutes, and Mr. Parnes was suspended by the Board for his very offensive letter, and his want of subordination to the Resident Commissioner. He took a few indirect shots at me also, but I have been shot at by lots of people indirectly.

14450. We will come to a few of these shots in the memorandum; but what strikes me as peculiar is that though the document appears to have been thought as sacred as the Ark of the Covenant, nobody will acknowledge the authorship of it at the present day?—Well, I think that is a very sweeping assertion. I have acknowledged very freely my share of it, and I think Dr. Sturges has acknowledged as freely his share of it, and I think some of the other people who had a hand in it would acknowledge it. Some of them have gone to their reward. Professor Fitzgerald was largely in it, the Right Reverend Dr. Bernard, the present Bishop of Ossory, was largely in it too, and I think other Commissioners, and I am sure I have the names of a considerable number of them.

14451. I understood that this is such a patch-work that you could not tell who put in any particular piece?—It might be possible to tell who put in a particular piece, but I do not think it would be very desirable, and I do not think it is a fair way to criticise a document. Let it be criticised as a whole, but not on the assumption that particular parts are to be attributed to particular men.

14452. Mr. HANCOCK.—I presume that in any case you consulted together?—Yes.

14453. And therefore it can only be considered as a joint production?—Yes.

14454. The CHAIRMAN.—Everyone who has been at the drawing up of a document of this kind knows how difficult it is to attribute any part of it to any particular man?—The greatest difficulty that we had in the reform of the administration then was to get anybody to consider anything. We asked the teachers when the new programme was severely criticised to take it in hand and to spend as much time as they pleased in amending it, but with little result. The revised programme was criticised on many grounds, but it still holds the field for this reason, that up to the present we have not got anybody to suggest anything better.

14455. Did I understand you to say anything about the teachers being consulted?—Yes, the teachers were consulted.

14456. Because that question was asked the other day, were the teachers ever consulted about the revised

programme?—Before the revised programme was adopted the evidence of the teachers given before the Manual and Practical Instruction Commission was considered. A number of them gave evidence before the Manual Instruction Commission, and everything that was ever in the National system had the draft revised programme submitted to them, and they went over it and made some suggestions that were embodied in it. Sir Joshua Fiske got a copy; it was submitted to him, and he told me it was the best programme he ever saw on paper; but he also predicted that it would meet with a storm of opposition, because it was in advance of the times, and would not be understood, and that is what we found did occur. Now, after 13 years, it is beginning to be understood, and it has been taken up in the schools. Managers, teachers, and others connected with education, and even inspectors, did not understand it in the beginning, or at least a considerable number of them, did not see the advantages of it.

14457. Mr. HENRY.—We have not the revised programme in operation now?—We have, indeed; there is very little fundamental change in the present programme. We have elaborated and we have changed the details in some things, but still the main principles of the revised programme are in full working order at the present day. It holds the field, as I say.

14458. At the same time you prepared a confidential report to be sent by the managers with regard to the teachers?—Yes.

14459. I understood you to say that was in the teachers' interest?—Largely in the teachers' interest, mainly in the teachers' interest.

14460. You said the object of it was to correct harsh or lenient reports of the inspectors?—That was one of the objects. We gave the manager an opportunity, if he thought the inspector was too severe or too lenient to the teacher—we gave him an opportunity or an excuse for coming to the Commissioners and saying, "Mr. So-and-so has been visiting the school here and he has been rather severe. He has given the school 'bad,' and I think it deserves 'good.'" From our experience of managers, we expected that in 999 cases out of 1000 the manager's report would be in favour of the teacher, because we find the manager very rarely makes a complaint against the teacher. I have had very large experience of the managers of all parts of Ireland, and I could count on the fingers of one hand the managers that have ever come to the office to complain about teachers, but I could not count on the fingers of 40 hands the managers who have come to plead for teachers, and to say a good word for them; and we expected, when we gave the managers this opportunity of expressing their views, that it would be a great corrective. I do not say that the inspectors were harsh, but it would be a great corrective of unevenness of judgment, and it would be consequently also in the interest of that thing you are so full of at the present time, uniformity of standard. If one inspector should be lenient, and another that came into the district severe, the manager would write to the Commissioners and say, "The new inspector is ruining my schools by severity."

14461. Were not the teachers from the beginning opposed to these confidential reports?—I do not think they were. There was a certain writer in a certain paper who was opposed to them.

14462. Was it not claimed that one of the good things that Mr. Ward did since he got on the Board was that he got these reports withdrawn?—Oh, I don't know; I can't answer that. I am not aware that any such credit was given to Mr. Ward.

14463. It has been given to him?—I think the reason the Board decided to drop these confidential reports was that they found only a section of the managers would send in reports, and that they failed of the object mainly intended, and that was to get the views of the men who were the real governors of the schools, and who were constantly on the spot, of the condition of the work done there, and the way the teachers did their work.

14464. And then you were looking forward at that time to unreasonable judgments occasionally on the part of inspectors?—Not more, I should say than at present; but we knew every man is fallible. We did not credit the inspectors or teachers with any double dose of original sin, but all men may occasionally make mistakes, men have prejudices, and I do not say that you might not find an inspector that would have a prejudice against a teacher. It seems to be assumed in connection with this inquiry that the teachers are all immaculate, and that they are all good tempered.

14465. I do not think it is assumed by anybody?—But it seems to be assumed that the inspector is always in the wrong. An inspector going into a school may, no doubt, have a bilious attack, and he may therefore give the school an inequitable mark; but, on the other hand, a teacher may have a bilious attack and he may be rude to the inspector, and, of course, the inspector is a human being and he would be something of a saint if he did not display occasionally a little acerbity. I am not excusing the inspector for that, and if it came before me, I would send him an admonition.

14466. You contemplated from the beginning that where the managers could not put the programme as a whole into operation they might modify the programme?—Yes; we wished to make the managers really what they are styled in the rules; we wished to make them real governors of the schools, not paper governors.

14467. Did not Father Loughrey submit a modified programme?—I do not want to go into Father Loughrey's case; it is a very long story.

14468. I would like to hear a little about Father Loughrey's case?—I do not know whether the Chairman would consider that Father Loughrey's special case comes within the terms of the reference.

14469. The manager was invited to submit a programme, and he submitted a programme. That programme, after undergoing some changes, I am given to understand, was recommended by the inspector for adoption, and notwithstanding that there was some difficulty in having it approved?—Well, I will tell you the facts.

14470. The CHAIRMAN.—I think it seems to be relevant, as it affects the work of inspectors?—I cannot see how it affects the relations between the inspectors and the teachers. This is purely a managerial thing between Father Loughrey and the Commissioners.

14471. Mr. HEWLEY.—It does not affect the teacher?—I think not.

14472. How is that?—Because the teacher was in no way affected by what programme was in the school, so far as the inspectors were concerned. The inspector did not come down on the teacher in any way or recommend any serious action in connection with the programme.

14473. But surely the programme would affect the inspection, would it not?—The managers were at liberty to adopt programmes of their own; but they were to draw up those programmes after consultation with the inspector. Father Loughrey submitted a programme to the Commissioners. That programme was not a new programme. It was not drawn up in accordance with the suggestions made in the notes for teachers and managers.

14474. But he had liberty to submit it?—Yes, and he did submit this programme. It was pointed out to Father Loughrey that that programme was merely a rebuke of the old results programme, and Father Loughrey in very unparliamentary language told us he would have nothing to do with our new programme. We were anxious to conciliate Father Loughrey. We did not want to fight with anybody, and we were particularly anxious not to fight with him, because he is a gentleman that rushes into the Press, and he is a very voluminous correspondent when he takes to writing. He sent the programme again to us after we told him that it was not in accordance with the ideas of the Board; he made some slight changes in it. Mr. Purser was sent down to see him, and he and Mr. Purser apparently became friends, though Father Loughrey had

been on good terms with few inspectors. He is a gentleman of very peculiar temperament. He had a particular objection to manual instruction, and he wanted the old work-mistress in the school. The Commissioners said they wanted a person capable of doing a little more than a mere work-mistress, and the work-mistress only got £12 a year, while the manual instructress got £24; but Father Loughrey appeared to be wedded to the old system and he did not go far to meet us; however, for peace sake the Commissioners adopted this programme. Now, those are the main facts, the story is, however, a very long one.

14475. When Mr. Purser got him to modify his programme and recommended the modified programme to the Board did you write a memorandum asking the Board not to adopt it?—No, if you wish to go into the case of Mr. Purser and my relations with him, which I referred to in a very slight manner the other day, I will go fully into it, and I will go into all the circumstances connected with that report. I do not think you will be perfectly satisfied with what I will say about Mr. Purser in connection with it, and I do not want to say anything that might be hurtful.

14476. The point that I want to get at is this, that though it was stated by the Board that managers might submit programmes, still there was a difficulty when a programme was submitted in getting it sanctioned?—I will answer that question in a general way without going into Father Loughrey's case. I say there was no difficulty whatsoever. I say that officially, that there was no difficulty in getting a programme sanctioned if the person who drew up the programme only contemplated to a moderate extent with the suggestions of the Commissioners, and it is absolutely untrue if anyone suggested that there was any difficulty in getting a programme sanctioned.

14477. The CHAIRMAN.—Any programme submitted by individuals must conform to a certain extent to the principles of your new programme?—Yes.

14478. Though it might vary in detail?—Yes, the object was to have the programme suited to the locality. The manager had for the first time in the history of the Board a voice in the preparation of the programme. That was following the recommendation of the Manual Instruction Commission, that the programme should be suited to the locality.

14479. In answer to Mr. Hewley you stated that Father Loughrey's was a return to the principles of the old system, in fact that the programme was not suitable, and he then modified it?—I think Mr. Purser induced him to make some slight changes, and the Board finally accepted it, and if any other programme was submitted to the Board when there was an honest effort made by the manager to comply with the wishes of the Commissioners, even to a small extent, the programme would have been accepted.

14480. And do you accept no programmes that vary in a considerable degree from your own programme?—No, for this reason, that we do not get them. The managers did not rise to the occasion and did not submit programmes. Mr. Hewley reminded me on the last day that there was a programme from Castleknock. Well, that was approved.

14481. Mr. HEWLEY.—The point I wanted to get at is this, that programmes were not submitted because as a matter of fact it was not found easy to get them adopted?—No.

14482. The CHAIRMAN.—It had got abroad that the Board would not accept it?—That was one of the slanders. I pronounce it one of the many slanders made against the Commissioners of National Education.

14483. Mr. HEWLEY.—You told us that the scrutiny of reports by the chiefs of inspection was illusory?—The scrutiny of the reports?

14484. Yes?—I told you the reports were acted by the office staff, and they were noted by the clerk in attendance on the chiefs of inspection, and that occasionally the chiefs of inspection themselves noted them; but I do not recall telling you that the scrutiny was illusory. I think now I would be rather inclined to say that there was no real scrutiny of all.

25th June, 1918.]

Mr. P. E. LEMASS, I.S.O., L.R.C.S.I., examined.

[Continued.]

14485. I suppose that you have heard that a report\* of Mr. Weply's on the Clonsilla circuit has been found recently in the office?—Yes, I am aware of that. (Document produced).

14486. I will ask to look at that. It is the only document of the kind that has come before us, and I would like to see whether the noting on that is careful or not. This is marked: "Refer to chief inspector for personal observations"?—Yes.

14487. Look at the noting all along?—What is the particular noting?

14488. It is not any particular noting, but what strikes me is that the document is very carefully noted, and that it must have been studied with some care?—Yes, it bears evidence of that.

14489. Are we to take that as typical of the documents that came before the chiefs of inspection, that they dealt with all of them with the same care as is shown in dealing with this?—No, this is not a report; I am speaking of reports.

14490. The CHAIRMAN.—How would you describe that technically?—This is an inspector's letter; of course, we might call it a report.

14491. It is a report of a conference?—The reports I was referring to were the ordinary reports on schools, furnished on printed forms by the inspectors; this is a special letter.

14492. Of a conference?—Yes, and I say that special letters of this kind were scrutinised carefully; that to the best of my belief they were carefully scrutinised.

14493. Mr. HENLY.—And so far as he was concerned the work was carefully done?—I have no reason to think it was not.

14494. The CHAIRMAN.—May I ask whether reports of conferences were sent up to the Board?—The procedure on conferences has changed of recent years. In former years prior to 1900, in Sir Patrick Keenan's time, a conference was a very formal thing. The Resident Commissioner, the two secretaries, the chiefs of inspection and some other inspectors, met at a round table in the Board room and there was a regular conference, and a regular report of the proceedings taken; but I do not think reports of those conferences were ever submitted to the Board.

14495. So I understand?—But they were considered by the Resident Commissioner, and any points that struck him as of importance or that it would be desirable to embody in the rules and regulations he adopted, and they were submitted in that way to the Commissioners, but the report as a whole was not considered. Then Mr. Redington I think had a couple of conferences of that kind, not quite so formal; but from the appointment of Dr. Stankle there were only about three conferences held, only three since his appointment, and the secretaries were not present with the Resident Commissioner. The reports were printed, the printed report of the conference in 1903 and the printed report of the conference of 1904, as well as I recollect, were sent round to the Commissioners with the agenda; they were circulated amongst the Commissioners. I am speaking now entirely from memory and I cannot recall that they were ever considered at the Board, but some of the recommendations, especially in the 1900 report (not by any means all) were embodied in the new regulations, and some changes in the details of the programme and other matters made in consequence.

14496. Mr. HENLY.—I have two or three more questions to ask. We have a punishment book in operation at present?—Yes, a corporal punishment book.

14497. Now, tell us the circumstances, if you please, under which the corporal punishment book comes into operation, and the cases in which notings are made in it?—Well, I have not looked at the punishment book for some time. The regulations are printed in the book. I think one regulation is that the teacher when he is going to punish must not punish immediately, but must pause until he is calm. I think that is one of the regulations, and that when he inflicts corporal punishment he must enter it in the book, and state the nature of the punishment and the cause of the punishment.

14498. And I suppose he has also to show the book to the manager the first time the manager comes to the

school after the punishment?—I do not know what the relations between the manager and the teacher with regard to that book are, and I would not like to commit myself to that.

14499. I have here a letter signed by yourself:—"Referring to previous correspondence in connection with charges preferred against Mr. ———, principal teacher of the above-named school, I am directed by the Commissioners of National Education to state that all the circumstances of the case and the report of the inquiry held by the Board's inspector have been considered, and I am to request that you will inform Mr. ——— that before punishing Mrs. ———'s son he should have consulted you, as manager of the school, and taken instruction from you in the matter"?—Yes.

14500. What rule or regulation of the Board requires that?—There were very peculiar circumstances in the case; this is not an ordinary case. You will have to consider the history of that case if you wish to understand the matter.

14501. We have not the history of the case?—Well, I do not know that it is desirable that the history of the case should appear on the minutes. I think it is necessary that some of it should if you want an answer to that; this was a question of immorality.

14502. What regulation of the Board requires the teacher to consult the manager before he punishes a boy for an offence?—Well, I think that the whole tenor of the Board's regulations and practical rules for teachers and the fact that the manager is the governor of the school makes it quite reasonable in particular cases. If the case is gone into I think every member of this Committee will admit that it is one essentially for consultation with the manager. It was a case of gross immorality on the part of this boy. The manager of the school is supposed to be the guardian of the pupils attending the school, and before that teacher, if he were a prudent man or a tactful man, punished that boy he ought to have consulted the manager on this very question as he knew more about it very likely than anybody else in the district, but he did not do that. He took the law into his own hands and punished him for an offence not committed in the school, but outside the school.

14503. But is not the teacher responsible for the pupils from the time they leave school to the door of their own house and from the door of their own house till they reach the school again?—We try to make the teachers tactful, and if he were a tactful man, and had gone and consulted the manager about this, that would not injure him in any way.

14504. The teachers are living under certain definite rules, and there is no rule or regulation of the Commissioners which compels the teacher before punishing a pupil to go and consult his manager?—Well, I suppose there is no specific rule to compel him, as there is no specific rule to prevent him, beating a boy without cause; but the law would step in and interfere in the latter case. What right had this man to go and pass judgment in regard to a thing that he was not personally acquainted with without consulting the manager, who knew the facts.

14505. The CHAIRMAN.—Was the manager a witness?—He was cognisant of it.

14506. He had special information?—He had special information.

14507. Mr. HARRISON.—Was there any question as to whether the fault had been committed?—Yes, it was denied. I am speaking now from recollection, the boy's mother alleged that the boy was perfectly innocent. In connection with that question of the teacher being responsible for the conduct of pupils outside the school I may mention that our rules having regard to control by teachers outside school hours are not precise, and I am perfectly certain that if the Commissioners put in their code a regulation that teachers were to be responsible for the conduct of the children after they leave the schools, or before they come to them in the morning, it would be repudiated by the large majority of National teachers. I may give as an illustration an incident that took



place in connection with Lurgan Model School some time ago. There were some boys who, on leaving the school, used to annoy the local parish priest, and he came to the Education Office and said that this thing had been going on for a considerable time, that he was very friendly with all the people in Lurgan, though they were (the majority of them) of a different way of thinking from him, but he said the boys coming from the Model School meeting him in the street would dance round him and call him names, and this was becoming very unpleasant for him. He came to the office to make a complaint, and to say that the Commissioners ought to take some steps to put a stop to this kind of thing. We sent a letter to the Inspector telling him to see the head master of the Model School, and to say that he must put a stop to this annoyance to the priest. The Inspector did so, but the master told the Inspector that he was not responsible for the conduct of the boys once they left the school; and that he would not interfere with them. The Inspector sent up this letter to the office and we looked up our rules, but we had no precise rule to meet the case, so we adopted this plan. A letter was sent to the Inspector with the approval of the Resident Commissioner somewhat to this effect:—"Call on the head master and tell him that this serious state of things, this discreditable conduct on the part of boys of the Model School, has been brought under notice, and that the Commissioners are determined that it must cease, and that if it does not cease forthwith the Commissioners must regard the discipline of the Model School as very lax, and they will have to consider the propriety of making an entire change in the teaching staff."

14506. Mr. HENLY.—Now, in clause 4 of rule 90 we have this:—"In no case is a teacher dismissed for inefficiency on the report of a single inspector. Before recognition is finally withdrawn his work is tested by means of a thorough inspection of the school as a whole, and an examination of all the standards for whose instruction the teacher is responsible. This inspection is conducted by one of the senior or chief inspectors in presence of one of the Commissioners if they think it is desirable." Now, I asked that point when Dr. Starke was here, and he promised to bring us additional information, but that additional information has escaped his attention in the mass of other matter. Here is the report on the principal teacher, the last report, made by the senior inspector who visited the school on the 16th of June, 1912. He furnished the following statement concerning the principal teacher's work:—(reads report). There is the official document, and that was a teacher of 34 years' standing, and I have to ask you a question with regard to that case?—I am prepared to answer it.

14509. That teacher unfortunately did not join the pension scheme in 1895, and she has been out of pocket on the road without one penny of compensation of any kind?—It is a very sad case.

14510. The CHAIRMAN.—Is that case a solitary one?

Mr. HENLY.—That is one case in Dolphin's Barn?—It is a very sad case, and it is rendered particularly and because these poor women who have not joined the pension scheme if they retired in the ordinary course, would get a very considerable gratuity from the Treasury.

14511. And by that dismissal they were deprived of the gratuity?—That is another question altogether.

14512. Surely they would be entitled to one year's salary for every ten years' service, and therefore they would be entitled to a little over three years' salary if they had retired voluntarily?—They could not retire until they were 60. The Treasury would not give it to them, unless they were 60, or broken down in health.

14513. The CHAIRMAN.—What age were they?—I think they were under 60.

14514. Mr. HENLY.—This lady was 57 years of age and of 34 years' service. The point is this. That lady was entitled to two things according to that rule; a thorough inspection of her school and an examination of all the standards. There is no evidence there that there was an examination?—Well, that point I object, and I think Dr. Starke brought it before the

Committee when he was under examination. I sent for Dr. Alexander, the senior inspector, and had him in the Education Office. He showed me his notes, and he stated that he had complied fully with the requirements of the rule.

14515. But it is not on the face of that document on which the teacher was dismissed. The teachers were dismissed on that and on Dr. Alexander's notes?—But then I say that Dr. Alexander stated that he complied fully with the rule.

Mr. HENLY.—I am not disputing that, but the Commissioners had not that in Dr. Alexander's report on which they acted.

The CHAIRMAN.—The statement is that Dr. Alexander did not give that information in his report.

Mr. HENLY.—It is not in it.

14516. The CHAIRMAN.—The point is this, that apparently Dr. Alexander, though he did make a full examination, did not do himself justice in the report?—That is so, perhaps.

14517. Mr. HENLY.—The Commissioners acted when they had not before them the information they were bound to have?—Surely the omission of Dr. Alexander to state in his report that he kept rule 90 in mind does not affect the issue. Dr. Alexander states over his head in writing that he gave the full benefit of the rule to these teachers; that he wrote the report with that rule before his mind. He told me that and he wrote it down.

14518. It is not in the report?—An Inspector does not say in every report "I am acting under rule 90-and-so." He assumes that we know it in the office.

14519. Sir HIRSH WILKINSON.—Is not the issue this, that the Board are entrusted with the decision as to the dismissal or non-dismissal of a teacher?—Yes.

14520. And they have laid down the evidence on which they should act, and in this case they acted without the evidence that they themselves say is required for that purpose, and it does not matter in the least what private conversation you have with Dr. Alexander if the Commissioners when they received a report which was utterly insufficient on the face of it proceeded to dismiss the teacher?—You are running away with the whole question, with great respect. That report was quite sufficient for the Commissioners, and quite satisfied the Commissioners, there was no reason to think that Dr. Alexander had not complied with the rule, and there was no such thing as you insinuate in connection with the matter.

14521. I did not insinuate, and do not say that I insinuated?—But what is your point?

14522. You are quite competent, Mr. Lemars, to state your point without using the word "insinuation," and I have not insinuated anything?—Well, I will use the word "suggest." You suggested that the Commissioners came to a decision without having the information that under their own rule they should have. I say they had that information. I say that Dr. Alexander was sent there to make a special report, and it is not to be supposed that our inspectors do not know when they are sent to make a special report that they must keep the Commissioners' rule in view, and Dr. Alexander states that he did that.

14523. Mr. HENLY.—Where is that written statement?—That written statement was furnished to Dr. Starke, and I understood that he had it before this Committee.

14524. Was the written statement of Dr. Alexander before the Commissioners?—His special report was.

14525. Well, if that is his special report, then I say that the Commissioners dismissed the teachers without having before them the evidence that they were bound to have before they dismissed them?—Well, all I can say is that you are entitled to your opinion, but your opinion is not my opinion.

14526. If you thought that report satisfactory, why should you have sent for Dr. Alexander and ask him did he or did he not hold the examination?—Because I was told that that point was raised here at this Committee.

14527. Sir HIRSH WILKINSON.—So that Dr. Alexander's having complied with the rule was never in question until the point was raised here?—Certainly

not. We do not ask our trained inspectors of 30 years' service such questions. Do you think we should go and ask when he sent his special report whether he had complied with the rule? No Board in the world could get on in that way. We must assume that men trained for years know their business.

14528. I think the teachers are entitled to see that they are not dismissed without the secretaries and other people having received evidence that they deserved to be dismissed?—Quite so; but I had nothing to do with this dismissal. I did not investigate the case. I had nothing whatever to say to the point; and perhaps I should not be defending those who dealt with it; but I say that the case has been dealt with as fully and carefully as any case that ever came before the Commissioners as far as I can see, and the Commissioners had a full statement of it in print.

14529. The CHAIRMAN.—I think we had better drop the question now; everything has been said on both sides?—I may say one word. There is a point that arises in connection with it and I am sure if the matter were brought under Dr. Starke's notice he would consider it, and perhaps he is thinking of it, and that is that by the dismissal the teachers of these schools have suffered an additional penalty beyond what a teacher who had been joined in the pension scheme would have suffered. If we dismissed teachers who had joined the pension scheme, who were over 60 years of age, they would get their pensions unless we said they were dismissed for some crime. I think that makes it an exceptional case, and I have sympathy with these people in that respect.

14530. Mr. HAMILTON.—I believe that these cases involving dismissal are put on the agenda paper at the Board, are they not?—Yes.

14531. Was there any evidence besides Dr. Alexander's report in this case?—Oh, yes, there were other reports; and there were the official records of these teachers for a number of years.

14532. Was there any serious evidence that he had gone thoroughly into this case put before the Board?—The Board assumed that he had thoroughly gone into the case.

14533. Now, looking over your précis, I see with regard to the new programme that after telling us how elaborately it was prepared, and how numerous criticisms were invited and carefully considered you say it was received by the teachers with acclamation?—Yes.

14534. Can you give us any evidence of that?—I do not know whether I have it with me or not, but I had it the last day, the "Teachers' Journal." The teachers passed a resolution about it and were delighted with the new programme and the new scheme.

14535. Have you got any extracts in regard to it?—The "National Teacher" of the 14th September, 1903, has this article:—(Reads article commencing "The long promised and anxiously looked for school programme has at length appeared.")

14536. I think that would be sufficient?—That is only one.

14537. Now, about the position of the chiefs of inspection, is it the fact that the new arrangement was outlined before 1899, the new arrangement that involved changes with regard to the chiefs of inspection?—No, it was not.

14538. At the same time, I think you say that it was both recommended and approved by Archbishop Walsh?—As far as I know the Commissioners after an inquiry held in 1895 were of opinion that the chiefs of inspection were not doing work of the character that they ought to do.

14539. I think you told us that the Board themselves examined the report and concluded that the work could easily be done by clerks?—They got the reports, hundreds of reports were brought in and placed on the Boardroom table, and they turned them over and saw the notings made by the clerks, but with the initials of the chiefs of inspection.

14540. The point I want to know is this, that the initiative for the change came from the Commissioners themselves?—Came from the Commissioners themselves.

14541. And they actually satisfied themselves by examining into the system that this work could be done by other people than by the chiefs of inspection?—Yes, and they had before them the example of the Education Department in England, where similar work was done by examiners who were not inspectors.

14542. We should think it a most wicked waste if our most experienced inspectors were occupied with noting reports?—Yes.

14543. The CHAIRMAN.—What Dr. Starke said was that at that time the object of Archbishop Walsh and others was to cut the connection as far as possible between the office and the inspectors?—I do not know what was passing in the minds of the Commissioners, but there was a little friction between Mr. Purser and Professor FitzGerald on one occasion, and there was a claim put forward by the inspectors to all the higher positions in the office; of course, also there was a feeling on the part of the inferior staff that they were cut off from the highest appointments, that they might climb a certain distance, but when they got a certain distance they could not get any higher, and that men from outside were taken in and put over them, and they had to do the work.

14544. Now, what was the incident to which you referred between Mr. Purser and Professor FitzGerald?—That was when the Committee to prepare a working scheme was appointed. Mr. FitzGerald and Dr. Starke were members of the Committee. I cannot recollect whether there was any third Commissioner present; but I was present when Mr. Purser was sent for to be consulted about this working scheme as he was the chief of inspection. Mr. FitzGerald explained something about the new scheme to Mr. Purser, he outlined it I think in a general way to him, and Mr. Purser immediately, as far as I could see, put himself in a position of antagonism to it; he did not agree with it, and did not agree that it would work. I remember Professor FitzGerald saying: "But, Mr. Purser, you are not a Commissioner; we are the Commissioners, and we, the Commissioners, have made up our minds that the thing is to be done, and we want you as an officer to help us in carrying it out." I forget what Mr. Purser said in reply, but the interview terminated almost immediately, and Dr. Starke told me that after that interview the Committee of the Board concluded that they could not count on getting much help from the chief inspectors.

14545. In fact, Mr. Purser made himself difficult to one of the Commissioners?—To the two of them.

14546. You say in your evidence that the Teachers' Association condemned Mr. Purser for his rebelliousness upon teachers. Can you produce that resolution?—I thought Dr. Starke handed copies of the resolution in to you.

14547. No, he did not?—I can send them, not one resolution, but ten resolutions, I think, from Teachers' Associations. I will give you an extract from the "National Teacher." This is the "National Teacher" of the 12th of October, 1899. (Reads article commencing: "We are sorry to observe that the most unfair and most inconsistent criticisms of the teachers in the recent report of the Commissioners is from the pen of Mr. A. Purser.")

14548. And that I understand is not the only evidence you can afford; that is a specimen?—That is a newspaper comment, but I can give you resolutions; I think I have ten, certainly eight or nine. I have them in print. I gave them to Dr. Starke and I thought he had submitted them. These were sent to the Commissioners and submitted to the Board.

14549. Now, you mention among the ideas of the new system free books for the use of poor children. Who provided free books?—I do not think I said "free books." Perhaps I referred to the intention to provide them.

14550. Mr. HENRY.—There are no free books?—We went to the Treasury to get money but they would not give it.

14551. Mr. HAMILTON.—You counted your chicks before they were hatched?—I do not think I said anything in my evidence about free books.

14552. Mr. HENRY.—In that memorandum that we had before us there was a suggestion that in poorer

25th June, 1918.]

Mr. P. E. LEWIS, I.R.O., L.R.C.S.I., examined.

[Continued.]

localities managers would provide free books for the use of the children, but that was only a suggestion, it was never acted on?—I could not have that in my mind; we used to give free books under the old system years ago.

14553. Now, we have had it in evidence that the introduction of the new system of payment to teachers entailed upon individuals a certain amount of hardship. Can you give us any cases of that?—It is not known to me. I cannot recall any case where there was hardship (I am speaking of financial hardship).

14554. Financial hardship I mean. You know of no cases?—I know of no cases.

14555. No case has ever come under your own personal observation?—Well, of course, in the beginning a great many appeals were made and considered by us. I think we considered about 8,000 appeals, and in every case we did what I consider was ample and generous justice to the teachers, and we have been doing it from time to time since then, and in the case of Mr. Miller who was before you recently we found that there was a mistake in 1900. It was his own mistake largely; he gave a return of his income that was not correct; but we are about to pay him a considerable sum now in the shape of arrears.

14556. So far as your experience goes, you do not know of any case where a teacher suffered financial hardship by the change?—No, and we have been anxious to find out any such cases, and to remedy them if there are any in which wrong has been done.

14557. Can you give me an instance showing the gains to the teachers from the change?—I think the great gain was the abolition of the results system.

14558. A substantial pecuniary gain?—The pecuniary gains were the increments, the twelfth increments.

14559. But were they over and above what the teacher could earn under the results system?—Yes, as a rule they were. There may possibly be individual cases where teachers could make more under the results system, but I say that, taking the new system as a whole, it was very much more beneficial to the teachers as a whole, with very few exceptions.

14560. But could you put it in this way—what extra sum was distributed among the body of the teachers owing to the introduction of the new system?—During the past 18 years?

14561. No, at once?—At the present time we are giving the teachers—

14562. No, but at once?—In 1901, the first year, I think they got about £20,000 more than they would have got under the old system, and they were subsequently paid arrears or so-called arrears amounting to £114,000, which arrears would not have been paid up to this day under the old system.

14563. Now in making your arrangement or bargain with the Treasury, you did not stipulate that there should be an increase in the numbers in the grades to correspond with any increase that there might be in the number of teachers?—In our letter to the Irish Government we said that it should be made clear to the Treasury that the Commissioners in submitting this scheme of salaries, and so forth, did so on the understanding that they would be in a position to increase the grade salaries or continued good service salaries so long as the normal estimates were not exceeded or so long as the grants for primary education in Ireland were not in excess, as compared with the grants to England and Scotland.

14564. And what was the reply of the Treasury to that?—The Treasury passed that over in silence.

14565. I am afraid it was not the silence that gives content to that case?—No.

14566. You reserved your claim, but you were not sure that your claim would be admitted. Might I just look at that paper\* that Mr. Welby sent up?—(Paper handed by Mr. Henry.)

14567. That came in, was at once filed, and sent on by you to Mr. Purser?—That was submitted by me to the Resident Commissioner. That is the meaning of the word "submitted" on the back. I submitted that to the Resident Commissioner, and the Resident Commissioner then gave the direction there, "Refer to chief inspector for perusal and observations."

14568. The Resident Commissioner, in a case of that kind, instructs you, but does not send on the thing himself?—Sometimes he sends the thing himself, and now in nearly every case I ask him to put his initials to the notes.

14569. Now is there anything to show what happened to that document when Mr. Purser had initialed it?—No; he initialed it the day after apparently, but I never saw the document again till it was found in the Library recently.

14570. Is there anything on the face of that document to show what happened to it?—No, there is nothing on the face of the document.

14571. Sir HENRY WILKINSON.—What does the date of 27th January refer to?—That is the date when it was registered.

14572. And the date of Mr. Purser's minute?—Is the 28th.

14573. And Mr. Welby's is the 22nd?—Mr. Welby's is the 22nd.

14574. And it was registered on the 27th, and then Mr. Purser made his note on the 28th?—Yes.

14575. What is the date of the note, "Refer to"?—The 25th. That note was made before the document was registered.

14576. Mr. HOSKIN.—That is rather irregular, because the document ought to be registered first?—Well, I had given directions to the clerk in charge of the correspondence branch that all letters of a special character were to be immediately brought to me on receipt.

14577. So that, at any rate, he is in accordance with the practice?—In accordance with the practice. Then after the document had been submitted to the Resident Commissioner and when that note of mine was put there I handed it back to the correspondence clerk and said: "Register that document. Take action that is noted," and he marked it "Done."

14578. Now, what I want to know is, is there anything on the face of that document to show what happened to it when Mr. Purser had initialed it?—No, I know nothing more about it. I have no subsequent recollection of it.

14579. You have no recollection of the document yourself?—I have not subsequent recollection of the document.

14580. After having been registered would not the clerk who registered it see that it was returned?—Well, he should. You see papers go backward and forward there between the officers, and we cannot register every movement of a document, and it would be impossible to follow the documents. We try to follow them.

14581. It is possible for that to have got beyond Mr. Purser?—I think the presumption is that Mr. Purser had it over-since.

14582. That he initialed it and retained it?—And retained it.

14583. And if he did so it was an irregular proceeding?—In every way irregular, that document, strictly speaking, ought not to have come to the Secretary at all. It relates to a conference of the inspectors, a report from members of the conference. In the case of these local conferences of inspectors they do not send their correspondence to the Secretary. The chief inspectors have a good deal of correspondence with the inspectors regarding the details of their work, that does not come under the eye of the Secretary.

14584. Then why did Mr. Purser minute it so fully?—Because it was addressed to the Secretary.

14585. And then it having been referred by the Secretary to him he was bound to return it to the Secretary?—He should have done that.

14586. And there is nothing to show that he ever did so?—No.

14587. Now, would you kindly look at the last paragraph in the report. That is a distinct intimation to the officials at Tyrone House that he has found the standard in the district to which he has been lately appointed extremely low, and that he proposes to raise that standard?—Yes, and Mr. Purser, in his evidence before this Committee, said he was not aware of this, and here is a written proof that he was aware of it.

14588. It is perfectly clear that Mr. Purser must have known, because he admitted it very fully, what the state of things was in the Clerical district?—Yes, and here is a proof that would stand in any Court of Justice in the world and could not be contested.

14589. And we might go further and say that the registration system of Tyrone House is slightly imperfect?—It is imperfect in this way, that nothing human is perfect, but I am sure it is as perfect as the registration in any Government Department in the Kingdom.

14590. And you cannot in the least explain how that document was mislaid?—There is nothing to show that it was mislaid. This document was found amongst Mr. Purser's papers.

14591. But it should not have been there?—He might want to keep this, as it related to a conference.

14592. But surely if a document is referred to any official by the Secretary, and he mislaid that, it should be returned to the Secretary?—It ought.

14593. Then it has been mislaid?—I would say retained.

14594. Unduly retained?—Well, I do not want on that particular point to express an opinion, because this is a matter relating to a conference, but I seriously think that Mr. Purser, having noted and mislaid that document, ought to have conferred, if not with me (he might not wish to come to the Secretary), but with the Resident Commissioner in the next room.

14595. It is absolutely clear that he knew the state of things?—He knew the state of things.

14596. I think you said to Mr. Howly that the administration is a product of long growth, and that it is an elaborately bureaucratic system, and that that is why it is able to subsist in this country?—I did not use the word "bureaucratic." I said it was an elaborate system of scaffolding and building up, and that kind of thing.

14597. You do not object to "bureaucratic"?—Well, I do not know in what sense "bureaucratic" is used. It might have different meanings. You have a Board of Commissioners there, and they are a representative Board; in a very real sense they are representatives.

14598. At any rate, the whole work of the administration is very elaborately and carefully systematised?—It is systematised, and it is the result of experience.

14599. And you say that that gives it strength in this country?—Yes.

14600. Now, do you really think that a system of that sort is specially required in Ireland?—You see, as I am an official of that system, I would sooner not express an opinion.

14601. Would you see any danger in such a system that must necessarily be somewhat hide-bound?—If I were at liberty to express an opinion about it I might make suggestions that to my mind would improve it.

14602. Is there not a tendency in such a system to decide everything by the merest precedent?—No, I think not; if you allow me to answer your question it will make clear my views. I think that under the present system, which is satisfactory to the great controlling parties in this country, which are the religious denominations—

14603. I am not talking about that. I am talking of a system of administration, of the official system of administration, the way in which inspectors and teachers and managers are dealt with?—Well, I cannot see any other way of dealing with inspectors and managers under any system.

14604. I want to get what was in your mind when you said that this whole administration was a plant of long and slow growth?—That is the whole system of National Education in Ireland, not the administration merely.

14605. I understood you to apply it to the administration?—Oh, no; if you take the administration alone, the administration of the Education Department is

very like the administration of any other public department, but I was thinking of the whole system, the controlling Board, and the rules and regulations formulated by that Board, and the laws made by that Board.

14606. That was what was in your mind when you described the system?—Yes.

14607. And not merely the Executive administration of Tyrone House?—Oh, no; the administration, so far as that is concerned, is like the administration of all other public departments.

14608. Sir Hiram Wilkinson.—You mentioned the fact in your statement that Mr. Purser was under a misapprehension when he spoke of the secretaries being appointed from inspectors, and you mentioned those who became secretaries who had not been inspectors?—Yes.

14609. There is a statement in the report of the Powis Commission showing how many of the secretaries were appointed from inspectors. Do you happen to remember how many?—Well, I could not tell you right off, but I could name those who had not been inspectors.

14610. You mentioned three who had not been inspectors?—Mr. Taylor was secretary for many years. Dr. Newell, who was secretary, had also been a clerk in the office.

14611. Was he not head inspector?—No doubt, but he had been a clerk in the office previously. Mr. James Kelly, the first secretary to the Board, was not an inspector, he was a Barrister; Mr. Dowdell was not an inspector.

14612. We have not before us at the moment the report in which these names are given. I think that you like to bring out that, although persons were appointed to the post of secretary who had not been inspectors, yet some were appointed who had been inspectors?—Yes, I made that statement in reference to a claim that has been put forward by inspectors repeatedly, that those higher officers, I mean these secretaries, were the right of the inspectors.

14613. But I wanted to make quite clear, and you did not want to have it misunderstood, that several, at any rate, of the inspectors did become secretaries?—Yes.

14614. Mr. Harrison asked a question with reference to the work of the chiefs of inspection, and what the Board did in order to come to a conclusion whether the chiefs of inspection should be outside officers or inside officers, and you said that on looking through the reports the Board found that a great many of the notings had been made by their clerks?—Yes, and you had one of the officers before you the last day who made many of those notings, Mr. Priestall.

14615. You are, no doubt, aware of the evidence of the Civil Service Inquiry Commission in which your own name appears?—Yes.

14616. You have there the evidence of two gentlemen who appeared from the office, Mr. Cairns and Mr. Flood, and this is Mr. Cairns' evidence regarding the work in the commissioners' department (reads evidence)\* So that what was done by clerks under the chiefs of inspection is done now under the commissioners. Of course, in a large office I suppose that the three commissioners could not make all the notings themselves?—Well, I thought when the first two of them were appointed that they could do it. We appointed one recently, and, of course, I suppose we will have to appoint another soon. The work in our office is expanding, and it is getting more complicated. New questions are arising, and our work has got very much heavier within the last two or three years.

14617. You recognise the analogy between what happens now and what happened under the chiefs of inspection?—Yes, to a certain extent.

14618. There is another point with regard to that. A point, I think, that Mr. Harrison has put to you was based upon this, whether the chiefs of inspection, or as they now are, the chief inspectors, could not do better work than noting reports in the office?—Yes.

\* Vide q. 12451.

26th June, 1913.]

Mr. P. E. LEMASS, I.S.O., I.R.C.S.I., examined.

[Continued.]

14619. And there was another point, that that work would not require men of the experience of the chief inspectors?—Yes.

14620. But there is this other point, that under the present system the reprimands are sent out without any recommendation on the part of any inspector at all?—Oh, no, that is quite a misapprehension.

14621. I will read what Mr. Purcell said here. (Reads evidence\* of Mr. Purcell). That was brought to Dr. Starkie's notice, and I think it surprised him a little?—It did, and it surprised me too when I read it, but, as I say, Mr. Purcell must have been a bit rushed here.

14622. The reason of that was explained in this way, that in that form of report which is used by inspectors there is a query asking them whether they recommend any action or not, and that in the majority of cases

the evidence seems to be, they do not make any recommendation?—I think if that is the impression formed by the Committee it is not correct; that is not my experience of the inspectors.

14623. Mr. Henly will bear me out that the evidence given here was that it is not the practice now for inspectors to make recommendations, and that Mr. Purcell, in issuing reprimands, looks not to the recommendation of the inspector, but to his own conclusion upon the general report made by the inspector and the merit mark? Well, I am afraid that there is a tendency to magnify one's office occasionally, and that is what happened in this case.

Mr. HENLY.—And Dr. Starkie stated that he was quite willing that the system of administering reprimands might be given up altogether.

\* Vide qq. 8458-9.

## APPENDICES.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS.

|   | PAGE |
|---|------|
| APPENDIX XII.—( <i>Handed in by Mr. A. Purser</i> ) :—  |      |
| General Statement of Evidence ... ..  | 463  |
| APPENDIX XIII.—( <i>Handed in by Mr. A. Purser</i> ) :—   |      |
| Memorandum on Case of Cloonell N.B. ... ..  | 465  |
| APPENDIX XIV.—( <i>Handed in by Mr. A. Purser</i> ) :—  |      |
| 1. Copy of Letter from Mr. Purser to Dr. Starkie, 20/6/11 ... ..  | 468  |
| 2. Letter from Dr. Starkie to Mr. Purser, 30/6/11 ... ..  | 468  |
| 3. Letter from Dr. Starkie to Mr. Purser, 1/7/11 ... ..   | 469  |
| 4. Letter from Dr. Starkie to Mr. Purser, 12/7/11 ... ..  | 468  |
| APPENDIX XV.—( <i>Handed in by Mr. A. Purser</i> ) :—   |      |
| Letter from Mr. Cussen to Mr. Purser, 6/8/11 ... ..   | 469  |
| APPENDIX XVI.—( <i>Handed in by Mr. A. Purser</i> ) :—  |      |
| Letters published in <i>Irish Independent</i> from :—   |      |
| 1. Mr. P. Ward, 20/10/12 ... ..   | 469  |
| 2. Mr. A. N. Bonaparte Wyse, 30/10/12 ... ..  | 470  |
| 3. Mr. P. Ward, 31/10/12 ... ..   | 470  |
| 4. Mr. A. Purser, 2/11/12 ... ..  | 470  |
| 5. Mr. P. Ward, 2/11/12 ... ..  | 470  |
| APPENDIX XVII.—( <i>Handed in by Mr. A. Purser</i> ) :—   |      |
| Alteration of Duties of Chiefs of Inspection ... ..   | 471  |
| APPENDIX XVIII.—( <i>Handed in by Mr. A. Purser</i> ) :—  |      |
| 1. Letter to Chairman enclosing extracts from a Letter of M. Vernay, Inspecteur des Ecoles<br>Primaires (Grasse, Alpes Maritimes) ... ..              | 472  |
| 2. Extracts from Letter of M. Vernay ... ..   | 472  |
| 3. Two Specimen Forms (Bulletin d'Inspection) ... ..  | 472  |
| APPENDIX XIX.—( <i>Handed in by Mr. E. Downing</i> ) :—   |      |
| General Statement of Evidence ... ..  | 474  |
| APPENDIX XX.—( <i>Forwarded by the Rev. A. S. Woodward, M.A.</i> ) :—   |      |
| Memorial of the Church of Ireland Managers of National Schools in the Counties of Antrim<br>and Down, and in the County of the City ... ..            | 475  |
| APPENDIX XXI.—( <i>Handed in by Mr. F. Miller</i> ) :—  |      |
| Reports on Tobemore National School ... ..  | 479  |
| APPENDIX XXII.—   |      |
| Heads of Evidence forwarded by the Education Board of the General Synod of the Church of<br>Ireland ... ..  | 481  |
| APPENDIX XXIII.—( <i>Handed in by Mr. F. O. Porté</i> ) :—  |      |
| Diagram and Explanation ... ..  | 481  |
| APPENDIX XXIV.—( <i>Handed in by the Chairman</i> ) :—  |      |
| Memorandum of English Education Office. Kindly furnished by Mr. B. Fitzgibbon Young, of<br>the English Education Office ... ..                        | 482  |
| APPENDIX XXV.—( <i>Handed in by Sir Henry Watkins</i> ) :—  |      |
| Memorandum re London County Council Schools. Kindly furnished by Mr. Blair, Education<br>Office ... ..  | 485  |
| APPENDIX XXVI.—( <i>Handed in by Mr. P. E. Lewis, Secretary, Board of National Education in<br/>Ireland</i> ) :—                                      |      |
| 1. General duties applicable to both Secretaries ... ..   | 487  |
| 2. Form of Manager's Annual Report ... ..   | 487  |
| 3. Extracts from the Order in Council, dated the 10th day of January, 1910, relating to the Home<br>Civil Service (with forms of certificates) ... .. | 488  |
| APPENDIX XXVII.—( <i>Forwarded by the Board of National Education in Ireland</i> ) :—   |      |
| Observations of the Chief Inspectors on the new School Programme, 10/7/00. ... ..   | 489  |

## APPENDIX XXVIII.—(Forwarded by the Board of National Education in Ireland).

Report of the Board of National Education, made for the information of His Excellency the Lord Lieutenant, in reference to the Recommendations of the Commission on Manual and Practical Instruction, July, 1896 ... 480

## APPENDIX XXIX.—(Forwarded by the Board of National Education in Ireland).

Memorandum of Mr. Downing, Chief of Inspection ... 493

## APPENDIX XXX.—(Forwarded by the Board of National Education in Ireland).

Memorandum as to (a) The Re-organization of the System of Payments, Salaries, &c., to the Teaching Staffs of National Schools; (b) The Revision of the School Curriculum and System of School Organization; (c) The Re-organization ... 497

## APPENDIX XXXI.—(Forwarded by the Board of National Education in Ireland).

New Inspection Circuits:—Letter of Instruction to Chief Inspectors and their Memorandum thereon ... 500

## APPENDIX XXXII.—(Forwarded by the Board of National Education in Ireland).

Extract from Freeman's Journal of 1/3/00. Interview with His Grace the Archbishop of Dublin ... 510

## APPENDIX XXXIII.—(Handed in by Mr. W. J. M. Stokes, Litt.D., LL.D., Resident Commissioner of the Board of National Education in Ireland).

1. Report of Conference of Senior Inspectors of National Schools in Ireland, 1904 ... 511
2. Mr. Wolpely's Report of Conference, Circuit 18, 23/1/05, with notes of Mr. Power, Chief Inspector, thereon ... 513
3. Reports on Dolphin's Barn National Schools ... 515

## APPENDIX XXXIV.—(Forwarded by the Board of National Education in Ireland).

Notes to Managers and Teachers of National Schools ... 516

## APPENDIX XXXV.—(Forwarded by the Board of National Education in Ireland).

Circular to Inspectors of National Schools, February, 1913 ... 520

## APPENDIX XXXVI.—(Handed in by Mr. D. Frisell, Accountant to the Commissioners of National Education in Ireland).

Statement of the principal duties of the Accountant to the Commissioners of National Education ... 517

## APPENDIX XXXVII.—(Forwarded by the Board of National Education in Ireland).

1. Return showing for each year, from 1908 to 1913 inclusive, the number of Teachers in the Board's service ... 517
2. Return showing for each year, from 1902 to 1912 inclusive, the number of Teachers who received increments ... 517
3. Return showing for each year, from 1908 to 1912 inclusive, the number of Teachers who were debarred from obtaining promotion or increment on the grounds of personal inefficiency, and a statement in regard to an inquiry, made by the Vocational Committee, as to the number of Teachers debarred from obtaining promotion or increment as the result of reports of Inspectors relating to building or equipment ... 518

## APPENDIX XXXVIII.—(Forwarded by the National Board of Education in Ireland.)

Return showing the number of Teachers compulsorily retired by the Board of National Education, before attaining the age for retirement on full pension, for each of the 24 years from 1888 to 1912 inclusive ... 518

## APPENDIX XXXIX.—(Forwarded by the Board of National Education in Ireland).

Statement giving the number of Teachers to whom it was intimated that unfavourable action might be taken in their regard for not satisfactorily teaching subjects introduced by the Revised Programme of 1900 ... 518

## APPENDIX XL.—(Forwarded by the Board of National Education in Ireland).

1. Resolutions of the Board in 1910, relative to the new system ... 519
2. Board's Order of 1902 as to Secretaries, Chief Inspectors, and Financial Assistant Secretary ... 519
3. Board's Order of 1903 ... 520
4. Board's Order of 1904, restoring status and emoluments of Secretaries ... 520

## APPENDIX XLI.—(Forwarded by the Board of National Education in Ireland).

Return of Merit Marks in General Circuit ... 520

## APPENDIX XLII.—(Forwarded by the Board of National Education in Ireland).

Memorandum of Mr. Power, Chief Inspector, 13/10/03 ... 521

## APPENDIX XLIII.—(Forwarded by the Board of National Education in Ireland).

Report of Financial Assistant Secretary (being an extract from a Memorandum prepared for Sir A. MacDonnell, Under Secretary, 30/1/04, showing how the Commissioners' Rules in regard to awards of Good Service Salary and Grade Promotions of Teachers have been carried out for the first triennial period of Teachers' Service under the New System of Payments, ended 30/3/05 ... 522

## APPENDIX XLIV.—(Forwarded by the Board of National Education in Ireland).

1. Return showing average incomes from State sources of Teachers for years 1895, 1904, 1910, 1912 ... 527
2. Return showing payments to the Teaching Staff for 1895, 1895, 1900, 1905, 1910, 1911, 1912 ... 527

## APPENDIX XII.

(Handed in by Mr. A. Purser.)

## GENERAL STATEMENT OF EVIDENCE (forwarded by Mr. Purser, late Chief Inspector).

I was appointed under the National Board as District Inspector, 14th March, 1871; as Head Inspector, 1st July, 1891; as Chief of Inspection, 11th October, 1908 (title changed to Chief Inspector and duties modified, 1st April, 1909). I resigned 6th November, 1911. I was Inspector, therefore, before the introduction of the so-called result system in 1872; while the result system was in force, 1872-1900, and under the present system, from 1900-1911.

In 1871, before payment on individual passes was introduced, the staff consisted of six head and sixty district inspectors. Each of the latter had charge of a definite district; the schools number 6,960. The head inspectors had no districts, but besides being largely responsible for the model schools and for the examination of teachers, they had such a general supervision over the district inspectors.

For inspection purposes the year was divided into three terms, and every school had to be inspected each term if possible. The format of report was:—

- (1) "Primary," which was largely concerned with house, premises, furniture, and so forth, and was required only once every four or five years. As it was abolished in 1873, I had very little to do with it.
- (2) "Secondary, No. 1." For this report notice of visit had to be given to teacher. The visit was supposed to be held during the months of best attendance, and it was obligatory on the Inspector to examine every pupil he found present. It was the most important inspection of the year, and on it the school was "passed." As well as I recollect the Inspector had to state if the school was making satisfactory progress.
- (3) "Secondary, No. 2." This report was one of inspection rather than examination; individual examination was not required, but the Inspector was supposed to look fairly closely into the work done since his previous visit. These inspections occurred twice a year, and were held without notice.
- (4) "Incidental." These were reports on short visits, when any irregularity was observed.

When the examinations for result fees were introduced in 1872 it was deemed unnecessary—indeed, it became impossible after the first year—to continue this minute system of inspection. The "Results Report" was made essential, the examination being spread over the entire year. In addition, the Inspector had to visit each school twice without notice, and on one of these occasions to hold a "Secondary Inspection." With the large increase of schools and children, especially in the higher classes, it was found impossible to fulfil these requirements completely, but most inspectors held many secondary inspections; I think my proportion was seldom below three-fourth of my schools, and often reached nine-tenths. This form of report was abolished about 1888, the essential points being incorporated into the "Incidental Form."

Up to 1890 the old district system maintained its ground. The number of districts was raised to 63 (I think, the inspectors to 66, four being "unattached." Four "inspectors' assistants" were appointed in 1877, and the number of these was gradually raised to 12 during the next ten years. These all exercised their functions, under the superintendence of the six head inspectors, who had no special schools assigned to them until 1888, when a small district of about thirty schools was arranged for each head inspector.

The means taken to secure uniformity of result examinations were somewhat as follows.—The head inspectors met in conference, under the chiefs of inspection, in the Education Office, and drew up regulations for the result of examinations and standards of tests

in the various subjects for each class—for instance, special cards were prepared for testing arithmetic. These regulations, etc., were conveyed to the district inspectors, either by circular from the Education Office, or by each head inspector in conference with his own inspectors. At the annual conference, the head inspector deplored one of the district inspectors to examine a school in presence of all the others; his examination was subsequently criticised, and the marks were compared as a means of obtaining uniformity. The head inspector also held "check examinations" in every district each year, if possible, and in case of a teacher's appeal through the manager against an inspector's examination, the head inspector might re-examine the school if a *prima facie* case were shown.

Various modifications were made from time to time in the regulations regarding the "pass mark"; the general effect was to make the examinations rather mechanical and to open the door to "exam." Appeals were very rare under the circumstances, but the right of appeal was always there.

When the payment for "individual results" ceased the district system was abolished. Circuits containing about 400 schools were established, each in charge of a senior and two sub (or district) inspectors. Thus 22 senior and 44 sub-inspectors were created. The arrangement is open to this evident objection, that 22 men of sufficient experience and judgment are not likely to be found among a staff of 66, if their position is to be one of guiding and controlling subordinate officers. Of course, this was met to some extent, by depriving places of power and authority; even those who had been chief inspectors were no longer allowed to control the examinations or inspections of the sub-inspectors. Each circuit was divided into three equal sections, reducing not from the common residence centre, and the schools of each of these sections were in charge of each of the three district inspectors in rotation, so that if one inspector were not quite satisfactory, the other two might correct the balance. The objection was the effect—the one unreasonable man's sword militated against the just treatment of all the schools. This arrangement, which had many other faults, was introduced without any reference to the chiefs of inspection (chief inspectors). When the defects of the system became patent, a re-arrangement of the circuits was made at the suggestion of the chief inspectors. Twenty-two new circuits were mapped out, each divided into two sections, which were put in charge of sub-inspectors; but the senior inspector, who is in charge of the circuit as a whole, has to inspect and examine one-fifth of the schools every year. This has proved a more workable scheme, but is open to the same objection given above. The senior inspector has no authority; the sub-inspectors have no responsibility. He cannot now change the merit mark up or down without the consent of the "Seniors," and so the mark will tend to become stereotyped. The circuit inspectors hold conferences, but have no means of enforcing any view, except by laying it before the chief inspector at his annual conference.

With six head inspectors conferring together, a fair equality of standard of examination might be reached, but even with them the attainment of a uniform standard of inspection would probably be hopeless; uniformity of either standard is not to be expected with 32 senior men, who do not even meet each other in conference. A uniform standard becomes quite impossible with the sub-division of the merit mark into "good," "fair," etc., etc. The restoration of the old district system, with the supervision of six or eight head inspectors, would provide at least a partial remedy. So far for outdoor work.

When the inspectors' reports reached the Education Office they were dealt with by the clerks in charge of the several districts. It was their duty to see that all queries were answered, that the statistics agreed with those returned by the teacher through the manager, that the examination sheets were complete, to enter in the registers such particulars as were required, to note previous action, and to call attention, by under-



ling or otherwise, to points that the chiefs should consider. The reports were collected by the clerk attending on the chiefs of inspection. He looked through the report to see these matters had been attended to, and in the ordinary routine cases he drafted orders on them. Cases requiring special consideration he brought to the chiefs of inspection for noting. The action finally recommended in these cases, very often after submission to the Resident Commissioner, as well as in routine cases, was on every report initiated by the chief of inspection. The reports then returned to the clerk in charge (those which required the Board's fiat having first passed the Board), who made any further necessary entries in the registers, and wrote such letters as the notings of the chief of inspection demanded. These letters then went to the secretaries along with the corresponding reports, who signed them if he approved, if not, he could refer them back for reconsideration.

Under the new system the reports are in the first instance dealt with in the same manner, but instead of coming to the chiefs, they go in to the higher clerks, who have been appointed "examiners." They have no knowledge of school matters, and are not in a position to decide on the merits of the schools from these reports.

The chief inspectors, who would understand them, are not allowed to deal with them, and owing to their being withheld from them, the chief inspectors have but a very imperfect knowledge of the progress made by the schools.

As the "examiners" are not experts, the decision regarding merit marks and diplomas was handed over first to Mr. Stronge, senior (formerly head) inspector, and afterwards to Mr. Wyse, a junior inspector of but very little experience or service.

I repeatedly recommended an alteration in this matter, but as the Resident Commissioner did not wish the chief inspectors to deal with the inspectors' reports or the diploma files, my proposals were not adopted.

It may be mentioned here that the only reports (statements they are called) submitted in the ordinary course to the chief inspectors are the unimportant documents sent in by the organizers, which in most cases are of little or no educational value, and as far as they are, should be sent to the circuit inspectors.

#### *Inspection and Examination.*

(See Mr. Dale's report, section 91 (page 29), especially the last half; note particularly his prophecy about appeals.)

Neither inspection nor examination alone is sufficient; both are required. Examination best shows the results of instruction in school, but inspection is necessary to show the cause of defects; also to afford full evidence as to the state of the school in regard to discipline, order, etc.

Inspection alone affords no evidence how far the teacher's instruction has reached the mind of his pupils. It leaves the inspector's judgment on a school open to great doubt, owing to his personality and idiosyncrasies, even though he may be trying to come to a fair and just decision. It does not admit of enough definiteness and certainty to be used as the only test of the merit of a school, or its progress, and hence is unsuitable as the basis for a system of payment on "results," whether the payment is made on individual passes or by increments. All the best inspectors use examination largely, and the better the inspector the more he uses it.

If the present system of making grants direct to the teachers is maintained, there should be a definite programme for each school or grade of school, and a definite examination on such programme.

All the sub-division of the merit mark ("excellent," "very good," "good," "fair," "middling," "bad") should be abolished for increments, promotions and diplomas. Teachers should, in my opinion, be recognised only on probation for the first two or three years, and until definitely appointed after their probationary period, should not be entitled to any increment.

Increments and diplomas should not be withheld except for unfavourable reports—i.e., increments would become automatic; promotion to deputed generally on training, scholarship (to be tested by examination), efficiency and service. Encouragement to study should be held out to all teachers. This would enable a reduction to be made in the examination work, and more time to be given to professional studies in the training college.

Teachers who have served twenty years or more, with favourable reports, should not be harshly dealt with as they grow old, unless the defects they develop are due to misconduct.

The Commissioners and their officers should show more trust and confidence in the teachers, and inspectors should treat them with courtesy as fellow-workers. After every inspection or examination the inspector should confer with the teacher, especially regarding the notings he leaves in the observation book. It is most important that the former close and friendly relations which existed between the inspectors and managers, which the new system has interrupted, should be restored.

Inspectors' efforts should be directed to bringing about an improvement in the individual schools and to raising the standard of instruction and education in their districts.

In judging the merits of a school they should duly consider if the instruction is sound and intelligent; if discipline and order are well maintained; if cleanliness, decency, neatness, and good habits are promoted. A day school should not be held responsible for the formation of character, or for more than a proper effort to promote the points above referred to. (I do not approve of the wording of rule 79.)

In order that inspectors' work may be effective, it is important that their system of inspection and examination should be carefully thought out, and each day's work carefully prepared; and it is just as essential that they should continue their educational studies as that teachers should do so.

The Resident Commissioner's personal interference in the work of inspection tends, in my opinion, to destroy the inspectors' feelings of responsibility and their independence of judgment. He has not the necessary intimate knowledge of school management, and his visits are much too brief and hurried to warrant the promulgation of anything but a most superficial opinion on the work of a school.

All the pupils should be tested annually in reading, writing (including spelling) and arithmetic; girls also in needlework. In other subjects the test need not be individual.

The programme should be lightened to bring the requirements within the reasonable accomplishment of the staff. Subjects which teachers cannot cope with should be excluded (the supposed teaching of them is at present a sham); alternative subjects should be allowed—horticulture and similar matters, for instance, in rural schools.

No pupil under five (or, perhaps, six) should be enrolled in any ordinary National school; but in towns, grades might be made in infant departments or play-schools. No such school should have more than 30 children in a room, each under a separate teacher, except that for games several might be brought together in a large hall or yard. The children in these would have no set lessons and no books. The superintendents should prove themselves suitable, but need not have the qualifications of a certified teacher. No more junior assistant mistresses should be appointed.

Changes should not be made in the code without longer and more careful consideration.

The former "Office Committee" were a useful adjunct to the Board. The Pwll Commission recommended a small permanent Committee of the Board; such a Committee would be useful to consider appeals and some other matters to be laid before the full Board.

The Board meets only once a fortnight; it is used to meet once a week, which was seldom enough. The objections to a weekly meeting might be met by the Board's sitting two consecutive days in each fortnight. This would give the members time to look into appeals and other cases.

A. PURSER.

6th March, 1913..

## APPENDIX XIII.

(Handed in by Mr. A. Purser.)

## MEMORANDUM ON CASE OF GLOONDAFF NATIONAL SCHOOL.

At the Mansion House public meeting, held on the 25th October, to protest against the dismissal of Mr. Mansfield, the following extracts were read from letters of mine to a Mr. O'Callaghan, National school teacher:—

"To my mind, the greatest grievance the teachers have is that there should be no means of appealing against a matter of the sort, and that the Resident Commissioner or any higher official should be allowed to intercept or stop an appeal to the Board. I, as the highest official, gave my opinion that Mr. — had been unfairly reported upon, and was unable to have the report cancelled, or my view of the matter laid before the Board."

"That the teachers have no means of making an effective appeal in case of an unjust report is perfectly clear and patent, after my experience in the — case; but I think that you write imprudently when you write of smothering the Board, and that your organisation is attacking the wrong party. It is not the Board that is unwilling to do justice to the teachers, but Dr. Starkie, who suppresses facts and reports, and thus prevents the Board coming to a proper, or any, decision."

"As regards the general question, it is claimed by the Resident Commissioner that 'he alone had authority to decide what cases should be submitted to the Board.' (Independent, 31st October, 1912); and Mr. Ward, a Commissioner, stated (Independent, 30th October, 1912) that no appeal from a teacher had come before the Board for the past two years. These two statements appear to me to confirm what is said in the extracts from my letters to Mr. O'Callaghan. The letters were not written for publication, but I gave permission to a teacher to use the information they contained, insisting only on the condition that it should be clearly explained that they were not written in connection with the Mansfield case, of which I had no personal knowledge. This condition was not, I think, observed."

I now come to the particular case of Gloonadiff National School, referred to in my letter.

The teacher considered himself aggrieved by the last two reports on his school—dated 16th February, 1910, and 3rd November, 1910. Though he had worked hard—the written work of his pupils proves it—the senior inspector, Mr. Conner, reduced the merit of the school from "fair" to "middling," and, in consequence, an official reprimand (in duplicate) was addressed to the teacher, who, in his anger, wrote an impetuous letter to the secretary, dated 22nd December, 1910. This letter, along with the inspector's report, was sent to me, when with a noting at top by the secretary, Mr. Lemass, asking for my observations. It is not pretended there was any direction to me not to visit; in fact, Dr. Starkie, in a letter dated 12th July, 1911 (six months later) writes:—"I rated Mr. Lemass for not making it perfectly clear that you were not to examine the school." As I did not see how I could make any useful observations without knowing more about the school, as I thought a visit was not only within my rights, but in accordance with my duty, knowing nothing of any objection on Dr. Starkie's part to my paying such a visit, I included the school in a round of visits I was paying in the West of Ireland. There was no secrecy about my intention. The evening before my visit, I met the senior inspector at Westport station, and referred to the matter in terms decidedly unfavourable to the teacher.

Next morning (21st January, 1911), I reached the school at 10.30 o'clock, and remained there over 3½ hours. I had not intended to make so prolonged a

visit; the memorandum which contains my observations on the teacher's letter explains why I found this necessary. (To be produced by me, if required.—A. P.)

As the propriety of this visit has been called in question by Dr. Starkie, I must ask the Commission to permit me to go into the matter, which I will do as briefly as possible.

The duties of the chief inspectors are laid down in a document dated 22nd May, 1908, of which I submit a copy. Paragraphs 1, 5, 7, 8, 9, 10, and 13 bear, to a greater or lesser extent, on the relation of the chief inspectors with circuits and officers in charge. Here I need quote only paragraph 5:—"The chief inspectors to be at liberty to examine any National school, when they deem it necessary." I think it will be admitted that the above paragraphs not only justify school visits, but require the chief inspector to visit schools for the purpose, among other things, of maintaining a fairly equitable standard of inspection throughout their eleven circuits. The following are the objections made by Dr. Starkie to my visit. They do not appear to be consistent:—

(1) Mr. Ward writes in Independent, of 8th November, 1912:—"He (Dr. Starkie) states that the only communication sent to Mr. Purser was one asking him to express an opinion on the tone of a letter received from the teacher, and to say what action should be taken."

(2) Dr. Starkie, in a letter to me, dated 30th June, 1911, writes:—"The teacher's appeal was formally referred to you for your observation, but you were neither asked, nor expected, to visit the school."

(3) In his letter of 12th July, 1911, Dr. Starkie writes:—"You held a check inspection in Gloonadiff school without orders. This cannot be denied; the point referred to you was whether a re-inspection should be held. By holding it you took the decision out of my hands. You say this was five months ago, but I did not know of your action until April, when I rated Mr. Lemass for not making it perfectly clear that you were not to examine the school."

(4) Mr. Ward, in Independent, of 30th October, 1911, writes:—"He (Dr. Starkie) informed me that Mr. Purser had interfered in the case without instructions to review the report of the senior inspector, and contrary to the practice followed in the school, as set forth in the orders of the Resident Commissioner, and which are of many years standing."

(5) Dr. Starkie, in his letter of 31st October, 1911, signed by Mr. Wyse, states:—"He (Dr. Starkie) had decided not to bring Mr. Purser's (unauthorised and irregular) report before the Board. . . . It should be remembered that it was open to Mr. Purser . . . to appeal to the Board through the secretary; and further that Mr. Ward might have raised the question at the Board."

As regards No. 1, there was nothing about "tone" in the noting when sent to me; it was absurd to suppose that the Resident Commissioner or the Board would need the opinion of a chief inspector to decide on the tone of a letter.

As regards No. 2, I have only to point out that there was nothing in the secretary's noting forbidding my visit to Gloonadiff National School, and that the matter was within my discretion, according to the document regulating my duties.

As regards No. 3, I held no check inspection. A check inspection would require a check report, and I furnished nothing of the sort, but only a memorandum of observations on the teacher's letter. I need not emphasise the difference between the statement made here:—"The point referred to you was whether an inspection should be held"—and the statement in these other extracts.

As regards No. 4, I informed Dr. Starbke that no orders had ever reached me or my colleagues, I do not believe they were ever issued, but if they were, Dr. Starbke will, no doubt, be able to produce a copy.

As regards No. 5, I think the foregoing paragraphs show that my report was neither unauthorised nor irregular. But even if it had been, the fact would also appear to me to warrant the depriving the teacher of an increment to which he was entitled.

As regards the part of number 5, referring to my right of appeal, I shall take it up later on.

To return to my visit to the Clondraff school, I looked over the written exercises of the pupils, both those done before and those done since Mr. Cassen's inspection, I heard the children at their oral lessons, and examined them to some extent, inspected the premises thoroughly, and conferred with the teacher. My inspection lasted about as long as Mr. Cassen's. The conclusion forced on me was that the school had been undermarked by Mr. Cassen, senior inspector, and probably by Mr. Benton, junior inspector, in the previous year.

I had an hour to spare, and rode on to a neighbouring school for comparison. Here the merit "very good" had been given. The oral work of the school went on merrily and, quietly, but certainly in no respect better (to say the least) than in Clondraff, which had been marked "middling." When I came to examine the written work, I found it greatly inferior—not only was there an absence of intelligence, but practically an entire absence of correction. (I can produce some compositions.) Judged by the average age of the pupils, the classes were a year behind those of Clondraff.

That there had been a lapse from a proper standard in both cases was so perfectly clear to me that I wrote to the senior inspector the same evening, telling him so, with a view to his reconsidering his standard in future. His reply reached me in a couple of days, and required careful consideration before my memorandum of 8th February was sent in. I recommended that the merit mark of the school Clondraff should be changed to "good," and that Mr. Kelly be admonished not to write such an impertinent letter again.

The next thing I heard of the case was contained in a letter from the teacher, in which he informed me that Dr. Starbke (Mr. Starbke and Miss Starbke, Mr. Dilworth, the Secretary, and Mr. Cassen, the senior inspector, whose report was impugned, had visited the school on the 30th March; that Dr. Starbke seemed pleased; but that Mr. Cassen was going about the school pointing out defects to Mr. Dilworth. At this time I was not aware that practically the whole of my memorandum had been submitted to Mr. Cassen for his criticism, and that a reply dated 18th March, 1911, had been received from him, but never submitted to me. Mr. Dilworth, when I questioned him on the 6th April, informed me of this visit. He denied that Mr. Cassen had acted as stated, but had to admit it was true when I mentioned specific matters the senior inspector had pointed out. He acknowledged that the written work was good, and that the pupils answered him intelligently on what they were doing, and he added that he had told Mr. Cassen on coming out that he had undermarked the school. Mr. Ward subsequently told me that Dr. Starbke had made the same observation to him.

I accept Mr. Dilworth's statement as confirming my judgment; but, at the same time, I desire to draw attention to the fact that by the Board's directions, the secretaries are not inspection officers, and are not to interfere with the chief inspectors' functions. I may refer to this point later. Here I only desire to draw attention to the treatment of the teacher and his school. Dr. Starbke, Mrs. Starbke, Miss Starbke, Mr. Dilworth, and Mr. Cassen drive up to the school door in a motor car, in a very remote part of Mayo, where the children are quite unused to ordinary visitors; the very unusual visit of five persons of their importance would naturally upset the teachers and children for some time, especially when one of the visitors is allowed to go about pointing out defects in the teacher's teaching; at the end of about 20 minutes, before ordinary attention and work could well be expected to have been resumed, the visitors depart—the Resident Commissioner without expressing any disapproval of the school—and though he and Mr. Dilworth inform Mr. Cassen that the letter had undermarked the school, the Resident Commissioner, without further reference to

me, settles the matter by noting on Mr. Cassen's criticism of my memorandum:—"Having visited Clondraff School, I see no sufficient reason for altering the mark assigned to the school by Mr. Cassen.—W. J. M. S., 4th April, 1911."

(1) I have nothing of this, or of Mr. Cassen's criticism of my memorandum for a couple of months. I kept asking for the file, but was put off with statements as to its whereabouts. On May 22nd, I made a formal written application for it; but not until 10th June was it given me. Then I found it had been marked as a "confidential" file and locked up in the safe. It was left with me only a few days—until 16th June—when it was taken away by Mr. Norton, acting for Private Secretary. On the 16th June, I drafted a letter to Dr. Starbke, but on Mr. Hyne's advice, as Mr. Ward, a Commissioner, was looking after the matter, I withheld it. As Mr. Ward failed to get any satisfaction at his interview, and as Dr. Starbke went away to visit Tipperary or other schools before a second interview could take place, I wrote to him on the 20th June setting out my views of the case, and expressing my intention of appealing to the Board. On 1st July I received the following two letters from him (B; and C).

COPE.

B.

AMSTERDAM, June 30th, 1911.

Dear Sir—I will take measures that your appeal shall be heard by the Board.

I may say that I fail to understand how you are aggrieved. The teacher's appeal was formally referred to you for your observations, but you were neither asked nor expected to visit the school, and I fancy you are aware of my objection to your holding what was called "check examinations" without orders. Again, I fail to see how you have a right to question the way in which your report was treated, unless it is your contention that a chief inspector's report is final, and must bind me, even when I have first knowledge, as in this case. Such a misconception of his position is strange in an official of 40 years standing; it is still more strange to find him discussing the details of administrative, which are my province, with a Commissioner, and giving him confidential information which should be reserved for my ear. Such conduct shows that the official of 40 years standing has not yet learned the most elementary rules of the service. Again, I cannot grasp how the teacher has been unjustly treated. Weeks ago, I directed that his school should be examined by a chief inspector next year, and that if his report is good, the increment should be payable from April 1st in this year. I fail to see what further I could do, unless I am to be subject to the dictation of a subordinate, who has given me no evidence that his judgment is unbiased in dealing with his own subordinates.—Yours faithfully,

(Signed). W. J. M. SEAMAN.

C.

COPE.

July 1st, 1911.

Dear Sir—On further thought, I have decided not to bring your appeal before the Board, as you are not entitled to appeal against a decision of mine which does not affect you personally. I do not think in your interest, as I intended to ask the Board to ensure you for your misbehaviour, but as I am very anxious not to do anything to affect your pension, I will let the matter drop, in the hope that you may come to see the impropriety of your conduct.—Yours faithfully,

(Signed). W. J. M. SEAMAN.

I think it is impossible to look upon these letters as anything but a refusal to put the Clondraff case before the Board. The first letter speaks of taking measures that my appeal should be heard by the Board, but the context shows that what was intended

was to put my letter of 20th June before the Commissioners, and without hesitating, to get me censured, probably suspended or called on to resign, for venturing to propose to exercise my right of appeal, which Dr. Starbuck himself says in his letter of 21st October, 1911, in the *Independent*, I had:—"It should be remembered that it was open to Mr. Purser . . . to appeal to the Board through the secretaries." It was apparently inconsideration for me to mention to him that I intended to exercise this right; he had determined to ask the Board to censure me for my intonation; and he assumes that the Board would have done so as a matter of course.

As this would have interfered with my pension (already four years over-due) and as I could not conveniently afford to have it reduced, I was obliged to give way. As Dr. Starbuck had left the office for ten days or so, I wrote to him on July 2nd, as follows:—

COPY. (Letter D.)

Saturday Night,  
1st July, 1911.

Dear Dr. Starbuck—Your first letter, received this morning, though it censured me for faults of which I do not think I was guilty, contained some things for which I was grateful—the promise that you would allow my appeal to go before the board, and the statement that weeks ago you directed that Mr. Kelly's school should be examined by a chief inspector next year, with a view to granting him an increment from 1st April last, in case of a favourable report being made. This direction had not reached either chief inspector before I wrote. Had I known of it, I would not have written my letter, even though I felt strongly that his increment should date from an earlier period. But unfortunately my letter has drawn from you several serious charges to which I plead "not guilty," and which I shall be glad to have investigated if you see fit. You charge me with at least an irregularity in visiting Clondroff School without orders, to inquire into the teacher's appeal; but it is only five months after my visit that this objection is made to me. It was not, strictly speaking, an appeal against the inspector's recommendation, but a protest against a reprimand, that the teacher made. I did not see what useful observations I could make without acquainting myself with the circumstances of the case and giving the teacher an opportunity of defending himself. Neither you nor the Commissioners desire to condemn any teacher unheard, I am confident. My visit to the school, which was made with a prejudice against the teacher, led me to believe that the unfavorable report on his school was not justified. Mr. Dilworth told me that he had expressed the same opinion to Mr. Cussen; and Mr. Ward told me that you also considered the school had been under-estimated. So far as I am aware, the teacher's reprimand remains uncancelled.

I am not so ignorant or presumptuous as to suppose that a report of mine is final, or must bind you or the Board, and I should be sorry to put forward so absurd a claim.

You charge me "with discussing the details of administration with a Commissioner and giving him confidential information which should be reserved for my ear." I cannot plead guilty to doing so, and you close your letter by refusing to me as "a subordinate who has given me no evidence that his judgment is unbiased in dealing with his own subordinates." I do not think I have spoken of the other officers of the Board as "my subordinates." Is it allowable to suggest that I might reasonably claim to be held unbiased until the contrary is shown, and to point out that you cannot get confidential information on the spot from all the staff in a few days. If any of them holds me guilty of showing bias against him, I shall be surprised. Even Mr. Cussen, though we have disagreed about one case, will not do so, I suspect; but should he, I would refer you to my meeting on Mr. Dilworth's query in the matter of the Commission's deliberations.

I fully recognize the kindness of the motive given in your second letter for not bringing my appeal before the Board: some of the remarks which Mr. Cussen has been allowed to make, would seem to make the matter of personal interest to me. If my appeal was intemperate, I apologise for making it, but I should like these other charges made against me withdrawn or

inquired into. Should the Board consider them proved, I hope the Commissioners will be pleased to accept my resignation, and so treat me with as much consideration as has been shown to other officers who have left the service in recent years. The tone of your letter leads me to hope for a favourable ending of the matter.—Yours faithfully,

A. PURSER.

P.S.—I hope you will excuse my saying, and I do so without any intention of making a complaint (for I believe the matter was a pure accident, owing to hurry) that it was not pleasant to receive your second letter in an open envelope.—A. P.

As far as the teacher was concerned, I had obtained a promise that some retribution would be made to him, though I considered his increment should date from 1910; and I beg your special attention to this. As I could not hope for any justice in the matter being done to myself, I sent in my resignation to date from 31st October, 1911.

I knew nothing more from Dr. Starbuck until the 12th July, when he sent me the following letter:—

COPY.

July 12th, 1911.

Dear Mr. Purser—I have not replied to your last letter, as I was away, and very busy with extensive matters since my return last Friday.

If I may venture to advise you, I would drop this affair altogether. My letter was, no doubt, strongly expressed, but you gave me cause for anger by the tone of your letter, which was a reflection on my sense of justice. As far as I remember, my charges were:—(1) That you held a check inspection in Clondroff School without orders. This cannot be denied; the point referred to you was whether a re-inspection should be held; by holding it, you took the decision out of my hands. You say this was five months ago, but I did not know of your action until April, when I read Mr. Lemass for not making it perfectly clear that you were not to examine the school; (2) that you discussed details of administration with Mr. Ward, in violation of my order, sent round some years ago, that no officer should do this. I am glad you deny the charge. Mr. Ward had told me that he had discussed the matter with him (*sic*) and that you showed him specimens of the work. Of course, I could not conduct the administration if Commissioners, behind my back, discussed questions with officials; (3) that you were insubordinate. This can hardly be denied. The administration could not go on if my orders are not accepted. You know there is a S.O. that even the orders of the secretaries must be obeyed, as coming from me or the Board.—Yours truly,

(Signed), W. J. M. STARBUCK.

P.S.—As I am the final authority on details of administration, no responsibility rests on any subordinate officer for any acts.—W. J. M. S.

I saw him later in the day, and find the following summary of the interview in my note-book:—"Spoke to him (Dr. Starbuck) about Clondroff. He said orders were issued years ago about check inspections, and he supposed I had got them; that Mr. Lemass's noting on the file was not meant to produce a visit; that he supposed I knew all about his order in the case (Clondroff), and that it had been duly notified to me. I explained that none of these had been conveyed to me, and that I knew nothing of his order re Clondroff till four or five weeks ago. He had to admit my action was reasonable, suggested I should tear up his letters (another long one that morning). He was quite civil and even friendly."

The same day I saw Mr. Ward, who informed me that the Resident Commissioner had permitted that the teacher's increment, if a favourable report was received, would date from the 1st April, 1910. This quite satisfied me, as I now thought the teacher was to get all I had contended for. Dr. Starbuck, however, has gone back on this, and has refused to fulfil his promise—in fact, denies that he made it.

It will be noticed that in his letter of the 30th June, he says:—"Weeks ago I directed that his school should be examined by a chief inspector next year—the school year, of course, being plainly implied. I got

the clerk who used to attend on the chief inspectors to find out if such directions had reached the inspection department. They had not. They certainly had not been sent into the Library—the chief's room. On my return from a couple of weeks' holidays, I made similar inquiries with the same result. I then wrote to the senior inspector, Mr. Cussen, to know if these directions had reached him. On 5th August, Mr. Cussen replied that no such notification had yet reached him or Mr. Fenton. It does not seem to me unreasonable to assume that no such directions were issued; but, as Dr. Starke had notified to me his direction to have the school inspected by a chief inspector in the year 1911-12, I inspected it on the 27th September. There was nothing irregular in my doing so, and though my report was sent about the middle of October, no objection to my action was made before I resigned on

8th November. Then Dr. Starke had my report cancelled, and later on (March, 1912, I think) he sent my successor, Mr. McNeill, to hold another inspection. He also marked the school "good."

So now we have my two reports and Mr. McNeill's, giving the school "good." Dr. Starke's and Mr. De-worth's acknowledgement that the school was under-marked by Mr. Cussen, but Dr. Starke still contends that I was wrong, and that his notice re Mr. Cussen's "misdoing" was correct and proper, with this consequence, that the teacher is deprived of one year's increment, and may even if no such miscarriage of justice occurs in future be deprived of the amount of such increment every third year, when his case comes forward for reconsideration under the triennial system.

A. P.

## APPENDIX XIV.

(Headed in by Mr. Purser.)

### No. 1.—*Re CLODDUFF CASE.*

On the 29th June, 1911, I wrote to Dr. Starke the following effect:—

Dear Dr. Starke—I regret to have to trouble you with a letter on the Clodduff case. The decision came to in the matter, especially as it was not referred back to me after Mr. Cussen had been allowed his say, has been an unpleasant surprise to me.

I was quite unaware of it until about three weeks ago, as the usual courtesy of notifying the action on a report was not shown to me.

The day after I was allowed to see the file I wrote you a letter, but at Mr. Hynes's suggestion, I withheld it for a while, as Mr. Ward was apparently taking up the case. Mr. Ward spoke to me about it again yesterday, and was to have seen you on the matter, but as you have gone away for some time, he has probably failed to have an interview with you.

Under the circumstances, lest it be said I had by lapse of time forfeited any claim to reconsideration, I beg respectfully to inform you that I cannot look upon the decision as final until I have appealed to the Board and been heard by them.

I fortunately brought home some specimens of work done, both in Clodduff and Belina National Schools, and I think I can satisfy any impartial person that my opinion in both cases is correct, and that serious injustice has been done Mr. Kelly by Mr. Cussen. Indeed, the letter's report, if carefully read, shows such unfairness, and his long special pleading letter (which was never submitted to me for my observations), is such a theme of misrepresentation as to make his opinion quite worthless. It is with regret that within the last few months of my service I should have to appeal against action taken on a report of mine, but injustice to the teacher, not to mention my own self-respect and the responsibilities of my office, I cannot conscientiously do otherwise.—I am, yours, etc.,

The Resident Commissioner,

A. PURSER.

### No. 2.

COMMISSIONERS OF NATIONAL EDUCATION, IRELAND,

ABERNETHY, June 30th, 1911.

Dear Sir—I will take measures that your appeal shall be heard by the Board.

I may say that I fail to understand how you are aggrieved. The teacher's appeal was formally referred to you for your observations, but you were neither asked nor expected to visit the school, and I fancy you are aware of my objection to your holding what was called "check examinations" without orders. Again, I fail to see how you have a right to question the way in which your report was treated, unless it is your contention that a chief inspector's report is final, and

must be, even when I have first knowledge, as in this case. Such a misconception of his position is strange in an official of 49 years' standing. It is still more strange to find him discussing the details of administration, which are my province, with a Commissioner, and giving him confidential information which should be reserved for my ear. Such conduct shows that the official of 49 years' standing has not yet learned the most elementary rules of the service. Again, I cannot grasp how the teachers has been unjustly treated. Weeks ago I directed that his school should be examined by a chief inspector next year, and that, if his report is good, the increment should be payable from April 1st in this year. I fail to see what further I could do, unless I am to be subject to the dictation of a subordinate, who has given me no evidence that his judgment is unbiased in dealing with his own subordinates.—Yours faithfully,

W. J. M. STARKIE.

### No. 3.

COMMISSIONERS OF NATIONAL EDUCATION, IRELAND.

July 1st, 1911.

Dear Sir—On further thoughts, I have decided not to bring your appeal before the Board, as you are not entitled to appeal against a decision of mine which does not affect you personally. I act thus in your interest, as I had intended to ask the Board to consider you for your incoordination; but as I am very anxious not to do anything to affect your pension, I will let the matter drop. In the hope that you may come to see the impropriety of your conduct.—Yours faithfully,

W. J. M. STARKIE.

### No. 4.

COMMISSIONERS OF NATIONAL EDUCATION, IRELAND.

July 12th, 1911.

Dear Mr. Purser—I have not replied to your last letter, as I was away, and very busy with extraneous matters since my return last Friday.

If I may venture to advise you, I would drop this affair altogether. My letter was, no doubt, strongly expressed, but you gave me cause for anger by the tone of your letter, which was a reflection on my sense of justice. As far as I remember, my charges were:—(1) That you held a check inspection on Clodduff school without orders. This cannot be denied. The point referred to you was whether a re-inspection should be held. By holding it you took the decision out of my hands. You say this was five months ago, but I did not know of your action until April, when I rated Mr. Lemass for not making it perfectly clear that you were not to examine the school; (2) that you discussed details of administration with Mr. Ward, in violation of my orders, sent round some years ago, that no officer

should do this. I am glad you deny the charge. Mr. Ward had told me he had discussed the matter with him, and that you showed him specimens of the work. Of course, I could not conduct the administration, if Commissioners, behind my back, discussed questions with officials. (3) That you were insubordinate. This can hardly be denied. The administration could not go on if my orders are not accepted. You know there

is a B.O. that even the orders of the secretaries must be obeyed, as coming from me or the Board.—Yours truly,

W. J. M. STARKIE.

P.S.—As I am the final authority on details of administration, no responsibility rests on any subordinate officers for my acts.

## APPENDIX XV.

(Handed in by Mr. A. Purser.)

WESTON, 5th August, 1911.

Dear Mr. Purser—The notification you mention in your letter has not yet reached Mr. Fenton or myself.

—Yours faithfully,

J. S. CUSHEE.

## APPENDIX XVI.

(Handed in by Mr. A. Purser.)

No. 1.

### INSPECTORS AND TEACHERS.

LETTER FROM MR. PHILIP WAIN.

To the Editor, *Irish Independent*.

Sir—It is not my intention or desire at present to express publicly any opinion on the dismissal of Mr. Mansfield or on the merits of the controversy to which it has given rise.

Without touching on this very delicate and painful subject, however, I should like to make some reference to the letter of Mr. Purser, late chief inspector, which was read at the public meeting in the Mansion House on Friday evening. My reason for doing so is that I believe he is alluding in that letter to a case in which I have been very much interested almost from the first day I became a member of the Board, and is in, I consider, only fair to all concerned that I should give my version of what took place during the negotiations.

#### WITHOUT INSTRUCTIONS.

On the first occasion on which I mentioned the case to Mr. Purser he told me that he had already visited the school in question, and had formed a more favourable opinion of the teacher and his work than the senior inspector had done. Immediately afterwards I brought the case under the notice of Dr. Starke, telling him that I believed justice had not been done to the teacher, and earnestly appealing for a review of his case.

He informed me that Mr. Purser had interfered in the case without instructions to review the report of the senior inspector, and contrary to the practice followed in the office, as set forth in the orders of the Resident Commissioner, and which are of many years' standing. He also told me that he had himself visited the school in the month of March, 1911, and satisfied himself that the chief inspector's report ought not to be interfered with. I still urged strongly that as the chief inspector had been favourably impressed with the school, he might, apart from the question of the regularity of the inspection, justly award the increment of good service salary from the 1st of April, 1910.

#### A QUESTION AS TO DATE.

Notwithstanding his expression of opinion as to the efficiency of the school and the unauthorized and irregular report of Mr. Purser, the Resident Commissioner stated to me that he would take the chief inspector's views into consideration, so far as to order that the school should be inspected by the chief inspector in the course of the following year, and that if the report then furnished were favourable the question of awarding an increment to the teacher from the date mentioned would be specially considered.

A difference of opinion as to the accuracy of this date arose afterwards between Dr. Starke and myself. He maintained that he said 1st April, 1911, and could not possibly mean 1910, while I was equally convinced the latter was the date from which the increment was to be paid.

Some time towards the end of June or the beginning of July, 1911, Dr. Starke informed me that Mr. Purser had written a letter requesting that his views in the case should be brought before the Board, and that to this he had replied that if Mr. Purser wished he would bring the case specially before the Board, but thought it might not be prudent in Mr. Purser's own interests, and that Mr. Purser did not press the matter further. I cannot myself recall any instance, during the past two years, in which an appeal against the report of an inspector on the work and character of a school, or the result of such an appeal, ever came formally before the Board.

#### IN CONTACT WITH DR. STARKIE.

Mr. Purser again visited the school on the 8th September, 1911, although the Resident Commissioner maintained he should, not, according to directions, have done so until 1912, and, consequently, the report which the chief inspector sent in on this occasion was not acted on, and no increment as a result of the report was awarded to the teacher.

After this inspection, Mr. Purser submitted to me samples of the written work and drawing which had been executed in this and a neighbouring school, taken, he said, at random from similar standards in both schools. This neighbouring school had got higher report than the school under consideration, while undoubtedly the specimens of work from the lower-marked school were, in my judgment, by far the better.

On the 21st March, 1912, Dr. Starke, carrying out his promise to me, and in accordance with his intentions and the direction already given, sent the chief inspector at present in charge of the school, and as the report showed an improvement in the school work since the preceding year, an increment of good service salary was granted to the teacher.

#### TEACHERS AND INSPECTORS.

I have here tried to give a brief and impartial history of this case, upon which so much importance has been laid. I was very grateful to Mr. Purser for his sympathy with the teacher, and I must state here that I should like to see a similar state of feeling subsisting between all our teachers and our inspectors. Inspectors, while doing their duty fearlessly, need never forget that the teachers, too, have rights as well as duties, and that they have sometimes great difficulties to contend with. They should remember how very easy it is for an official to make a teacher's life a burden to him, and perhaps even render his teaching ineffective.

I am bound to state in justice to Dr. Starkie that he acted throughout this case in a most sympathetic manner towards the teacher, and, notwithstanding the difference of opinion already referred to, he kept faith with me in all he had promised.

PHILIP WARD,

Commissioner of National Education.

Belfast, 26th October, 1912.

No. 2.

*Irish Independent*, 31st October, 1912.

# MR. WARD'S LETTER.

A REPLY FROM DR. STARKIE.

To the Editor, *Irish Independent*.

Sir—The Resident Commissioner of National Education wishes to draw attention to the following passage in the letter of Mr. Ward in to-day's issue of the *Irish Independent* :—

"Some time towards the end of June or the beginning of July, 1911, Dr. Starkie informed me that Mr. Purser had written a letter requesting that his views in the case should be brought before the Board, and that to this he had replied that if Mr. Purser wished he would bring the case specially before the Board, but thought it might not be prudent in Mr. Purser's own interests."

## TWO LETTERS TO MR. PURSER.

The Resident Commissioner wrote twice to Mr. Purser, and so far as he remembers Mr. Ward has given the substance of the first letter. But subsequently the Resident Commissioner wrote a second letter, of which the following, to the best of his recollection, was the purport:—That (by Board's Order of 7th January, 1908), outside of general principles and the classes of subject matter to which they are applicable, and subject to the right of individual Commissioners to raise whatever matters they thought proper, he alone had authority to decide what cases should be submitted to the Board, and that he would not tolerate dictation in this matter from any subordinate official; that in company with Mr. Dilworth he had inspected the school himself, and had taken suitable action; that on further consideration he had altered his mind, and had decided not to bring Mr. Purser's unauthorised and irregular report before the Board, in Mr. Purser's own interests, as his position was already in jeopardy on account of his previous suspensions by the Board for insubordination, and the Resident Commissioner was most anxious that a third conviction for the same offences should not prevent him from recommending Mr. Purser for a full pension.

## AN APPEAL TO THE BOARD.

Mr. Ward seems to think that the teacher's innocence was proved from April, 1910. In no circumstances could this have been done. The Resident Commissioner promised to substitute the report in 1912 of the Chief Inspector for the Senior Inspector's report of the preceding school year (1910-11). This is, in effect, stalling the latter's report.

It should be remembered that it was open to Mr. Purser, as to any other official, if he felt aggrieved, to appeal to the Board through the Secretaries; and, fur-

thermore, that Mr. Ward might have raised the question at the Board at any time if he was dissatisfied with the action taken by the Resident Commissioner as head of the Administration.

A. N. BONAPARTE WISE

(Priv. Sec.)

Office of National Education,  
Dublin, Oct. 30th, 1912.

No. 3.

MR. PURSER AND DR. STARKIE.

LETTER FROM MR. PHILIP WARD.

To the Editor, *Irish Independent*.

Sir—With reference to my letter, published in the *Irish Independent* of Wednesday, permit me to say that I have received a note from Mr. Purser, in which he states :—

- (1) That he interfered in the case alluded to without instructions to review the report of the Senior Inspector, and contrary to the practice followed in the office.
- (2) The accuracy of Dr. Starkie's version as to bringing the report of the Chief Inspector before the Board.

Mr. Purser also states that by the following year he understood, not the calendar year 1912, but the school year 1911-12.

Belfast, 31st October, 1912.

PHILIP WARD.

No. 4.

## A CORRECTION.

To the Editor, *Irish Independent*.

Sir—Your issue of this date has a misprint in the letter I addressed to Mr. Ward. If you refer to my MS. you will find that the second last paragraph reads as follows :—

"As regards No. 2, he (Dr. Starkie) wrote on 30th June from Abbeyleix that he would bring the matter before the Board; on 1st July he wrote from the Education Office that he would not do so; on 2nd July I sent him a letter containing my resignation to date from 31st October." Instead of 2nd July you have printed 20th July.

A. PURSER.

12 Palmerston Road, Dublin,  
November 2nd, 1912.

No. 5.

MR. PURSER AND DR. STARKIE.

To the Editor, *Irish Independent*.

Sir—Dr. Starkie has written to me with reference to Mr. Purser's denial No. 1, as given in my note in yesterday's issue. He states that the only communication sent to Mr. Purser at the time mentioned, regarding the case in question, was one asking him to express an opinion on the tone of a letter received from the teacher of the school, and to say what action should be taken.

I have now done with this case, and shall not trespass further on your space. Knowing so much about the matter I have tried to be fair and impartial to all concerned, and to keep the case distinct from every other issue.

Nov. 2nd, 1912.

PHILIP WARD.

## APPENDIX XVII.

(Handed in by Mr. A. PUNNIA.)

## Alteration of duties of Chiefs of Inspection.

| Alteration of duties not corresponding to new duties. | New duties assigned to Chief Inspectors (Chiefs of Inspection).   | By whom performed hitherto.  | Duties taken from Chief Inspectors (Chiefs of Inspection).   | To whom assigned. | Duties that should be assigned to Chief Inspectors to enable them to perform their functions. |
|---|---|--|--|-------------------|---|
| § 1 partially   | § 1 a. "Immediate responsibility" for the inspection work of the circles.   | 01 Inspectors, each in his own district.   | Noting and checking on action to be taken or recommended on Inspectors' reports.   | § 2 "Inspectors"  | Preparation of Annex of Report of Inspectors, etc.  |
| § 2 partially   | § 2 a. Partially new, (Hitherto Chiefs of Inspectors had annual conferences with the Head Inspectors.)  | 10 Head Inspector had usually annual conferences with District Inspector and Inspector's Assistant.  | Recommendations as to appointments and transfers in model schools; and as to appointment of Tamil teachers and monitors. | § 4 "Inspectors." |   |
| —   | § 2 b. Report on each Circle.   | 01 Head Inspectors   | Noting of diplomas, graduation sheets, and other documents of Training College.  | § 4 "Inspectors"  |   |
| —   | § 2 c. General Annual Report for full Ireland.  | Each Head Inspector for one-sixth of Ireland.  | Teachers' Examination—mark of questions of Papers, etc.  | § 7 "Inspectors." |   |
| § 4 partially   | § 4. Dual control instead of single, it refers as required nearly general superintendence.  | One Chief Inspector  | Preparation of Circulars official orders—forms and circulars in connection with the Inspector's Branch.                  | § 8 "Inspectors"  |   |
| —   | § 4.5. Examination of schools. (Especially forbidden by B.I. on Report of Unscrupulous Commission, 1974).   | Head and District Inspectors.  | Property of Inspectors' Journals for Board.  | Do do.            |   |
| § 5   | —   | —  |  |                   |   |
| § 7. (S.B.—District and Junior Inspectors)            | § 7 (a) Responsibility for the character of work done by Inspectors and Organizers.   | Not specially named.   |  |                   |   |
| —   | (a) for the character of the standards in their officers' journals.   | 10 and 01. Responsibility has rested with each Inspector and Organizer.  |  |                   |   |
| —   | § 8. Responsibility for the (a) organization, and (b) activities, for the National Schools in each Inspection Circle.   | § 8. (a) Teacher & Manager (b) Councilmen. [The meeting system shows that the Councilmen seem to be still responsible for the activities.] |  |                   |   |
| § 12. —   | (c) Teachers' Teachers and Managers.  | (c) Inspectors (Head and District).  |  |                   |   |
| § 13. partially                                       | § 13. Training of newly appointed Inspectors, Organizers, etc.  | Head and District Inspectors.  |  |                   |   |
| § 15. partially (Effects only general arrangements).  | § 15. Responsibility for local arrangements for Examination of Teachers, etc.   | District Inspectors.   |  |                   |   |
| § 16. partially                                       | § 16. (S.B. Chief Inspector to be held responsible for the work of his colleague when absent.)  | —  |  |                   |   |
| § 16 partially  | § 16. To advise Commissioners on Educational matters.   | —  |  |                   |   |
| § 16 partially  | § 16. To make themselves personally acquainted with the results of Training of Model and other large schools so as to be able to advise Commissioners about promotion, etc. | Head and District Inspectors (at least as regards ordinary schools).   |  |                   |   |
| § 18 —  | § 18 —  | —  |  |                   |   |
| —   | § 17. Undefined duties  | Undefined  |  |                   |   |
| §   | § 18 ("A room")   | Literary.  |  |                   |   |



## APPENDIX XVIII.

(Handed in by Mr. PUNSEL.)

No. 1.—LETTER TO CHAIRMAN ENCLOSED EXTRACTS FROM A LETTER OF M. VERNEY, INSPECTEUR DES ÉCOLES PRIMAIRES (CHARENT, ALPES MARITIMES, FRANCE).

No. 2.—EXTRACTS FROM LETTER OF M. VERNEY.

No. 3.—TWO SPECIMEN FORMS (BULLETIN D'INSPECTION.)

No. 1.

12 PALMERSTON ROAD,  
28th March, 1913.

DEAR MR. SANUEL,

In my examination by the National Education Committee, I was asked some questions on the French system of inspection, etc., which I answered to the best of my ability. However, to procure absolutely correct information for the Committee, I wrote to my friend, M. Verney, and now enclose you a copy of his reply; also two forms of report used in the département Alpes Maritimes. (Note the little paragraph at the end of each report, and the French method of pushing out an inefficient teacher.)

I am,

Yours faithfully,

A. PUNSEL.

No. 2.

Extracts from a letter of M. Verney, French Inspector of Primary Schools:—

"(1) The raising of class (i.e., promotion) for teachers. It is chiefly based on time of service. From the fifth to the fourth class, and from the fourth to the third, after five years; from the third to the second, after six years. Some, one-fourth, are promoted by choice (selection) after three or four years, and the choice is made by us. From the second to the first class, promotions by choice only, after a stay of at least six years in the second class. To prepare the 'choice' promotion list, we, the Elementary Inspectors, meet under the presidency of the Inspecteur d'Académie (Head Inspector) and discuss the merits of the candidates. There is a kind of control by what we call the 'Conseil départemental de l'enseignement primaire,' in which all the school masters or school mistresses, but no name may be added to the list we have established [drawn up]. You know that an increase of salary for teachers has been voted by the Parliament, £12, but it will be realized in four or five years. But teachers will not yet be rich; the first class will get £160 exactly. It is just to say that in the towns they get many additional grants or bounties, according to the importance of the town. At Nice it may amount to £25, at Cannes £15, and so on.

"(2) The monthly syllabus. There is no general rule, and every department has not an official one, like in Haute Savoie. Here there is none; but good teachers, and they are a majority, establish [draw up] one for every class of the school, and it is posted up in the class room. This way of proceeding allows to make a difference, according to the place and to the school: it will not be the same on the mountain and on the Riviera, in a mixed school with 12 or 30 pupils, and a big school of 10 classes and 400 pupils.

"(3) All our inspections are unexpected ones; they are confined to inspection. On our arrival in the class room, we sit down and let things go on as usual. We look at registers, monthly exercise copy books, daily copy books. As a rule we stay one hour and a half in a class; the last half-hour is devoted to questions we put to pupils on some particular points, but it has not at all the character of an examination.

"I don't remember whether I sent you a model of the 'bulletin d'inspection' used here. I send you two; one of an old master, a large man who will go out on pension this year. [N.B.—This lay man is in first class.—A.P.] And the other of a young mistress that

wanted to be called a title; she does better now. But the last reports are an exception. Mind, that they have to copy themselves what we have written on their class and their way of teaching. It is already a punishment.

"(4) How we decide of the merit of a teacher.—We have no absolute criterion. The chief are his way of teaching and the moral nobility he has acquired in the place by his conduct and manners. We take into account also what he does for post-school classes and institutions connected with the school (cantines scolaires, mutualité scolaires, tir et préparation militaire—we have a great deal of these now).

"Of course there is nothing mathematical in our appreciation, and we may err more or less, like all human beings; but you must have experienced it, it is not difficult to make out whether a school is or is not on a good footing, whether work is or is not done regularly and conscientiously."

No. 3.

## BULLETIN D'INSPECTION.

M.....(1).....  
 Inspecteur (2).....  
 (.....classe)  
 Circonscription de Grasse.  
 Canton de Grasse.  
 Commune de.....

Age: 39. Années de service: 41.  
 Etat civil: Marié.  
 Charges de famille (enfants mineurs):.....  
 Titres de capacité: B.E.  
 Elève de l'école de:.....  
 Distinctions honorifiques (Dates):.....  
 Classe: 1er. Traitement fixe: 3,500.  
 Date de la nomination au poste actuel:.....  
 Observations particulières:.....

## ÉCOLE A.....CLASSE.

.....Classe.

|                           | De la classe. | De l'école. | TOTAL. |
|---------------------------|---------------|-------------|--------|
| Nombre d'élèves inscrits: | 39            |             |        |
| — présents:               | 20            |             |        |

Fréquentation scolaire: Mauvaise, était meilleure en hiver.

Cours d'adultes:.....

Secrétariat de mairie: 400.

Avantages accessoires:.....

État du local: local convenable, a besoin de travaux d'entretien-prévue.

(1) M.....  
 (2) ST (stagiaire) ou T (titulaire) ou D (directeur);  
 A (adjoint).

Tenue matérielle de l'école : Passable ; Salle de classe peu propre, bureau du maître encombré.  
 Education et discipline : La propreté laisse à désirer ; la discipline reste faible ; les élèves se déplacent, causent, font un peu comme chez eux.

Tenue des registres : Assez bien.

Tenue des cahiers : Bonne pour 2 ou 3 élèves ; médiocre pour les autres, surtout au cours élémentaire (1re année) où l'on a pris de mauvaises habitudes.

Correction des devoirs : faite pour les premiers ; mais pour les 2, aucune correction ni surveillance du travail.

Préparation de la classe : choix des devoirs ; leçons entendues ; Journal de classe, avec des inégalités, détails exagérés pour l'histoire, leçons de sciences appelées exercices de langage. Devoirs assez bons au cours moyen ; passables au c. élément. (2e année), médiocres ailleurs, mauvaises copies. — Leçons : — Correction de dictée ; individuelle ; les explications qui suivent sont médiocres. — Grammaire (c. élève) : l'adjectif ; on ne serait pas mal si le maître un peu se faisait lui-même, ne laissant pas aux élèves le temps de réfléchir. Calcul. — Problèmes peu appropriés à la leçon faite ; on fait moyennement les opérations sont pénibles. Rédaction : Des fautes seulement ; Dictée pénible.

Appréhension générale de la méthode et des procédés d'enseignement ; résultats : Le travail est toujours mal organisé chez M. (on 6 groupes parmi ses élèves, qu'il n'arrive pas à faire travailler simultanément. Il s'agit et parle beaucoup, mais c'est souvent du simple bavardage. Il est fort en retard pour le plupart des matières du programme. Le niveau laisse : l'an dernier il avait encore 4 ou 5 élèves qui finissaient à peu près ; il n'y en a, plus qu'un cette année.

Il devrait comprendre que le moment du repos est venu pour lui.

A Grasse, le....., 1912.

L'Inspecteur primaire : Signé, VERMAY.

Vu : L'Inspecteur d'académie : Signé : JOURNET.

Fait en communication le.....1912.

L'Instituteur.....

Je regrette d'avoir à constater dans le dossier de M. .... que des observations de ce genre lui ont été adressées déjà, à plusieurs reprises. Je ne veux pas insister alors qu'il accomplit sa 41e année de service mais ne doute pas lui rappeler qu'il y a deux ans déjà je lui ai conseillé de songer au repos. Je lui serai obligé de me faire connaître quelles sont à ce sujet ses intentions. Il serait sage de sa part de devancer la mesure que nous serons bien obligés de prendre.

N.B.—Prière de prendre pour vous-même copie de ce Bulletin, pour le représenter aux inspections ultérieures. En faire une autre copie et l'adresser avec ce Bulletin, revêtu de votre signature, à M. l'Inspecteur primaire.

No. 4.

# BULLETIN D'INSPECTION.

M..... (2).....

Instituteur (2) T. à.....

Chapelle de Grasse.

Croix de Saint Vallier.

Coursiers d.....

Age..... Années de service : 6j.

Etat civil : Célibataire.

Charges de famille (enfants mineurs).....

Titres de capacité : B.S.—C.A.P.

Elève de l'école de.....

(1) Mm.....

(2) S.T. (régulier) ou T. (titulaire), ou D. (directeur) ; A. (adjoint).

Distinctions honorifiques (Dates) :

Classe : 5. Traitement fixe : 1,300f.

Date de la nomination au poste actuel.....

Observations particulières.....

ECOLE N° 1 CLASSE.

|                            | De la classe | De l'école | Total |
|----------------------------|--------------|------------|-------|
| Nombre d'élèves inscrits : | 14           |            |       |
| Nombre d'élèves présents : | 13           |            |       |

Préparation de la classe : Assez bonne.

Cours d'adultes : .....

Secrétariat de mairie : .....

Avantages accessoires : .....

Etat du local : Assez bon ; les cabinets sont peu convenables.

Tenue matérielle de l'école : L'ensemble est propre et rangé ; dans la salle de classe, 2 gravures, qui sont de la réforme, à faire disparaître.

Education et discipline : La tenue des élèves est assez bonne dans l'ensemble ; la discipline est bonne.

Tenue des registres : Totaux à faire au registre d'appel, s'inscrire au registre matriciel.

Tenue des cahiers : Assez bien ; on n'a pas encore constaté des habitudes de goût traîné, titres. Les cahiers manuels sont tenus.

Correction des devoirs : Faite régulièrement et abondamment ; trop de corrections sont nécessaires ; le travail n'a pas été assez préparé ou n'est pas assez surveillé.

Préparation de la classe : choix des devoirs ; leçons entendues : Préparation par écrit pas assez méthodique ni régulière ; la préparation matérielle fait défaut, quelques particularités dans les devoirs de français, ceux de calcul sont empruntés au livre. Leçons : Instruction civique : On récite un résumé, on en copie un autre 2 mots sont expliqués ; c'est insuffisant. Grammaire : Alternativement à 2 cours : on récite le livre ; qq. explications assez bonnes néanmoins. Lecture (cours prep.) : De bonnes classes. Calcul : Bonne leçon au cours prep. prép. opérations sèches au cours élève, mais assez bien faites ; problèmes bons au cours moyen.

Appréhension générale de la méthode et des procédés d'enseignement ; résultats : Méth. .... fait travailler mais le travail n'est pas bien organisé ; pas d'emploi du temps, pas de programme mensuel, et on ne tire pas tout le profit possible de ce qui est fait. D'autre part, elle se contente trop de faire apprendre par cœur et ne croit pas devoir faire des leçons. Il faudra qu'elle s'y mette ; elle est jeune, elle ne manque ni de savoir, ni de bonne volonté, ni d'aptitudes ; la preuve c'est qu'elle a fait quelques bonnes leçons et elle peut mieux. Elle n'a pu faire son éducation dans le sens réel ou elle ne trouvait, et on elle n'a guère été inspectée ; mais maintenant c'est une nouvelle vie pédagogique qui commence pour elle, et il faut qu'elle fasse un effort dès maintenant. Elle tiendra compte des différentes remarques ci-dessus, et des recommandations verbales.

A Grasse, le....., 1912.

L'Inspecteur primaire, J. VERMAY.

Vu : L'Inspecteur d'académie.....

Fait en communication le.....1912.

L'Instituteur.....

Je ne comprends pas qu'une jeune institutrice ne sente pas le besoin d'organiser (voir plus haut le point souligné) son travail. Il est indispensable qu'elle s'y mette sérieusement.

N.B.—Prière de prendre pour vous-même copie de ce Bulletin, pour le représenter aux inspections ultérieures. En faire une autre copie et l'adresser avec ce Bulletin, revêtu de votre signature, à M. l'Inspecteur primaire.

## APPENDIX XIX.

(Handed in by Mr. E. Downing.)

## NATIONAL EDUCATION: COMMITTEE OF INQUIRY.

RICHARD DOWLING.

|                                       |         |
|---------------------------------------|---------|
| Assist. Master Limerick Model School, | 1896    |
| Head Master Limerick Model School,    | 1898    |
| District Inspector, ... ..            | 19.3.74 |
| Head Inspector, ... ..                | 5.1.92  |
| Chief of Inspection, ... ..           | 23.4.95 |
| Notrod, ... ..                        | 1.6.94  |

As requested, I here submit a statement of the points on which I may be able to give evidence relevant to the investigation that is being held by the National Education Committee of Inquiry. I intend to follow as closely as possible the order of the references in His Excellency's mandate.

## The Programmes.

The present programmes of the National Board do not conduce to sound education. They are very unsuitable to the National Schools, and detrimental to the interests of both pupils and teachers, for the following reasons:—

(a) They do not give due prominence to Reading, Writing, and Arithmetic, and do not leave sufficient time for adequate instruction in these, the most essential branches.

It is to learn to read, write, and calculate the children are sent to school. It is a knowledge of Reading, Writing, and Arithmetic that is absolutely necessary to fit them for the humble vocations of life open to the typical National School pupil, or for a course of further instruction in a secondary school, or for self-study in after-life. It is on his success in teaching these subjects the popularity of the teacher with the parents and general public depends.

A conscientious teacher should consider first and above all the interests of the pupils entrusted to his care, and should not be diverted from this purpose by regulations which are the outcome of gross ignorance of the circumstances.

In the case of schools with average attendance less than 25, and, therefore, taught by one teacher (without assistance), it is a matter of easy calculation to see that there is time for but two half-hour lessons per week in Reading and in Arithmetic, supposing that one lesson of half-an-hour's duration is given per week in each of the other prescribed subjects. According to the latest available returns, there are 2,687 such schools (more than one-fourth of all).

(b) The programmes are impossible of fulfilment in their entirety, and give no idea of the amount of work which should be accepted by the inspector as satisfactory. Hence they are not conducive to uniformity of standards on the part of the inspectors. They leave the teacher at the mercy of an inexperienced or unsympathetic or unsympathetic inspector.

(c) The programmes are interspersed with suggestions as to method of instruction, some of which an experienced teacher should not willingly adopt. While the directions are embodied in the programme, some inspectors will deem them obligatory on the teacher, and may give an unfavourable report no matter how successfully the instruction had been given otherwise.

Instances of this are:—Requiring, at a Writing lesson, the model to be set before the children on a blackboard. This is contrary to common-sense. Requiring History to be taught orally; no text-book allowed except in the senior group, and then only as supplementary to the oral instruction. This is an amazing regulation. And again, requiring a knowledge of the "subject-matter" of the reading-books. This is well calculated to bring untrained censure on some teachers.

(d) The scheme of grouping of the standards in small schools is a badly conceived one. Simultaneous instruction given to 4th, 5th, and 6th standards in English, or Arithmetic, or Composition must be either uninteresting and valueless to the more advanced pupils, or unintelligible to the less advanced.

The teacher should be free, (as he was formerly) to adopt the best scheme he could learn or devise for conducting his school. It is utterly unfair to hold a teacher responsible for the failure of a scheme that has been forced upon him.

That the "new scheme" has proved a failure there is no longer room to doubt. The pupils now leaving the National Schools are not nearly as advanced in sound education as formerly; they are notoriously deficient in Arithmetic and more advanced Mathematics. The National Board should long since have been made aware of this failure if the inspectors dared to give expression to their honest convictions.

In fine, the programmes indicate, on the part of those who are responsible for their construction, gross ignorance of the circumstances, and particularly of the very great difficulties to be contended with in the teaching of these schools in which the attendance is sufficient but for one teacher, or for a principal with a junior assistant mistress. The number of such schools is 4,784; that is more than half of all the National Schools.

As the stability of a building depends on the quality of the foundations, so, in order to understand how the present disastrous condition of National Education has come, it is necessary to go back to the origin of the "new scheme."

The "new scheme" was submitted to the Board early in the year 1900, in an anonymous document, headed simply "Memorandum," and subscribed with the printer's initials, A. T. & Co., and the date, 11/90. The following passage is quoted verbatim from that document:—

"There are various systems of school organisation that are simpler and more effective than the *hyperic*, *trigetric*, etc., but it is suggested that the system which best suits the majority of Irish schools is one under which every child would be under instruction in the same subject at the same time. This would enable a single teacher to work a small school efficiently. A single teacher would have no difficulty in securing the attention of 30 or 40 children at reading or any one subject at the same time. For example, take the case of a teacher with a school of, say, 25 pupils, ranging from 5 to 15 years of age. Of course, these children would have different degrees of proficiency in, say, reading, but a skilful teacher could instruct the whole formed into one class for reading at the same time, if he commenced with the most junior, and asked the seniors to explain difficulties in spelling, etc., experienced by the juniors. When he came to the seniors, the juniors would benefit by the teacher's explanation of their difficulties. Or the teacher might get some of the more advanced pupils to instruct the juniors while he was engaged with the seniors, etc."

Is the writer or responsible author of this farcical scheme the fit person to have automatic control over the National School system?

## Instructions to Inspectors.

The latest instructions to inspectors as to the grounds upon which they are to base their judgments on the merits of the schools are, because of their vagueness of inconsistency, calculated to lead to error, to want of uniformity, and consequently to injustice and hardship to some teachers.

Rule 68 reads:—"When the inspectors are able to report that a school is in a very efficient state, it is unnecessary to make detailed inspections every year. Visits for the general report may, as a rule, be short, and impressions of the school should be gained by

an observation chiefly of the department, address, and intelligence of the pupils, together with a careful examination of the school syllabus, scheme of work, and written exercises. The inspectors should be careful to ascertain that the syllabus and schemes have been duly carried out."

How can an inspector be able to report that a school is in a very efficient state without an examination? How can he pronounce upon the intelligence of the pupils without examining them? How can he ascertain that the syllabus and schemes have been duly carried out without an examination?

The department and address of the pupils depend mainly on their home associations. The teacher may be able to improve them a little, but, at best, only a little. The inspector has no means of ascertaining to what extent the teacher deserves credit for the department and address of his pupils.

To pronounce on the merits of a school on a mere inspection without examination is a difficulty which no honest, intelligent inspector should like to face. Very few of the inspectors are competent to do it, even with a moderate degree of reliability. As for the assumption that the inspectors can, with justice, make this hair-splitting classification of the schools under the headings of excellent, very good, good, fair, middling, and bad, I must characterise it as a vain and mischievous one.

The impression left on the mind of an inspector from a mere inspection of a school without examination is far too vague a basis for a report on which the promotion of the teacher and increments of salary depend.

#### The Inspectors.

A large majority of the inspectors I found to be just and considerate to the teachers, conscientious and careful in the discharge of all their duties; but there were always a considerable number of cranks, who confined their efforts mainly to a search for defects in minor details as material for a report, while they avoided the trouble of measuring the amount of good work that had been effected.

To prevent or minimise the injustice likely to be done to the teachers by inspectors of the latter class, the programme and instructions should be very definite; and the report of such inspectors should always be carefully scrutinised by a superior officer.

Before the introduction of the "new scheme" this was done. The reports of the inspectors were then read and noted by the Chiefs of Inspection. Now, this most important work is assigned to three clerks, men of inferior rank to those whose work they are set to supervise, and who do not understand the technicalities of school work and inspection, nor know the idiosyncrasies of certain inspectors. The recommendations of promotions and increments of salary are dealt with by a very junior inspector. This, of course, in the natural order of things, should be done, as of old, by the chief inspectors; but the present Education Office order of things is not a natural, but a topsy-turvy one.

Under the present regime the inspectors are subjected to coercion of a very irregular and mischievous kind, which tends to produce friction between them and the managers and teachers, and which renders their reports comparatively unreliable and valueless.

The topics of their reports are dictated to them, and they are given to understand plainly enough that their reports must be in harmony with "the policy of the Board," which means that they are expected to confine themselves to a glorification of the "new scheme," and a condemnation of all the "old-fashioned" measures and works of the Board antecedent to the advent of the present Resident Commissioner.

The following is a verbatim quotation from an official letter addressed to me, when dated inspector, directing me to write a general report:—"You should avoid expressing any opinions adverse to the educational policy of the Board, as indicated by their recent Regulations and by the Revised Programme of

Instruction, and confine yourself to forming a judgment, so far as the general reports of the inspectors and other available sources of information will enable you, of the success that has attended the policy so far, and the prospective effect of the action of the Commissioners on the education of the country generally, so far as you can foresee. Your general report should be full and complete, and should embody any recommendations in harmony with the educational policy of the Commissioners which you may think it desirable to make."

In another official letter I was directed "to quote in" my "report all passages in the inspectors' reports dealing with managers, and the local interest taken in the schools"; and it proceeds thus:—"You will also be good enough to embody in your general report a statement as to the provision made by these locally interested in the schools in your division for school prizes, as stimuli to application to study on the part of the pupils. Your report should also contain a suggestion to managers of schools that they can greatly second the efforts of the inspectors by visiting the schools and holding test examinations of classes, or by getting the inspectors to do so in their presence, and by seeing that the observations of the inspectors in the Observation Book are attended to."

When I sent in the report thus called for I received the following letter:—"October 18th, 1902. Dear Mr. Downing, I have been reading the paragraph in your annual report concerning the managers, and I am afraid I cannot agree with your views, that it would be unanimously agreed that they deserve well of their country. I have read all the reports of 1902 lately, and I have noted many passages in which inspectors criticise the managers adversely. I would wish you to consider the managers' duties from three points of view:—(1) How they avail themselves of larger initiation under new schemes—the inspectors are unanimous that they don't to any appreciable extent. (2) General supervision. (3) Uplift of schools. I send you proofs of Appendix to my address in which I quote passages which (so far as your part of Ireland is concerned) ought to be included among your extracts.—Yours very truly, (Signed) W. J. M. Sturkie."

The position of manager of a National School is an homeric one, and, I may add, a very thankless one, involving a considerable amount of correspondence and much trouble of various kinds, as well as some expense. It is a position that few suitable laymen can be got to accept; most are clergymen, many of them not overburdened with wealth.

The managers have undertaken the position under certain conditions; these, in my opinion, the Commissioners are not justified in altering (as they have recently done) without their consent. At all events, I submit it would be an unwise impertinence for any inspector to suggest to the managers that they should give money for prizes, or that they should hold examinations of their schools. This is one of the numerous inconsistencies of the "new scheme," that the Commissioners are striving to force the managers to hold examinations just when they themselves are depreciating the value of examinations, and directing their inspectors to hold examination only in exceptional cases.

In my very extensive experience as inspector, extending into every province and almost every county of Ireland, I found the managers, with very few exceptions, taking a deep interest in their schools, visiting them frequently, and fully conversant with their condition. It was a very exceptional occasion on which the manager was not present during my inspection. But Dr. Sturkie had attacked the managers in his address at Belfast, and the inspectors were whipped up to try to justify statements which, according to my experience, were unfounded, and which certainly had no basis in any experience of his own.

#### Increments and Promotions.

The schools most difficult to teach successfully are, beyond question, those in which the attendance admits of the employment of but one teacher, who has, without any aid, to teach and supervise seven or eight

classes or standards. I know the exceeding difficulty, because I have helped to organize many of them. There are the schools that need the most resourceful teachers. They are generally in remote localities where, for several obvious reasons, the most reliable men or women are required. Yet the teacher of a school, with an average attendance of under 50, is debarred from promotion above the third or lowest grade. Teachers possessed of the necessary qualifications are not likely to remain contented under these circumstances, and, consequently, the pupils of these schools are placed at a serious disadvantage.

In schools having an average attendance of over 50, but under 60, the help of a "junior assistant mistress" is allowed. From my experience I am obliged to set very little value on this help. I generally found that the help given was not even an equivalent for the trouble of teaching that fell upon the principal teacher. At best this junior assistant mistress but keeps the infants occupied and in order. Accordingly, I include these schools with those of the preceding class as of exceeding difficulty to conduct. The number of schools with average attendance under 60 is 4,388. They constitute much more than half of all the National Schools. Teachers of schools with average attendance of under 60, are not allowed promotion above second grade. From what I have stated, I think it must be admitted that these regulations as to promotion are ill-advised and unfair, and call for relaxation.

Yet, notwithstanding these severe restrictions, there are a great many teachers who have qualified for promotion, and yet cannot get their increments of salary for want of funds. This is a hardship that ought to be remedied immediately.

In view of this fact, it seems strange to find the National Board applying to, and pressing the Treasury for grants towards the establishment of a new hybrid class of schools—Primary-Intermediate—for which there is no apparent want, instead of concentrating their efforts on obtaining the funds badly needed for these schools, for the promotion of which the National Board was called into existence.

Up to the time of Dr. Starke's appointment as Resident Commissioner the estimates to be submitted to the Treasury were always very carefully considered by what was known as the "Office Committee," consisting of the Resident Commissioner, the three Secretaries, and the two Chiefs of Inspection. The "Office Committee" was immediately abolished by Dr. Starke.

On the critical occasion when the estimates were being prepared for the launching of the "new scheme," the Financial Secretary (whether with or without Dr. Starke's knowledge I cannot say) gave me the estimates to read through, and asked me to let him know if I found any items requiring amendment. I told him that the required funds were very seriously under-estimated, pointing out several instances, and I added that, as this estimate was likely to be considered by the Treasury as a standard, the Commission would find great difficulty in getting from the Treasury afterwards the large increases that were bound to be required in the near future. My hint was not acted upon. Again, Dr. Starke asked me as to whether the teachers were justified in claiming certain amounts of Bunkle Fees for the year preceding the change. I explained to him why the claim could not be ignored. This money—a large sum—had subsequently to be paid. No provision was made in the estimates at the proper time for the payment of it.

It was at this time these arrangements with regard to the number of teachers to be recognised in each grade were made. It was a bargain between Dr. Starke and the Treasury officials, and, therefore, it is easy to fix the blame for the scantiness of the provision on the culpable party.

#### *Changes desirable in the system of Inspection.*

The changes desirable in the system of inspection are—

- (1) The office of Chiefs of Inspection to be restored, with the former duties and the old title of "Chiefs

of the Inspection and Statistical Department," so that educational matters may be supervised and directed by educational experts, instead of by clerks as at present.

The "Office Committee" to be revived; and it should be made imperative that all important matters bearing on the suitability and efficiency of the education given in the National Schools should be considered by the Office Committee, and that the views expressed at the meetings of the Office Committee, and the conclusions arrived at, should be duly submitted for the information of the Board before any serious question is decided.

(2) The office of the two Secretaries who attend on the Board should be filled in future, so of old, from the Inspectorial staff. At a certain meeting of the Board, His Grace the Archbishop of Dublin complained that there was no one in attendance able to give required information on educational matters, and an order was given that one of the Chiefs of Inspection should be present at each meeting of the Board in future.

(3) The Inspectorial staff should consist of about four Head Inspectors and about thirty District Inspectors, with some special inspectors for Irish. Each Head Inspector to have charge of some fifteen districts, his duty being to exercise a general supervision over the work of the District Inspectors of his circuit, with a special view to secure uniformity of standards and a judicious system of inspection and examination; he should also investigate cases of complaint or appeal.

Each District Inspector should be left in charge of a certain district for a long period, except on promotion or for serious cause. I affirm adversely that no inspector can give a reliable judgment on the character of a school on his first inspection of it, even with a careful examination. An inspector must be in sole charge of a district for at least two years before he has anything like a reliable knowledge of the character of the several schools. After three years he should have a very complete knowledge, and then he will readily detect retrogression or progress where it has occurred.

(4) Promotions to be made on just lines; juniors not to be placed over their seniors who had given faithful and efficient service.

(5) The District Inspector should not be required to examine every class in every subject; but he should be directed to examine, at his formal annual visit, the pupils of the highest grade very carefully, having before him a tabulation of the number of attendances made each year by each of these pupils since his admittance to this school. The inspector could thus form a valuable opinion of the degree of success with which the teacher had prepared his pupils for the avocations they are soon to enter upon. This should be a very prominent feature of the test as to the merits of the school. The principle might with advantage be extended to others than the pupils of the highest standard. His incidental visits should afford the inspector ample opportunity of judging of the teacher's style of giving instruction and skill in keeping those pupils not directly under instruction profitably employed.

The questions given at an examination should not be, as is too commonly the case, a few difficult ones which only pupils possessed of talents above average can answer, but should be a nicely graduated series, such as the average pupil should be able to answer if he had been properly instructed. Towards the end, a few questions, not difficult but yet demanding some little originality, might be given, with the view of distinguishing the talented pupils; but it should ever be kept well in mind that the teacher cannot supply or improve brains.

The recent outcry against examinations is the natural result of the employment of examiners who are not educationalists, whose aim is to show off their own cleverness at framing or finding worthless puzzles, instead of giving a lead to methodical and useful instruction.

(4) The inspectors not to be coerced, but to be free, as in former times, to express their honest opinions for the information of the Board and the general public.

*Relations of the Commissioners and their Inspectors to the Teachers.*

Up to the time of the introduction of the "new scheme" the relations of the Commissioners and their inspectors to the teachers were quite satisfactory. There is no need for me to describe their present condition.

*Rules and Regulations with regard to the conduct of the Teachers, and especially whether any unduly restrict the liberty of Teachers, etc.*

The "Maternity" Rule (94 J) I consider a very objectionable one, and quite uncalled for. In all my long experience I never became aware of any circumstances to suggest a necessity for this oppressive and nasty regulation.

Rule 105 (d) is one which may easily be availed of to oppress a teacher who had fallen into disrepute with his inspector.

Rule 122 (c). Why should a teacher be not at liberty to promote a pupil whenever he considers him fit to derive more benefit from instruction in a higher grade? This regulation sacrifices the interest of the pupil for some imaginary official convenience.

At page 171, paragraph 4, the teacher is required to strike off the rolls the name of any pupil who has been absent on the previous twenty school days. This must give a good deal of quite unnecessary trouble to the teachers. The complicated accounts and records give much trouble and take up a great deal of time. They seem to need simplification rather than the addition of needless trouble.

With the above exceptions, I do not see in the Rules and Regulations, as they now stand (1912-1913), anything to unduly restrict the liberty of the teachers; but I can find no rule or regulation that applies to Mr. Mansfield's case.

*Whether due facilities for appeal and means of access to the Board are allowed to the Teachers.*

According to my experience, due facilities for appeal and means of access to the Board are not allowed to the teachers.

Dr. Starkie claimed to have received special authority from the Treasury, such as was never allowed to or claimed by any of his predecessors in office—an authority inconsistent with the terms of the original appointment of the Board and of the subsequent Charter. Dr. Starkie claims that the National Board Service is a "Department" in the Civil Service sense of that term, and that he is the "Chief" of that department, and, therefore, claims the supreme power which, according to the Charter and according to all precedents, is vested, not in him, but in the Board.

At the inception of the "new scheme" the Board seems to have admitted this claim, and to have thereby abdicated its governing authority. If the National Board Service is a "Department" in this sense, why has the Chief Secretary to report in the House of Commons that he has no control over it? Is not there in this a dilemma?

Just as much information as suits the policy of the Resident Commissioner, and no more, is submitted to the Board, and precautions have been taken to prevent the several Commissioners from obtaining information on educational matters. The following is an exact copy of an order with which I was served, and it is but one of several similar ones issued at various times:—

"Off. L. 509-20, 3-6.

"That no officer of the Establishment is at liberty to prepare for, or furnish to any person, not a member of the official staff, any return or statement relating to the affairs of the Board, unless otherwise specially provided for in the official routine of the Department, without the express authority of the Resident Commissioner.

"(Signed). W. J. M. STARKIE,

"Resident Commissioner.

"Office of National Education,

"Dublin, 3rd May, 1906."

The meaning of this is that no Commissioner should be supplied with information. No other than a Commissioner ever asked for information. It was customary before Dr. Starkie's time for several Commissioners to come into the Library, where the Chiefs of Inspection worked, before the meetings of the Board, to obtain information respecting the business to be transacted at the meeting.

On a certain occasion, when a serious and contentious matter was under consideration, I was asked by one of the Commissioners to give him certain information. As I knew that this was to be used in opposition to the views of the Resident Commissioner (Mr. Redington), I did not like to be the medium through which this information should come, and I accordingly asked Mr. Redington if I should give it. His reply was—"Certainly, every Commissioner has the same right that I have to obtain all information available."

I was informed by one of the Commissioners, who was present on the occasion, that an appeal of mine was flung by Dr. Starkie into the waste-basket, without ever having been read to the Board. If a chief inspector could not get a fair hearing, what chance has a teacher?

If this case of mine, which illustrates the manner in which appeals are treated, be deemed pertinent to the present inquiry, I am prepared to give a full account of it.

EDWARD DOWLING.

## APPENDIX XX.

## MEMORIAL OF THE CHURCH OF IRELAND MANAGERS OF NATIONAL SCHOOLS

In the Counties of ANTRIM and DOWNS, and of the County of the City of Belfast.

TO

Sir SAMUEL DILL, D.Litt., LL.D., &c., and the Members of the Committee, to inquire into the system of Inspection of National Schools in Ireland and kindred matters.

GENTLEMEN,

We, the Church of Ireland Managers of National Schools in the Counties of Antrim and Down and the County of the City of Belfast, representing 246 schools and some 80,000 scholars, are desirous of making a statement of our opinions as to the present system of inspection, &c.

Two courses were open to us—the one we have decided on, or, as an alternative, that individual managers should offer themselves as witnesses at the inquiry. We felt, however, that an individual can only give testimony as to his own personal experience, and the views and experiences of one manager might on certain points conflict with those of others.

We have, therefore, decided to present a memorial to the Committee setting forth the points on which we managers are agreed, feeling sure that a unanimous expression of our opinions will carry greater weight than individual testimony. Some of our number are, however, prepared to give evidence, should the Committee desire it.

We are of opinion that the present methods of inspection fail in certain definite respects:—

- (1.) There is no uniform system of inspection. No two inspectors apparently set on the same principles.
- (2.) The inspection seems to us, in many cases, to be impressionist rather than exhaustive, and therefore it seems to us that it is unfair to the teachers to award distinguishing marks on the present system of inspection. At the same time were the inspection a reality we would not condemn a system of "marks."
- (3.) The inspectors are mainly critical. They find fault, but seldom encourage. Their visits, in place of being helpful to the teachers, are, in many cases, availed with dread.
- (4.) Under the present system inspectors frequently berate the teachers rather than test the knowledge of the children.

In the terms of reference drawn up for the Committee they are asked to report whether in their opinion "the methods adopted by the inspectors in carrying out their inspections are conducive to sound education?" In regard to this question, the managers desire to say that they are of opinion:—

That in many cases the methods adopted by the inspectors do not conduce to sound education; in fact, they are very remote from it. The present system

means inspection made easy for the inspector. It is often merely fault-finding, in place of a testing of the children's knowledge. In some cases, the children are practically not inspected at all, but the teachers only.

It is further asked in the terms of reference: "Whether any, and, if so, what changes are desirable in the system of inspection?"

To this query we reply that from the standpoint of managers we consider:—

(1.) That steps should be taken to provide a uniform system of inspection. For example, in mathematics, a subject where the different standards of inspectors are as present particularly glaring, we suggest that the Commissioners should issue to their inspectors a series of uniform tests, exhibiting the style of questions which would be a fair test for pupils in the different standards. There are many other subjects where similar provision could be made.

(2.) We are of opinion that the promotion of children should, to some extent, depend on the results of the inspection. Under present methods there is no moral obligation on the child even to care to do well at the inspection.

(3.) We also think that, when a school is inspected early in the scholastic year, instruction should be given to the inspectors, and indeed also to the teachers, as to what may be reasonably expected from the children of any standard at the end of, say, the third, sixth, and ninth month of the scholastic year. At present the ideas of different inspectors seem on this question to be quite chaotic.

(4.) The managers are also of opinion that the National Board should send them the whole of the inspector's report on any school, and not merely extracts from it.

(5.) But, perhaps, above all these points, we desire a change in the spirit of inspection. We hope that a time will come when the teachers will be able to look forward to an inspector's visit as an occasion of help and encouragement, for the present methods have given rise to a feeling of hostility and distrust, which is bad for the teachers, bad for the schools, and bad for our country.

Signed on behalf of the managers,

A. S. WOODWARD, M.A.,

Hon. Secretary.

## APPENDIX XXI.

(Handed in by Mr. F. MILLER.)

No. 1.

I.O. 171 (a).

County Derry.  
Roll No. 6152.School—Tobermore.  
Post Town—Tobermore.Confidential.FOR THE INFORMATION OF MANAGER, TEACHER, AND BOARD'S OFFICERS, AND TO BE  
PRESERVED AMONG THE SCHOOL RECORDS.

EXTRACTS FROM THE GENERAL REPORT ON THE ABOVE-NAMED NATIONAL SCHOOL.

Dated the 12th May, 1909.

Office of National Education,  
Dublin, 26th June, 1909.

By Mr. SMYTH, Inspector.

P. E. LEHASS,  
W. J. DELWORTH,

Secretaries.

## I.—General Condition of School.

(Opinion of Inspector expressed by one of the  
following words:—"Excellent," "Very Good,"  
"Good," "Fair," "Middling," "Bad.")

VERY GOOD.

II.—Inspector's remarks upon the result of the  
Inspection of the School.Since last general inspection a second assistant  
has been appointed in this school owing to the  
growth of the school in numbers. This appoint-ment has improved the school a good deal, as  
previously the teachers had too many pupils  
to attend to. The school is now making very  
satisfactory progress, and the teachers all work  
very earnestly. In middle division History and  
Geography should be improved, and there should  
be greater accuracy in Arithmetic. The seniors  
should speak out better, and should show a better  
acquaintance with the leading points in their  
History lessons. The order and discipline of the  
school are very good, and the school-room is kept  
neat and tidy.

No. 2.

I.O. 171 (a).

County Derry.  
Roll No. 6152.School—Tobermore.  
Post Town—Tobermore.Confidential.FOR THE INFORMATION OF MANAGER, TEACHER, AND BOARD'S OFFICERS, AND TO BE  
PRESERVED AMONG THE SCHOOL RECORDS.

EXTRACTS FROM THE GENERAL REPORT ON THE ABOVE-NAMED NATIONAL SCHOOL.

Dated the 16th May, 1910.

Office of National Education,  
Dublin, 11th June, 1910.

By Mr. SMYTH, Inspector,

P. E. LEHASS,  
W. J. DELWORTH,

Secretaries.

## I.—General Condition of School.

(Opinion of Inspector expressed by one of the  
following words:—"Excellent," "Very Good,"  
"Good," "Fair," "Middling," "Bad.")

Good.

II.—Inspector's remarks upon the result of the  
Inspection of the School.There is evidence of good work generally in this  
school. The teachers are earnest and attentive to  
duty. Order and discipline are very good, andSinging, Drill, and written exercises of senior  
pupils are also very good. In most other subjects  
the proficiency is good. The school-room is kept  
neat and tidy. The following points need attention.  
The pupils generally should be required to speak  
and read more clearly and distinctly. A larger  
proportion of the pupils should be expected to  
answer simple questions on the work gone over.  
Arithmetic, Grammar, and History require  
improvement in the senior division.The work should be more evenly divided between  
the teachers. The second Assistant has too many  
pupils to attend to at present.



County Derry.  
Roll No. 6152.

No. 3.

I.O. 171 (a).  
School—Tobermore,  
Post Town—Tobermore.

Confidential.

FOR THE INFORMATION OF MANAGER, TEACHER, AND BOARD'S OFFICERS, AND TO BE PRESERVED AMONG THE SCHOOL RECORDS.

EXTRACTS FROM THE GENERAL REPORT ON THE ABOVE-NAMED NATIONAL SCHOOL.

Dated the 17th March, 1911.

Office of National Education,  
Dublin, 12th June, 1911.

By Mr. SMITH, Inspector.

P. E. LEHMAN,  
W. J. DELWORTH,  
Secretaries.

I.—General Condition of School.

(Opinion of Inspector expressed by one of the following words:—"Excellent," "Very Good," "Good," "Fair," "Middling," "Bad.")

"Very Good."

II.—Inspector's remarks upon the result of the inspection of the School.

The teachers of this school have worked earnestly and successfully during the past year, and the

pupils have made good progress. The proficiency is generally good or very good. The order and discipline are excellent. The school-room is kept neat and tidy. The intelligence of the pupils should be carefully cultivated in all subjects, and a larger proportion of the senior pupils should be expected to answer simple questions on the work gone over in the various subjects.

County Derry.  
Roll No. 6152.

No. 4.

I.O. 171 (a).  
School—Tobermore,  
Post Town—Tobermore.

Confidential.

FOR THE INFORMATION OF MANAGER, TEACHER, AND BOARD'S OFFICERS, AND TO BE PRESERVED AMONG THE SCHOOL RECORDS.

EXTRACTS FROM THE GENERAL REPORT ON THE ABOVE-NAMED NATIONAL SCHOOL.

Dated the 22nd February, 1912.

Office of National Education,  
Dublin, 27th April, 1912.

By Mr. SEMPLER, Inspector.

P. E. LEHMAN,  
W. J. DELWORTH,  
Secretaries.

I.—General Condition of School.

(Opinion of Inspector expressed by one of the following words:—"Excellent," "Very Good," "Good," "Fair," "Middling," "Bad.")

Good.

II.—Inspector's remarks upon the result of the inspection of the School.

The school is efficiently conducted by a staff of industrious teachers. The grammatical con-

struction and the analysis of sentences should receive more attention; the written exercises should be more carefully corrected, and a greater degree of accuracy in writing questions in Arithmetic should be secured. The principal teacher has not complied with the regulation in regard to the preparation of schemes of work.

The principal room should be divided into two rooms. The gallery should be removed from the class-room, and desks substituted.

Some more Kindergarten apparatus is desirable.

County Derry.  
Roll No. 6152.

No. 5.

I.O. 171 (a).  
School—Tobermore,  
Post Town—Tobermore.

Confidential.

FOR THE INFORMATION OF MANAGER, TEACHER, AND BOARD'S OFFICERS, AND TO BE PRESERVED AMONG THE SCHOOL RECORDS.

EXTRACTS FROM THE GENERAL REPORT ON THE ABOVE-NAMED NATIONAL SCHOOL.

Dated the 2nd April, 1913.

Office of National Education,  
Dublin, 21st April, 1913.

By Mr. SEMPLER, Inspector.

P. E. LEHMAN,  
W. J. DELWORTH,  
Secretaries.

I.—General Condition of School.

(Opinion of Inspector expressed by one of the following words:—"Excellent," "Very Good," "Good," "Fair," "Middling," "Bad.")

Good.

II.—Inspector's remarks upon the result of the inspection of the School.

The teachers who work hard and comply faithfully with official suggestions accomplish a large

amount of work, most of which is of good quality. Grammar should be better known.

The number of pupils who reach the higher standards is comparatively small.

III.—Remarks on other points.

There are only two rooms for the three teachers. The walls of the schoolroom should be re-coloured. The exterior walls of the schoolhouse should be whitewashed this summer.

## APPENDIX XXII.

## HEADS OF EVIDENCE FORWARDED BY THE EDUCATION BOARD OF THE GENERAL SYNOD OF THE CHURCH OF IRELAND.

Apart from surprise visits, schools should receive one visit yearly, of which due notice should be given, in order to enable managers and inspectors to concur.

Qualifications and training of inspectors.

Practical experience of the work of teaching essential.

Inspectors and small schools—pressure brought to bear to close and substitute vans.

Evidence as to efficiency of small schools.

Inspectors' extravagant structural requirements.

Methods of inspection.

(c) Need for more efficient tests, individual examination required for Reading and Arithmetic and English Composition, for the rest class examination.

The examination to be an important feature in arriving at the general report (see (d)).

(b) Allowance necessary for the period of the school year in which the inspector comes; a uniform school year is not necessary.

(c) Impossibility of summing up in a word; better plan a general report; increments to be given as a matter of course when report satisfactory.

(d) Check upon power of depreciating and appreciating the work of the schools.

(e) Plans for securing uniformity of inspection (see (a)).

(f) When teachers employ recognised methods inspectors not to interfere; at present different inspectors recommend different methods.

National Board Rules.

Full notice to be given of changes. New rules not to be retrospective.

## APPENDIX XXIII.

(Handed in by Mr. F. C. FOOTE.)

## MUNICIPAL TECHNICAL INSTITUTE, BELFAST.

## "AGES" DIAGRAMS.

## NUMBER OF STUDENTS AT EACH AGE.

## EXPLANATORY NOTES.

The Department of Agriculture and Technical Instruction require students joining the Institute to state their ages. These figures for the First (1901-1902) Session and for the Seventh (1907-1908) Session of the Municipal Technical Institute, Belfast, have been tabulated, and the results are represented graphically on the accompanying diagrams. Some adults are reluctant to declare their age, and such cases are recorded in the column headed "No Record of Age."

The Diagram for the Seventh Session indicates very clearly the increase which has taken place in the total number of students enrolling annually. The diagrams also show that the greatest number of students of an age is now found at a lower age than in the First Session; this is a very satisfactory feature, inasmuch as it means that students enrol at an earlier age than formerly, in other words—are allowing a shorter period to elapse between the time of leaving the Elementary School and the date of joining the Technical Institute.

It will be observed that a large proportion of the students enrolled in the Institute are adults. The proportion of students under 18 years of age to those 18 years of age and over is approximately as 2 is to 3. Another fact brought out by the diagrams is that the proportion of women students to men students is markedly greater in the Seventh Session than in the First Session.

FRAS. C. FOOTE, Principal.

27th November, 1908.

| Age in Years. | SESSION 1901-02.<br>(First Session). |                 |        | SESSION 1907-08.<br>(Seventh Session). |                 |        |
|---------------|--------------------------------------|-----------------|--------|--|-----------------|--------|
|               | Men Students.                        | Women Students. | Total. | Men Students.                          | Women Students. | Total. |
| 10            | ..                                   | ..              | ..     | ..                                     | ..              | ..     |
| 11            | ..                                   | ..              | ..     | ..                                     | ..              | ..     |
| 12            | ..                                   | ..              | ..     | ..                                     | ..              | ..     |
| 13            | ..                                   | ..              | ..     | ..                                     | ..              | ..     |
| 14            | ..                                   | ..              | ..     | ..                                     | ..              | ..     |
| 15            | ..                                   | ..              | ..     | ..                                     | ..              | ..     |
| 16            | ..                                   | ..              | ..     | ..                                     | ..              | ..     |
| 17            | ..                                   | ..              | ..     | ..                                     | ..              | ..     |
| 18            | ..                                   | ..              | ..     | ..                                     | ..              | ..     |
| 19            | ..                                   | ..              | ..     | ..                                     | ..              | ..     |
| 20            | ..                                   | ..              | ..     | ..                                     | ..              | ..     |
| 21            | ..                                   | ..              | ..     | ..                                     | ..              | ..     |
| 22            | ..                                   | ..              | ..     | ..                                     | ..              | ..     |
| 23            | ..                                   | ..              | ..     | ..                                     | ..              | ..     |
| 24            | ..                                   | ..              | ..     | ..                                     | ..              | ..     |
| 25            | ..                                   | ..              | ..     | ..                                     | ..              | ..     |
| 26            | ..                                   | ..              | ..     | ..                                     | ..              | ..     |
| 27            | ..                                   | ..              | ..     | ..                                     | ..              | ..     |
| 28            | ..                                   | ..              | ..     | ..                                     | ..              | ..     |
| 29            | ..                                   | ..              | ..     | ..                                     | ..              | ..     |
| 30            | ..                                   | ..              | ..     | ..                                     | ..              | ..     |
| 31            | ..                                   | ..              | ..     | ..                                     | ..              | ..     |
| 32            | ..                                   | ..              | ..     | ..                                     | ..              | ..     |
| 33            | ..                                   | ..              | ..     | ..                                     | ..              | ..     |
| 34 to 40      | 146                                  | 41              | 187    | 150                                    | 114             | 264    |
| No record     | 147                                  | 115             | 262    | 21                                     | 363             | 414    |
| Totals        | 2,391                                | 764             | 3,155  | 2,865                                  | 2,341           | 5,206  |

## APPENDIX XXIV.

(Handed in by the CHAIRMAN.)

Kindly supplied by Mr. E. FREDERICK YOUNG, of the English Education Office.

1. Under Part III. (Section 18 (2)) of the Education Act, 1902, all State grants in respect of Public Elementary Schools in England and Wales are paid by the Board of Education direct to the Local Education Authorities. In the case of certain Institution Schools (Orphanages, etc.), which are not maintained by the Local Education Authority, but which receive Government grants under Section 15 of the Education Act, 1902, the grants are paid direct to the Managers or Governing Bodies. There are, however, comparatively few schools which are in receipt of this grant under Section 15 of the Education Act, 1902.

2. The Local Education Authorities pool the Government grants for the public elementary schools in their areas together with the income arising from their local rates for elementary education in a common fund, which is often known as the Part III. Fund from Part III. of the Education Act, 1902.

3. Under Section 7 (1) of the Education Act, 1902, the Local Education Authorities are responsible "for maintaining and keeping efficient all public elementary schools within their area which are necessary, and have the control of all expenditure required for that purpose, other than expenditure for which under the Act provision has to be made by the managers of the non-provided schools. It devolves on the managers of such voluntary schools to provide the schoolhouses, free of any charge, to the Local Education Authority, and to keep in good repair and to make such alterations and improvements in the buildings as may reasonably be required by the Local Education Authority.

The Local Authority are only liable for damage which they consider to be due to "fair wear and tear" in the use of any room in the schoolhouses for the purpose of a public elementary school. (Section 7 (4) of the Education Act, 1902.)

4. The Local Authorities are, therefore, alone responsible for the payment of teachers' salaries.

All arrangements for the promotion of elementary school teachers are made by the Local Education Authority, who, as a rule, fix a graduated scale of salaries and increments, etc., according to the qualification of the teacher, and his or her length of service, etc.

It should be mentioned that the Courts have decided in several recent cases that Local Authorities have no

power under any existing Statute to differentiate between teachers in provided schools and non-provided schools in the matter of salary.

5. In practice it is probable that many Local Education Authorities attach considerable weight to observations on the work and general efficiency of individual teachers in the reports of His Majesty's Inspectors. The Local Authorities are, however, under no obligation, statutory or otherwise, to accept H. M. Inspector's judgment in such matters. It is not impossible that some authorities promote their teachers more or less automatically according to their graduated scales, and that they may not take very much account of criticisms in the inspectors' reports on the work of their teachers, unless possibly they disclose serious inefficiency on the part of some teacher.

6. Some Local Education Authorities have their own local inspectors for elementary education, and it is quite possible that in some cases the arrangements for promotion of teachers, etc., may be based to some extent on the reports of the local inspectors.

7. The only cases in which, as a general rule, a report by H. M. Inspector might seriously affect the promotion of a teacher are those when a school, owing to bad teaching and organisation, verges on inefficiency. It might then be necessary for the Central Office to threaten suspension or non-payment of the grant unless immediate steps were taken to restore the school to a state of efficiency.

The Local Education Authority might in consequence dismiss or transfer the teacher or teachers concerned.

8. There is, however, one partial exception to the general rule that the promotion of teachers does not, or at any rate need not, be affected by the observations on their work in the reports of H. M. Inspectors.

The lowest grade of elementary school teachers recognised by the Board of Education are the so-called "Supplementary Teachers." They are women over 18 years of age who have no "paper" qualifications, but who are especially approved by H. M. Inspector for their expertise in teaching. These supplementary teachers are usually appointed provisionally for two months, subject to a favourable report on their work by H. M. Inspector. If the Inspector reports adversely the Board withdraws their recognition.

## CODE OF REGULATIONS FOR PUBLIC ELEMENTARY SCHOOLS IN ENGLAND,

## SCHEDULE I. (c).

## SUPPLEMENTARY TEACHERS.

1. Where the Board are satisfied that the circumstances of the case render it necessary, they may recognise from time to time, as supplementary teachers, suitable women over 18 years of age, who are specially approved by the inspector for their capacity in teaching.

2. The Board may make it a condition of the recognition, or continued recognition, of supplementary teachers in the area of any local Education Authority that the Authority make suitable provision for enabling such teachers to prepare and improve themselves for the practical work of teaching; and in the case of any individual supplementary teacher, that she shall avail herself of any such provision, or that she shall receive such other special training as the inspector may approve.

3. Not more than two supplementary teachers will be recognised on the staff of a department at any one time. Where, however, more than two supplementary teachers were employed in a department on 31st July, 1900, they may continue to be recognised, subject to the operation of Schedule I. (d) 6 of the Code of 1906.

4. A woman recognised as a supplementary teacher is only allowed to teach (1) Infants Classes, that is to say, classes in which the majority of the scholars are under eight years of age, or (2) the lowest class of older scholars in a school or department in a rural parish if the average attendance in the school does not

exceed 100. For the purpose of this provision children attending separate schools for boys or girls or infants in the same neighbourhood will ordinarily be counted as attending a single school.

Provided that supplementary teachers recognised in a school or department for older children on 31st July, 1900, may continue to be employed in that school or department till 31st July, 1914.

In the case of a boys' department the Board will require to be satisfied that the building and sanitary arrangements are suitable.

5. A candidate for recognition as a supplementary teacher must produce a satisfactory medical certificate, in a form approved by the Board, if the candidate has not been previously recognised as a supplementary teacher or an additional woman teacher.

6. The recognition of a supplementary teacher is subject to reconsideration from year to year, and may be withdrawn at any time. Recognition is given only for the school or department in which the Teacher is serving, and on her removal to another school or department the question of her recognition will be considered afresh.

7. The Board may give provisional recognition to newly appointed supplementary teachers for such period as they think fit, beginning with the date on which the appointments has been notified to the Board.

## CITY OF MANCHESTER.

## PAYMENTS TO TEACHERS.

(Extract.)

BOARDS ANNUAL REPORT OF THE EDUCATION COMMITTEE, 1906-1910.

Teachers' Salaries.

The teachers salaries are regulated by the scale as given below, and are paid in cash monthly at the schools. The cases where advances have been kept back owing to misconduct or inefficiency have been very few.

## SCALE OF TEACHERS' SALARIES.

(Adopted by the Education Committee, 18th July, 1910.)

## I.—PRINCIPAL TEACHERS.

|               | Class A.<br>Teachers who have had charge of schools for a less period than 5 years. | Class B.<br>Teachers who have had charge of schools for 5 years, but less than 10 years. | Class C.<br>Teachers who have had charge of schools for 10 years, but less than 15 years. | Class D.<br>Teachers who have had charge of schools for 15 years and upwards. |
|---------------|---|--|---|---|
| —             | Fixed.<br>£120<br>80  | Fixed.<br>£125<br>90   | Fixed.<br>£135<br>99  | Fixed.<br>£175<br>110   |
| Masters ..    |   |  |   |   |
| Mistresses .. |   |  |   |   |

## EXTRA PAYMENTS.

1. Head teachers will receive:—

|                            | Head Masters | Asst. Mistresses |
|----------------------------|--------------|------------------|
|                            | s. d.        | s. d.            |
| For the first 100 scholars |              |                  |
| In average attendance      | 4 0 per unit | 2 0 per unit     |
| For the next 100 ..        | 5 0 ..       | 1 6 ..           |
| For each unit over 200     | 2 0 ..       | 1 0 ..           |

In no case shall the yearly average attendance paid upon be in excess of the recognised accommodation of the school.

2. £10 per annum if the school obtain the full grant, and £5 per annum if the school obtain a lower grant.

3. £2 per annum for each pupil-teacher recognised by the Board of Education, or a composition of £4 per annum in lieu of this payment.\*

4. An extra payment, to be fixed in each case by the Education Committee, where there is a higher elementary school.

## Notes.

1. The fixed salary (including the payment on the average attendance), is paid monthly, the payment for pupil-teachers half-yearly, in June and December, and the payment according to the classification of the school on receipt of the Government Report.

2. The average attendance is calculated quarterly, the payment under this head being made on the average attendance for the previous quarter.

3. The initial total salary of a head master not to be less than £160 per annum, and of a head mistress not less than £120 per annum, in schools with less than 150 in average annual attendance. The initial total salary of head mistresses of schools, with 150 or over in annual average attendance, to be not less than £130 per annum.

\* Note.—Principal teachers who had pupil teachers on the "appointed day," but who are now deterred by the Regulations of the Board of Education from having charge of apprentices, shall receive a similar composition of £4 per annum.

4. The increases of the fixed salary of head teachers date from the 1st January and the 1st July, and for this purpose any period above three months in the first half-year in which a head teacher joins the Education Committee's service is counted as six months.

5. Teachers coming to Manchester from other districts commence at the minimum of the scale of salaries, with the exception of any teachers specially appointed by the Committee.

6. In the case of teachers leaving the service of the Committee at the Midsummer or Christmas Holidays, the resignation shall take effect on the last day of July or December respectively.

7. The Education Committee reserve to themselves the right of varying the scale in any particular case.

## II.—ASSISTANT TEACHERS.

Class A.—Certificated assistants to be appointed in higher elementary schools, or in such other schools in which it may be thought desirable to appoint assistants of this class.

Class B.—1. College trained teachers who have passed the Certificate Examination since 1905.

2. Certificated teachers who have passed the Certificate Examination since 1905, and have obtained at such examination two or more distinctions.

3. Certificated teachers who, prior to 1905, passed the Certificate Examination on second year's papers, either—

(a) Above the third division in both parts of the examination, or

(b) In the first division in either part, and in the third division in the other part of the examination (where the examination was not divided into parts, a place in either the first or second division of the classified list is necessary).

Class C.—Other certificated assistants, having lower qualifications than those of Class B, if specially appointed by the Education Committee to this class.

Class D.—Uncertificated teachers (Schedule 1, C. 1 of the Code) and certificated teachers not promoted to a higher class.

|       | Class. | Commencing Salary. | Yearly Increase. | Maximum Salary. |
|-------|--------|--------------------|------------------|-----------------|
| Men   | A.     | £                  | £                | £               |
| Women | —      | —                  | 5                | 100             |
|       |        |                    | 5                | 120             |
| Men   | B.     | 75                 | 5                | 150             |
| Women | —      | 55                 | 5                | 110             |
| Men   | C.     | 70                 | 5                | 110             |
| Women | —      | 50                 | 5                | 85              |
| Men   | D.     | 55                 | 5                | 80              |
| Women | —      | 40                 | 5                | 65              |

The commencing salary of teachers appointed to Class A shall be £5 in excess of the amount which they would receive according to service in Class B.

In the case of trained teachers in Class B or Class C, time spent in a Training College shall, for the purpose of the scale, be counted as service with the Education Committee, and the commencing salary shall be increased accordingly.

The initial salary of a teacher on promotion from Class D to Class B or C to be £5 above the salary such teacher is receiving, or would, had he or she remained in Class D, provided that such teacher shall not receive a less salary than the minimum of the class to which the teacher is promoted, and also provided that the date of such teacher's automatic increase within the scale shall not be affected thereby. The operation of this clause to date from the 1st January, 1906, and be not retrospective.

That as a general rule certificated teachers (under Class C) be admitted into Class B on the following conditions:—

That there has been eight years' satisfactory service as certificated teacher.

That the Committee reserve the right to deal with each upon its merits.

The minimum salaries of College-trained teachers and uncertificated (women) teachers, as from the 1st July, 1906, are as follows:—

|                 |     |                     |     |
|-----------------|-----|---------------------|-----|
| Class B, Men,   | ... | 3 years at College, | 225 |
| Class B, Women, | ... | 3 " "               | 220 |
| Class B, Men,   | ... | 2 " "               | 200 |
| Class B, Women, | ... | 2 " "               | 175 |
| Class D, Women, | ... | ...                 | 145 |

The minimum salaries of untrained certificated teachers, as from 1st January, 1907, are as follows:—

|                 |     |     |     |
|-----------------|-----|-----|-----|
| Class B, Men,   | ... | ... | 480 |
| Class B, Women, | ... | ... | 458 |
| Class C, Men,   | ... | ... | 475 |
| Class C, Women, | ... | ... | 450 |

## EXTRA PAYMENTS.

1. The following extra payments shall be made to assistant teachers for spaces at University and other Examinations, viz:—

(a) To a teacher in Class A or B who possesses the qualifications prescribed by the scale for Class B—

(i.) £10 per annum if he (or she) has obtained the degree of B.A. or B.Sc. (or other first degree) at a University of Great Britain or Ireland.

(ii.) £15 per annum if he (or she) has obtained a higher degree (after having previously obtained the degree of B.A. or B.Sc.), or has obtained his first degree with first-class honours.

In the case of Universities which do not grant degrees to women, the passing of the examination shall be considered as equivalent to obtaining the degree.

(b) £5 to a certificated teacher who has obtained the elementary or higher certificate of the National Froebel Union.

2. The extra payment shall date from the first revision of salaries following the date on which the success was obtained, but shall at the same time be subject to the operation of Note (3).

## NOTES.

1. A teacher in Class C or D, who has qualified for a higher class, shall not be considered as belonging to such higher class until appointment thereto by the Education Committee, and until so appointed a teacher in Class D shall count on the staff only for the number in average attendance for which a teacher possessing the qualifications of Class D is considered sufficient by the Code.

2. The increase of salary date from the 1st January and the 1st July, and for this purpose any period above three months, in the first half-year in which a teacher joins the Education Committee's service, is counted as six months.

3. The increases of salary provided by the scale may be stopped in the case of any teacher whose service is not considered satisfactory by the Education Committee.

4. Teachers entering the service of the Education Committee will be expected to serve in any school to which the Committee may appoint or transfer them.

5. Teachers coming to Manchester from other districts commence at the minimum of the scale of salaries, with the exception of teachers appointed direct from the Training Colleges, and of any teachers specially appointed by the Committee.

6. In the case of teachers leaving the service of the Committee at the Midsummer or Christmas holidays, the resignation shall take effect on the last day of July or December respectively.

7. The Education Committee reserve to themselves the right of varying the scale in any particular case.

## APPENDIX XXV.

(Hended in by Sir HIRAM WHITSON.)

## LONDON COUNTY COUNCIL.

## EDUCATION OFFICE.

## ANNUAL INCREMENTS UNDER SCALE.

Memorandum kindly furnished by Mr. Blair, Education Officer, dealing with the experience of the late authority for London Education, the School Board for London, with regard to annual increments in the salaries of elementary school teachers, and showing the position at the present time.

## SCALE OF SALARIES FOR TEACHERS.

## AWARD OF ANNUAL INCREMENTS.

The first scale of salaries under which teachers received increments to a maximum was passed by the late authority, the School Board for London, in 1875. It provided that assistants should be appointed at certain salaries, and be allowed an increment on the scale on obtaining parchment certificate, and also for each subsequent annual report on the school by His Majesty's Inspector, which, in the opinion of the School Management Committee, was a good report. In the revised scale of 1888 the same condition as to the reward of annual increment was continued, and it remained in force until 1899. At no time prior to 1897 were increases of salary dependent upon the acquisition of additional qualifications. On 4th March, 1897, however, the School Board decided that assistant teachers appointed to the permanent service after that date should not be entitled to any increase of salary on the scale (except that for parchment certificate) unless or until they had obtained five points of additional qualifications. Three of these five qualifications were obligatory. All teachers were required to possess a drawing certificate and the Board's Physical Education Certificate. The third obligatory qualification in the case of teachers in senior departments was an advanced science certificate, and, in the case of teachers in infants' departments, a recognised kindergarten certificate.

The remaining two qualifications were left to the option of the teachers out of a long list of possible certificates.

On 9th March, 1899, the late authority revised its scale of salaries for teachers, and decided that increments should no longer be dependent upon good reports on the school from His Majesty's Inspector. It was then decided that every year of service should count for an increment to the maximum of the scale, provided the condition as to the additional qualifications, the "five points" referred to earlier, had been fulfilled, unless the School Management Committee, on account of grave misconduct of the teacher, should decide that the year should not count.

Owing to the dearth of teachers the late authority, in 1900-1, considered the question of making the London service more attractive. One result of its deliberations was to abolish the amended requirement, that before teachers are granted increases of salary

after the third year of service they must have obtained some of the five additional qualifications. This decision was influenced largely by the belief that it was this condition for obtaining increments that caused teachers to refrain from seeking appointments to the London service. Teachers who were in the service of the London authority in March, 1904, are, therefore, entitled to proceed to the maximum of the scale of salaries under which they were appointed without any restriction, except such as had been deemed guilty of grave misconduct. In these cases the teachers suffered the loss of one annual increment only, and not the loss of an increment each year until the maximum was reached. In this connection it may be mentioned that under this regulation very few teachers have suffered loss of increment.

The Council's scale of 1905 is the first scale under which the service of a teacher in London is made the subject of a special review on reaching a certain maximum before the teacher is allowed to proceed to the final maximum. The final maximum for teachers who entered the London service since June, 1905, when the scale came into force is, in the case of an assistant master, £260, and the review takes place on reaching the £150. In the case of an assistant mistress, the final maximum is £150, and the review takes place at £120.

The regulation under which the services of assistant teachers are reviewed on reaching £150 (masters) and £120 (mistresses) provided that, at the time those salaries are attained or within two years after they are attained, the Council shall decide upon the teachers' advancement after report from its officers, based upon a review of the whole of the teachers' services, that they are fitted for advancement to the higher class on the grounds both of past work and present capability. In the event of a teacher being refused advancement on the first consideration of his services, a further review is held two years after that date. Should the teacher be again refused the higher maximum, he may ask for the third and subsequent considerations at periods of three years from the date of the last review.

It may be of interest to note that less than 5 per cent. of teachers are declined advancement to the higher maximum when their cases come up for review.

In this connection it may be mentioned that head teachers of elementary schools proceed to the maximum of the scale without being subject to any special report on their work.

## LONDON COUNTY COUNCIL.

EXTRACT FROM HANDBOOK CONTAINING GENERAL INFORMATION WITH REFERENCE TO  
TEACHERS, INSTRUCTORS AND INSTRUCTRESSES IN THE LONDON PUBLIC ELEMENTARY SCHOOLS.

## COMPLAINTS AGAINST TEACHERS—INQUIRY BY MANAGERS.

243. Complaints against teachers, not being complaints made by the managers themselves, are, except as otherwise provided, referred, in the first instance, to the managers for investigation and report. The teacher is informed in writing of the character of the complaint, and is afforded the opportunity of appearing before the managers at their inquiry. The correspondent must forward the report of the managers' inquiry to the Council within 15 days after receiving the reference. If necessary, a special meeting of the managers must be called.

244. When complaints from parents or others are investigated by managers, the complainant also should have notice to attend the inquiry.

## COMPLAINTS AGAINST TEACHERS—GENERAL PROCEDURE.

245. (a) In the event of any complaint against a teacher, or any misconduct on the part of a teacher, being brought to the knowledge of an official correspondent, teacher or other officer, he is required to report it at once to the education officer.

(b) If the allegations in the complaint, or the nature of the misconduct are considered by the education officer, after consultation with the chief inspector, to be of too trivial a nature to necessitate an inquiry by the managers, he informs the chairman of the managers, and the matter is settled by the education officer and the chairman of the managers.

(c) If, however, the chairman of the managers is of opinion that the case is one which should be inquired into at a managers' meeting, he is at liberty to institute an inquiry in accordance with Regulation No. 155.

(d) When any complaint against a teacher, or any misconduct on the part of a teacher, is brought to the knowledge of the education officer, he forthwith notifies the chief inspector thereof, and after consultation with him, and unless the matter is of a trivial nature, arranges for it to be brought before the managers of the school in which the teacher is employed.

246. (a) In cases in which inquiry by the managers is necessary, under clause (c) or (d) of Regulation No. 154, the managers hold their inquiry at the earliest possible moment, and forward a report to the Council, together with any recommendations they may think fit to make. They also depute one representative to attend any hearing by the Teaching Staff Sub-Committee.

(b) The chief inspector, either personally or by deputy, attends the meeting at which the managers hold their inquiry, and is entitled to take part in the inquiry, and to ask any questions with a view to elucidating the facts.

(c) The chief inspector may, independently of the inquiry by the managers, make such investigation into the case as he deems necessary, in order to enable him to assist the managers or the Teaching Staff Sub-Committee in arriving at a just decision.

(d) It is the duty of the chief inspector in all investigations to make himself as far as possible acquainted with the facts of the case.

(e) When the case is of sufficient gravity, a report is made in writing to the Teaching Staff Sub-Committee by the education officer, giving particulars of the acts or defaults complained of, and the names of the persons who are able to speak to such acts or defaults, and containing (if he thinks fit) recommendations for adoption by the Sub-Committee. Such report is based upon the report of the managers, and a statement of facts prepared by the chief inspector after the investigation provided for in this regulation.

(f) When the case is of such importance as to necessitate the attendance of the teacher concerned at the meeting of the Teaching Staff Sub-Committee, a copy of the report referred to in clause (e) of this regulation is sent to the teacher at least seven days before the day of hearing by the Sub-Committee.

(g) Within three days (or such longer period as the chairman of the Teaching Staff Sub-Committee shall allow) the teacher may send in a written reply to the charge, giving the names of the witnesses (if any) whom he may desire to call.

(h) At the hearing by the Teaching Staff Sub-Committee, which takes place at a fixed hour, the charge, and the teacher's reply thereto, are first read aloud. The chairman then examines any witnesses that appear in support of the charge, and the teacher is entitled to cross-examine them. The teacher may then call any whose names he has sent in prior to the hearing and other witnesses, with the consent of the chairman. The chairman and any member of the Sub-Committee, and, with the leave of the Sub-Committee, the representative of the managers, and any other officer concerned, may ask questions of the witnesses. The teacher may then address the Sub-Committee, and thereupon the Sub-Committee deliberates in private.

(i) In serious cases the teacher, and, if necessary, the complainant also, may, with the permission of the Teaching Staff Sub-Committee, be accompanied by a friend who, with the leave of the Sub-Committee, but not otherwise, may address them.

(j) Whenever the Teaching Staff Sub-Committee resolves to recommend the dismissal or degradation of a teacher, a copy of the report to the Education Committee, containing the facts and evidence, is sent to each member of that Committee and to the teacher concerned, and the latter is informed that he will be allowed, if he so desires, to send in, within three days, a written statement, which will be submitted to the Education Committee.

(k) When the recommendation of the Teaching Staff Sub-Committee is presented to the Education Committee, and before the chairman of the Sub-Committee moves its adoption, the teacher's statement is read aloud by the clerk of the Committee.

(l) When, in the opinion of the chairman of the Education Committee a teacher's appeal contains charges or statements which seriously reflect upon the conduct of some other party, the Education Committee sit in private for the purpose of hearing this appeal and arriving at a decision upon the matter.

(m) If upon any recommendation involving the dismissal or degradation of a teacher, an amendment, other than a verbal amendment, is moved, such amendment must take the form of a reference back to the Teaching Staff Sub-Committee.

(n) Nothing in this regulation shall prevent the Teaching Staff Sub-Committee, or the education officer, from suspending a teacher in the event of grave misconduct, or from taking such other action as may be necessary in cases of extreme urgency.

(o) When the copy of the report referred to in clause (j) of this regulation is sent to the teacher his attention is drawn to the following standing order of the Council:—

"When an official of the Council is proved to be incapable or unsuitable for the work he is required to do, the Committee under which the official works may call upon him to resign, or may discharge him without reporting to the Council, unless the official desires his case to be brought before the Council, in which case the Committee shall report to the Council, and obtain the Council's order thereon."

If the teacher desires his case to be brought before the Council in accordance with this standing order, he is required to notify the fact within three days of the receipt of the report in question.

## APPENDIX XXVI.

## 1.

(Handed in by Mr. P. R. Lavinia, Secretary, Board of National Education in Ireland.)

## GENERAL DUTIES APPLICABLE TO BOTH SECRETARIES.

(a.) In the absence of one Secretary, the Secretary who is present is to be entirely responsible for the prompt discharge of all the duties of both Secretaries, and bound to keep the work of the office in all its branches in a satisfactory condition.

(b.) In the event of a great pressure of work on either of the Secretaries, the other Secretary is to afford help to his colleague.

(c.) All communications shall continue to be addressed to the Secretaries as heretofore;

(d.) But, except in especially important communications directly ordered as such by the Board, the signature only of the Secretary responsible for the letter which he signs is to be given.

(e.) Board's circulars and all printed documents are to be signed by the two Secretaries.

(f.) No penal action with any pecuniary loss to schools or teachers is to be taken without the authority of the Resident Commissioner or the Board.

(g.) Action not of a routine character, or not definitely supported by the Rules or Orders of the Board is not to be taken without the authority of the Resident Commissioner.

(h.) Where any doubt may exist as to the application of the Rules or of Orders of the Board or Resident Commissioner to the circumstances of a particular case, the case is to be submitted to the Resident Commissioner for his determination.

## 2.

Confidential.

COUNTY.....

DISTRICT.....

Roll No.....

Received in Office.....

Registered.....

Examined.....

Sent to Records Dept.....

## MANAGER'S ANNUAL REPORT.

## .....NATIONAL SCHOOLS.

Date of Report.....day of.....19.....

N.B.—This Report will be considered by the Commissioners in connexion with the Inspector's Annual Report.

## TEACHING STAFF.

| NAME. | Position in School. | Religious Detestation. | Date of Appointment. | No. of Agreement Signed. | Character. |
|-------|---------------------|------------------------|----------------------|--------------------------|------------|
|       |                     |                        |                      |                          |            |
|       |                     |                        |                      |                          |            |
|       |                     |                        |                      |                          |            |
|       |                     |                        |                      |                          |            |
|       |                     |                        |                      |                          |            |
|       |                     |                        |                      |                          |            |
|       |                     |                        |                      |                          |            |

1. If any member of staff has left since date of your last report, please note particulars?

| Name. | Date of Leaving. | Class. |
|-------|------------------|--------|
|       |                  |        |
|       |                  |        |
|       |                  |        |
|       |                  |        |

2. In case you are not satisfied with the character, conduct, and attention to duty of any member of the staff, please state crime or crimes?

3. Are you satisfied with the manner in which the School has been conducted and with the instruction given to the pupils?



4. Have you found the School in satisfactory operation on the occasion of each of your visits?

| Dates | Time of Day | No. found Present | General character of School Work |
|-------|-------------|-------------------|----------------------------------|
|       |             |                   |                                  |
|       |             |                   |                                  |
|       |             |                   |                                  |
|       |             |                   |                                  |

5. Please note dates and hours of such visits?  
6. Have the Rules and Regulations of the Board been attended to, so far as you have been able to observe?

7. Are you satisfied that the School accounts are kept accurately and neatly?

8. Are you satisfied with the manners and behavior of the pupils? Are they polite and respectful—without being servile—to every person, but especially to their superiors and seniors?

9. Is sufficient attention paid to three matters and to the moral training of the pupils by the Teaching Staff?

10. Have the children facilities for personal cleanliness—such as lavatories, combs, brushes, &c., on the School premises? If so, are children who come to school unwashed or unclean made to avail themselves of such facilities?

11. Is sufficient attention paid by Teachers to personal cleanliness and tidiness in attire—(a) on their own part, (b) on the part of the pupils?

12. Is the attendance of the pupils as regular as it ought to be? Are any children in the locality prevented from attending School through want of food or clothing?

13. Is thrift encouraged amongst the pupils? Is there a School Savings Bank? If so, how many of the Scholars are depositors?

14. Are you satisfied with the hygienic condition of the School and premises?

15. Is there provision for making the School comfortable and warm in winter?

16. Is there any provision by way of omnibus or other conveyance for bringing infant children, or children who live at remote places, to the School, especially in inclement weather?

17. Is there provision for Physical Exercises (Drill, Swimming, Gymnastics, School Games, or otherwise) in connection with the School?

18. Is there any provision for School Prizes of Books, &c., for the pupils for diligence, proficiency, regularity of attendance, good conduct, politeness, &c.? If so, please note details?

19. (a) Is there a School Library? (b) Is there a School Magazine of Natural Objects? If so, how many volumes does the library contain? Are the books suitable? Of what objects is the Museum composed?

20. Have any "Reading Circles" been established in the evenings in connection with the School?

21. Do you approve of the Time Table arrangements and School curriculum?

22. Are they suitable to the locality and the wants of the pupils, especially as regards Manual and Practical Instruction, Drawing, and Elementary Science?

23. Have you local co-operation in providing for the wants of the School?

24. Is there a School Committee recognized by the Commissioners? What are the functions of the members? How are the vacancies amongst the members filled?

25. Have you supplemented the work of the Inspector by holding examinations of the pupils yourself? If so, please note dates of examinations? Were these examinations public, and were the parents of the pupils entitled to be present?

26. Have examinations of pupils been held by the Principal or other Teachers? If so, please note dates? Were you present at such examinations?

27. Had the School in your opinion advanced, remained stationary, or retrograded since last annual visit of the Inspector? To what do you attribute the present condition of the School?

28. Have you any suggestion that you wish to make to the Commissioners for the improvement of the School, or are there any defects or any other matters in connection with the School, Teachers, Inspection, or Examination that you think desirable to bring under the notice of the Commissioners?

.....Message.

.....Title.

.....Address.

.....Date.

## 3.

EXTRACT FROM THE ORDER IN COUNCIL,  
DATED THE 10th DAY OF JANUARY, 1910,  
RELATING TO THE HOME CIVIL SERVICE,  
&c.

18. An annual increment of salary shall not be allowed to any officer at the date at which it would in ordinary course become due without a certificate from his immediate superior, countersigned by the Head of the Department, or such person as he may designate for the purpose, to the effect that the service of such officer during the year preceding the date of such certificate has been approved.

## FORMS OF CERTIFICATE.

STANDARD A.

(A.O.409.)

Mr.....has throughout length  
of service and efficiency in the discharge of his duties  
and.....become entitled to an  
increment of salary accruing from.....  
19..... His conduct during the year immediately

preceding the date of this certificate has been approved.  
(Order in Council, 10. 1. 1910.)

Inspection Office—Superintendent

Secretary—

Provisional Order—

Ordered that the Salary of Mr.....  
be increased, as per scale allowed, according to length  
of service, from £.....to £.....

The increment of Salary, £....., per annum,  
to date from.....

Accounts Office:

Entered.....

Compared.....

Advised.....

SIR JAMES B.

(A.O. 446a.)

Mr.....has through length of service and efficiency in the discharge of his duties as.....become entitled to an increment of salary accruing from.....  
191..... His conduct during the year immediately preceding the date of this certificate has been approved.  
(Order in Council, 29, 11, 98.)

Inspection Office—Superintendent

Chief Inspector—

Secretary—

## Provisional Order—

Ordered that the Salary of Mr..... be increased, as per scale allowed, according to length of service, from £..... to £.....

The increment of Salary, £....., per annum, to date from.....

Accounts Office:

Entered.....

Compared.....

Advised.....

## APPENDIX XXVII.

(Forwarded by the Board of National Education in Ireland.)

(Copy.)

OFFICE OF NATIONAL EDUCATION,  
DUBLIN, 16/7/1900.

Sir,

We beg to submit, as requested, for the information of the Resident Commissioner, the accompanying Memorandum, containing our observations on the Revised Programme for Schools, with copies of which you favoured us on Friday evening last.

We hope that a joint statement may be deemed the most satisfactory form of reply.

We are, Sir,

Your obedient servants,

E. DOWNING,

A. PURSER,

Chief Inspectors.

M. S. Seymour, Esq.,

Senior Secretary.

## OBSERVATIONS ON THE NEW SCHOOL PROGRAMME.

As the new school programme did not reach us until Friday night it is not possible to make any detailed suggestions with regard to it. We confine ourselves therefore, to the more important points, but we desire to express our opinion, that both in matter and wording the document, and the accompanying notes on it, should be subjected to careful revision.

We are of opinion that the course laid down is much too extensive, probably quite beyond what would be possible even in the most favourably conditioned National School or even Intermediate School in Ireland, and quite unsustainable in the ordinary National School with one or two teachers. Whereas, formerly each pupil was taught 6½ subjects on an average, it is proposed now to teach over the infant girls 12 (boys 10), and all above second class 13 (boys 11) subjects, counting the sub-heads of English as separate subjects as formerly. Seeing that some of the new subjects will require far closer attention for each pupil from the teacher, it is not easy to understand how they can all be attended to, or what remedy has been provided against the evils pointed out in the first paragraph of Part II. of the Confidential Memorandum given to us last March.

We are in entire accord with the first sentence of the final paragraph of the "Notes" (page 7) accompanying this new programme: "In this connection the Commissioners wish to warn teachers against over-pressure on the children in any shape or form." We cannot think "over-pressure" will be avoided by this programme, which both managers and teachers will look upon as what the Commissioners expect them

to work their pupils up to. We, therefore, feel compelled to recommend the omission of several matters, particularly in the junior classes, and the simplification of all subjects, especially of those now introduced for the first time. To perceive how extensive are the demands made on the classes, it is only necessary to put the requirements for each class together, as has hitherto been done in all the Board's school programmes.

## Infants—English.

We recommend (1) that the Infant course be limited to English (the elements of reading, spelling and writing), Kindergarten (including counting), Singing, Drawing, and Object Lessons; (2) that Grammar should not be required for any class lower than fifth, and that the course of formal Grammar should not go beyond the analysis and parsing of simple sentences; (3) that Composition in the 3rd and 4th classes should be "oral," and limited to pupils being required to give their answers and their explanation of the reading lessons in complete and correctly formed sentences.

## Arithmetic.

The Results Programme has not been materially modified, and the requirements still exceed those of the English Code. We consider a shorter course of Arithmetic, with greater expertise in simple mental calculations, would be desirable. The form under (d), (e), (f), "to know practically how to measure," "to know how to weigh," is objectionable; it should be simply "to measure," "to weigh," &c.; but some of the measuring and weighing should be struck out, e.g., find draughts and ounces, square inches, &c., hundredweights, tons. This measuring and weighing would seem to fall more naturally into the early stages of Manual Training.

## Kindergarten and Manual Instruction.

The word "Methods" should be struck out. The course is quite too extensive, and in any case, even according to Mr. Bevis, should be introduced very gradually. Probably what is laid down for 1st and 2nd classes is the utmost that can at any time be attained to in any ordinary rural National School, and nothing more than is given in the first section ought to be required before 1902.

We consider the introduction of the Englishman "standard" undesirable, as the term has been hitherto used in Ireland to denote degree of efficiency.

## Drawing.

The course is quite unattainable; it is far beyond what is required even for the senior grade of the Intermediate. We are not able to agree entirely with the note at foot of page 5.

## Object Lessons and Elementary Science.

The syllabuses here laid down appear to have been taken almost verbatim from the English Code of 1900,

except in the case of the "Elementary Experimental Science," which is entirely too advanced. The compiler appears to have overlooked the fact that an object lesson is a lesson on an object, not on "qualities of things," on "usefulness of animals," or on pictures. The courses are much too difficult, and are made more so by being in every case taken up in a lower class than in England. Only 12, or at most 15, object lessons should be taken up in any year. It appears to have been overlooked that those in England are "class-subjects," that is optional, but in Ireland that at least one of them is to be made compulsory.

#### Singing.

The alternative "programme for smaller schools" brings the requirements for singing within very reasonable limits.

We may state here that similar alternative programmes are desirable in other subjects—limiting the number of divisions in small schools to four or five at most.

#### School Discipline and Physical Drill.

The words "School Discipline" should be omitted. This is not a subject to be taught at a special time, but should receive attention at all periods of the school day. A note might appear at the head of the programme directing teachers to pay special attention to "Department, Politeness, Good Manners" (delete these words from all classes as in fourth), or such direction can be inserted more definitely in the practical rules than it is at present. A simpler form of drill would appear desirable for most schools.

#### Cookery and Laundry Work.

The course begins at too early a stage, and is quite too ambitious. It is doubtful, from the italicised parts of the "Notes" (page 6), if the instruction is to be theoretical or practical; if the former, it will be of little or no value; if the latter, the course could not be carried out in ordinary one-roomed National Schools. The Commissioners' disapproval of "fancy" cookery or of "ornamental" laundry work appears to have been overlooked when (inter alia) are required the cooking of game and turbot, and the making up of lace.

#### Needlework.

This subject is also begun too early, and the course is too difficult and ambitious even for the three hours now allowed. As in the case of Elementary Science, the requirements are at least a year in advance of those laid down for English schools.

#### Extra Breaks.

We consider the course in these also too ambitious. We wish to express our opinion that if too much is required one of two things will happen; either the subject will not be taught, or the teaching will be merely nominal and sham, producing no satisfactory results.

We regret to see the omission of Geography. If properly taught, by beginning with a thorough examination and mapping of the neighbourhood, followed up by less minute map knowledge of their own country and the continent, the subject is one that forms an admirable training for the senses and the intelligence of the pupils, and is, moreover, one that is necessary for the due understanding of newspapers and of many books. We cannot think the

subject can be learnt satisfactorily from a few lessons in a geographical reader, if for no other reason than that the mere mechanical difficulty of reading absorbs nearly all the pupils' attention.

In conclusion, we beg to draw attention to the large amount of apparatus and requisites that would be required in every school to carry out the proposed scheme in its entirety, involving an outlay that very few managers would be able to meet, and affording a strong reason for limiting to the utmost the requirements under the new scheme, and for a very gradual introduction of the new subjects.

#### List of new Requisites to be provided.

Benches and desks, weights and measures, rules and measuring tapes.

Two extra sets of Readers for the pupils (Geography and History).

"Accurate balance" for Elementary Science (this would be very expensive).

Glass-cases for "museum," for collections, new apparatus, &c.

Window-boxes.

Indian Clubs, dumb-bells, &c.

Materials for Kindergarten and Manual Instruction.

Drawing Boards, T and set squares (3/- each, according to Mr. Boral).

Materials required for Object Lessons and Elementary Science.

Apparatus required for Cookery and Laundry Work.

Materials required for Cookery and Laundry Work.

Besides the above, new furniture and in many cases an addition to the present school buildings, would be necessary.

In view of the difficulty hitherto experienced of getting even a pane of glass put in when wanted, or of providing a little fuel in winter, we cannot believe the large amount of money needed for the new subjects will be immediately forthcoming.

We again urge the necessity of careful revision of the syllabus and of the working of the documents embodying the changes in the system of National Education.

(Signed),

R. DOWNING,  
A. PURSER.

15/7/1900.

#### SPECIAL MEMORANDUM ON "READING" BY A. PURSER.

Referring to the requirements of the new programme in Reading, I desire to express my opinion that only portions of the reading books should be required for each year, especially in the junior classes, but that the pupils should learn to read the lesson with proper expression, should thoroughly understand them, and be able to explain the meaning of all words and phrases, and to give a summary of each lesson and its sub-divisions after reading it.

I believe that in reading, as in other subjects, it is quality, not quantity, that should be aimed at.

I make the suggestions here, because I am aware that some members of the Inspection and of the higher Office Staff do not share my opinion on the matter.

(Signed),

A. PURSER.

16/7/1900.

## APPENDIX XXVIII.

(Forwarded by the Board of National Education in Ireland).

REPORT OF THE BOARD OF NATIONAL EDUCATION, MADE FOR THE INFORMATION OF HIS EXCELLENCY THE LORD LIEUTENANT, IN REFERENCE TO THE RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE COMMISSION ON MANUAL AND PRACTICAL INSTRUCTION.

July, 1899.

When the Report of the Commission on Manual and Practical Instruction was first submitted for consideration, this Board at once saw how important were its

recommendations, and how far-reaching would be the effects of the changes proposed therein upon the Schools. A Committee of the whole Board was accordingly appointed to examine carefully the whole matter; and on the 21st November, 1898, the Committee, having fully considered the question at several sittings, drew up an *ad interim* Report approving of the recommendations of the Commission, and indicating the steps which should be taken to introduce the subjects of Manual and Practical Instruction into the Schools.

On the 26th November, 1898, in connection with the Estimates for 1899-1900, the Board made certain proposals recommending the employment of a Staff of Experts to prepare the teachers for the new scheme of instruction contemplated. In explanation of these proposals, a printed copy of the *ad interim* Report above referred to was forwarded to his Excellency on the 20th December, 1898.

The following is a copy of that Report:—

**PRELIMINARY SCHEME FOR THE INTRODUCTION OF STUDENTS OF MANUAL AND PRACTICAL INSTRUCTION INTO THE NATIONAL SCHOOLS OF IRELAND.**

"The principal divisions of Manual and Practical Instruction with which the suggested regulations are intended to deal may be specified as follows:—

- "(a) Kindergarten and its development, Educational Handwork, or Sloyd.
- "(b) Drawing in the various branches.
- "(c) Elementary Experimental Science—viz. :—Object Lessons for the junior classes, and in the more advanced classes the elements of Science, including those bearing on Agriculture for boys, and on Domestic Science for girls.
- "(d) Cookery and Laundry-work.
- "(e) Needlework.
- "(f) Singing.
- "(g) School Discipline and Drill.

"With a view to their speedy introduction and development, the Commissioners recommend:—

**Head Organisers.**

"1. That an expert of specially high qualifications in each of the three first-mentioned of the foregoing branches be employed to act as Head Organiser, at a salary of £800 a year, with the usual allowances for travelling and personal expenses, as paid to District Inspectors.

**Local Organisers.**

"That with a view to training the National Teachers in the knowledge and practice of these three branches of instruction, 24 local organisers be employed, 22 be stationed in as many organising centres, and 2 be reserved specially for the Training Colleges. Of the whole number, one-third would have charge of one of the three subjects above mentioned. These Organisers should receive salary at the rate of £150 to £250 per annum, with travelling and personal allowances, as paid to Inspectors' Assistants.

**Duties of Organisers. (a) Lectures, etc.**

"3. That each Organiser be required to give a lecture and a demonstration of his centre every Saturday, and that, where convenient, evening lectures on two or three days of the week be also given.

**(b) Visits to Schools.**

"4. That on the other five days of the week the Organiser shall visit the Schools within his assigned area, and give a model lesson in his special subject, as an example to the Teachers; previous arrangements having been made with Managers and Teachers, in order to avoid undue interruption of school business. At a later stage the Teacher should give specimen lessons in the presence of the Organiser.

**Centres of Instruction.**

"5. That in determining the centres of instruction regard be had to the number of Schools within easy reach whose Teachers would be likely to attend, and to the accommodation available.

**Courses of Instruction.**

"6. That the course of lectures and demonstrations in each subject be given within a fixed time, at the end of which the Organiser may be removed to another centre, his place being filled by an Organiser in a different subject.

**Accommodation.**

"7. That the lectures, etc., in each centre be given at the Model School where such is available, and where it is not, then in some suitable National School with the permission of the Manager.

**Attendance of Teachers.**

"8. That the Teachers of the town and the surrounding country districts be required to attend the Organiser's lectures, their travelling expenses being paid by the Commissioners when the distance from the Teacher's residence to the Organising Centre is three miles or above.

**Certificates to Teachers already qualified.**

"9. That the Head Organisers be authorised to examine such National Teachers as may be already qualified in the subjects of Manual and Practical Instruction, and to recommend them to be certified as competent to teach those subjects in their Schools.

**Certificates at end of Course.**

"10. That at the end of each period of instruction Certificates of Proficiency, to depend partly on attendance at the lectures and partly on skill in imparting instruction, be awarded by the Commissioners on the reports of the Organisers.

**Obligation of qualified Teachers to give Instruction.**

"11. That a Teachers who has received a Certificate of Proficiency be required to teach the subject in which he has been certified when classes have been established in his School.

**Kindergarten in all Schools.**

"12. That the Kindergarten system may be taken up in any ordinary National School under a properly qualified Teacher, even though there may not be a specially organized Infants' Department in the School.

**Classes in which Kindergarten may be taught.**

"13. That while the Kindergarten system in its elementary form be confined to the Infants, First and Second Classes, its developments, under the three heads of Hand and Eye Training, Drawing, and Elementary Science, whether singly or in combination, be regarded as suitable for Third and higher Classes.

**Extra subjects removed from Programme.**

"14. That concurrently with the introduction into the Schools of the course of Manual and Practical Instruction the existing School Programme be modified by the omission of the following subjects—viz. Handicraft; Cottage Industries, Bee-keeping, and Dairying (when a special Department of Industries is established); Girls' Reading Book, and Domestic Economy; Advanced Dressmaking; Hygiene; Agriculture; Greek; Trigonometry; Navigation; Mechanics; Hydrostatics; Light and Sound; Heat and Steam Engines; Magnetism and Electricity; Botany; Animal Physiology; Inorganic Chemistry; Geology; Physical Geography.

**Cookery Teachers.**

"15. That arrangements be made for having instruction in Cookery given to the Teachers by Twelve Special Instructors, the teaching, as in other branches, to be conducted at suitable centres; the present arrangements for the instruction of pupils in Cookery not being interfered with.

**Needlework Instructors.**

"16. That the Directress of Needlework be aided by four Assistants, who will, under her supervision, visit the ordinary National Schools, give instruction and advice to the Teachers where necessary, and report on the results obtained. Salary, etc., as in the case of the local Organisers.

**Inspector of Musical Instruction.**

"17. That a Special Inspector of Musical Instruction, who will also discharge the duties of examiner in Music, be appointed. The salary to rise by increments from £400 to £600 per annum, with the travelling and personal allowances granted District Inspectors.

**Mode of paying Fees.**

"18. That the payment of Fees be made on a principle somewhat similar to that in force in England and Scotland.

**Equipment Grants.**

"19. That, in order to facilitate the introduction of Manual Work into the Schools, a moderate but suffi-

cient grant be made in proportion to the number of pupils in attendance, to supply and maintain the necessary apparatus for carrying on the work.

#### Building Grants.

"20. That in the annual Estimates provision be made for Building and Improvement Grants, with a view to supply accommodation for Manual and Practical Instruction.

#### Evening Schools.

"21. That an enlarged and improved curriculum for Evening Schools be drawn up, with an amended scale of remuneration to the Teachers, and that unnecessary restrictions on the mode of conducting such Schools be removed.

#### Superintendent of Manual and Practical Instruction.

"22. That an Officer, to be called the Superintendent of Manual and Practical Instruction, be appointed, to have special charge of this department of work, under the direction of the Chiefs of Inspection, and that the salary of this Officer be £600, rising to £900 per annum, with the necessary allowances when absent on duty.

#### " SUMMARY.

##### " Recommendations involving increased Cost—Detailed Estimates.

|   | £       |
|---|---------|
| "1 Superintendent of Manual and Practical Instruction—Salary £550 to £900, by £25. £550 first year.   | 550     |
| "2 Head Organizers—Salary, £500 per annum; travelling expenses, £20; personal allowance, at 15s. a night, £20. Total for first year (£600 x 3).                                   | 2,640   |
| "22 Local Organizers—Salary £150 to £200, by £10; personal allowance, at 15s. a night, £20; travelling expenses, £75.   | 5,860   |
| "2 Local Organizers, Salary £150 each. First year.  | 300     |
| "4 Assistants to Directors of Needlework—Salary £130 to £200, by £10; travelling and personal expenses, £20 each. Total for first year.   | 600     |
| "12 Cookery Instructors—Salary £80; travelling expenses, £20; cost and carriage of cookery apparatus, etc., £15. (£115 x 12).   | 1,380   |
| "1 Organizing Secretary for Cookery Instruction—Salary £150; travelling and personal allowance, £75. (Total for Cookery, £1,630.)   | 300     |
| (N.B.—Deducting £400, grant already allowed for Cookery, leaves net increase on this head at £1,140.)   |         |
| "1 Inspector of Manual Instruction—Salary, £400 to £500, by £10; travelling and personal allowance, £150. Total £550. Deduct grant already sanctioned, £250, leaves net increase. | 300     |
| "Travelling expenses of Teachers attending Organizers' Lectures.  | 200     |
| "Kindergarten, Manual Work, and Elementary Science Equipment Grants.  | 5,000   |
| "Total.   | 214,410 |

"These special grants, except that for Superintendent and for Needle and Cookery Instruction, are applied for as temporary grants for a period not exceeding five years. The introduction of the Scheme of Manual Instruction would not for about one year affect the Fees earned by the Schools; but after the expiration of that period provision should be made in the Estimates for increased earnings by Teachers to the extent of about £25,000."

In recommending the introduction of the various subjects of Manual and Practical Instruction into the Schools, the Commission made the following detailed

reference to the form of payment by which the teaching of these subjects should be encouraged, and to the way in which the value of the work done in the Schools should be ascertained—

#### II.—" CHANGES IN THE METHODS OF EXAMINATION AND INSPECTION OF NATIONAL SCHOOLS.

##### Section II.

"At the outset of our Inquiry we received inspection evidence that the introduction of subjects of Manual and Practical Instruction would necessarily involve a substantial change in the present method of testing the instruction given in the Schools. It is therefore necessary to describe briefly the system of examination and inspection of primary schools, which prevails at present in Ireland.

##### Present method of testing instruction in Ireland.

"National Schools are examined for Results twice a year, but incidental visits are made whenever the Inspectors can find time and opportunity. On account of the amount of time taken up by the examinations for Results less, these incidental visits are necessarily rare. The Results Examination consists in the testing of the pupils in all the subjects taught in the school; and from their answering the efficiency of the school is mainly judged. The pupils who have not made 100 attendances are not examined, and, so far as they are concerned, there is no definite test of the value of the instruction they receive, except that which may be applied by the Inspectors when making an incidental visit. Fees are paid to the teacher for each pupil passed at the Results Examination, the amount payable being assessed by a necessarily laborious process in the Education Office, on the basis of the returns furnished by the Inspectors.

"The Results Fees system, under which a considerable amount of the teacher's income is dependent, on the individual answering of the pupils, was introduced into Ireland in 1871-3; it had been in operation in England for ten years previously.

##### In England.

"In England, the examination of the pupils for the purpose of assessing the grant was at first confined to Reading, Writing, and Arithmetic, but this was found unsatisfactory in practice, inasmuch as the range of work tended to become more and more restricted to these subjects alone. Consequently in 1867 a small payment, not depending on the number of passes, was made to these schools in which subjects other than the 'three R's' were taught in the higher classes. In 1875 these extra subjects were differentiated into 'Class' and 'Specific' subjects. The former were subjects such as Grammar, Geography, History, which admitted of being taught according to a graduated programme, in all the classes of the school. Payment for these subjects was not made on the basis of individual passes, but according to the proficiency of the class as a whole. Specific subjects were more advanced subjects, such as Mathematics, Languages, Domestic Economy, taken, as a rule, not by whole classes, but by selected pupils in the highest classes. Payment for these subjects was made on the result of individual examination. In 1882 the number of obligatory subjects was increased, and while individual examination in the 'three R's' was still insisted on, a Merit Grant was also provided for, to be paid according to the condition of a school or class as a whole, the special difficulties of the teacher, owing to local circumstances, etc., being taken into consideration. In 1890, this system was superseded, and 'Class' examination, or examination by sample, was, except in the case of specific subjects made the test of the school work. Since 1895, in schools which have maintained for a sufficient time a standard of work well above the level of inefficiency, examination of the pupils has largely been replaced by inspection of the teaching. In other cases a 'sample' or 'class' examination may still be held if the Inspector is not satisfied with the state of the school after a formal inspection.

##### In Scotland.

"In Scotland the mode of examination as a basis for payment of grants has undergone a very similar modification. In that country, payment by results, even in the case of the 'three R's,' was not introduced till 1873, and from the very first, certain other subjects,

vin, those referred to above as class subjects, were paid for according to the success of the class as a whole. As early as 1880, class examination was applied to the 'three R's' also, but in the case of children in classes under VI. only. In 1890, individual examination in the 'three R's' was abolished in all the classes, except for the purpose of granting labour certificates. In the Scotch Code of the present year, changes have been introduced which are intended to have the effect of combining inspection of methods in the classes generally, at visits without notice throughout the year, with an individual examination of pupils in or beyond Standard VI, towards the end of the school year. On this examination, merit certificates will be awarded which shall attest individual proficiency in the whole range of a primary school. It should be explained that no Results Fee attaches to these individual examinations, though their collective result may be an element in determining the rate of grant to be paid to a school.

#### Recommendation.

The Results Fee system when introduced into Ireland undoubtedly had beneficial effects on the general character of the work then done in the National Schools. But evidence has been given to us of the benefits that have resulted from the successive changes made in the English and Scotch Educational Systems, whereby the system of individual examination has been gradually replaced by one of inspection; and whilst the scope of our Commission seems to prevent us from expressing an opinion upon the general question as to whether a similar modification might not with advantage be made in Ireland, we consider that as regards the practical subjects of which we recommend the introduction, such a change is absolutely essential. To secure the best effects from Manual and Practical Instruction the Inspectors should be at liberty to test the progress of the pupils by more flexible methods than can be applied under a rigid system of individual examination. Time should be available for frequent incidental visits. Experience has shown that, even in reference to the present subject of the programme, this cannot be secured so long as the existing system is maintained.

The change in the system of payment of Teachers thus recommended by the Commission is at present under consideration, and detailed plans are being worked out by the officials of the Board. The matter is necessarily one of great complexity, and will require prolonged as well as careful consideration before any definite scheme is finally decided upon. The recommendations made in this Report are quite independent of it. Besides, as contemplated by the Board, it is not a matter that will involve any increase of expenditure. The Board, therefore, have not deemed it advisable to make any further reference to it in this Report.

In determining the action to be pursued in introducing courses of Manual and Practical Instruction into National Schools, the Board have been guided by certain general considerations which apply to all the courses, and by special considerations which apply only to certain of them. What is proposed in the following Report may, therefore, be conveniently divided into two parts: the first dealing with the whole system of Manual and Practical Instruction, and the second dealing separately with the different branches as enumerated in the Report of the Commission.

#### PART I.

Action recommended with a view to introducing Manual and Practical Instruction in National Schools generally:—

Three classes of schools have to be considered: (1) schools which have teachers capable of carrying out all the proposed changes; (2) schools which have teachers capable of carrying out some of the proposed changes; and (3) schools whose teachers are not capable of carrying out any of the proposed changes.

There are very few indeed of the first class of schools, and it is not necessary to take any action with regard to them, beyond informing the Managers that the Board will recommend for favourable consideration of the Treasury claims for suitable remuneration, if a complete course of Manual and Practical Instruction (such as is recommended in the Report) is introduced by competent teachers.

As regards the second class of schools, it appears that the only subject to which any large number of teachers are qualified to give instruction is Drawing, and the existing regulations provide fees for this subject. The Board contemplates merely a regulation compelling all teachers holding Certificates in Drawing to introduce this subject into their schools, and permitting its introduction by other teachers who, though not certificated, are competent. In respect to other branches, it will suffice for the present to issue a circular permitting competent teachers to introduce one or more of these subjects.

As regards the third class of schools, no immediate steps can be taken to introduce Manual and Practical Instruction, as a considerable time must elapse before the teachers can be prepared for it.

With reference to the second and third classes of schools the Board propose to provide a system of organized instruction throughout Ireland for all unqualified or partially qualified teachers, and it is the provision of this organized instruction, and the estimate of the expenditure in connection with it, which were mainly dealt with in the 2d interim Report presented to His Excellency the Lord Lieutenant.

The Board propose, in the first instance, to provide instruction to only a comparatively small number of centres, because they feel that for the first year or so it will be necessary to proceed tentatively. According as they acquire experience, they propose to extend the instruction gradually until all the eligible teachers in Ireland shall have been trained to give at least some of the Manual and Practical Instruction contemplated in the Report.

The organization and administration of this system, especially as regards the framing of courses to suit different localities on such lines that the different branches shall not overlap, and that no one branch shall have undue prominence, are matters requiring very competent direction, and the Board consider that it is essential to provide a specially qualified Superintendent in Dublin for the purpose. They propose to place under his direction three organizing experts or Head Organizers (one in Drawing, one in Kindergarten, one in Elementary Science), and under each of these a certain number of local Organizers, whose duty it will be to train teachers at various centres. It is proposed to provide twenty-five of these local Organizers—eight in each of these three branches. The organizing experts are to superintend the local Organizers in their respective departments, and though eight may seem a small number to place under the charge of each expert, nevertheless the Board consider that for the first year there will be so much to be done in the way of preparing the various courses of instruction that a larger number could not be profitably employed. In each case the course of instruction would include the giving of model lessons by the local Organizers in some of the neighbouring schools. It is intended that when an Organizer in Drawing, for example, has completed his course at any centre, he shall be followed by an Organizer in Elementary Science, or in Kindergarten and Hand and Eye Training, so that the teachers in the neighbourhood of the centre shall have the opportunity of passing through a special course of training in all these branches of instruction.

As soon as teachers are thus trained, it is the intention of the Board that they shall at once introduce into their schools the branch of Manual and Practical Instruction in which they have received instruction; and to enable this to be done, it will be necessary to re-arrange to some extent our present School Programme and the System of Results payments. The nature of these re-arrangements will depend partly on the special course in which each teacher has been trained, and partly on local circumstances. For example, in town districts the Centro System\* may be available, in some districts peripatetic teaching can be organized, and in some others it may be necessary to arrange that each school shall depend on its own staff. Details, which must necessarily vary according to circumstances, cannot be determined until the centres have been decided upon, and the course of instruction at each has been arranged, and until reports have been received from the local Organizers, who will be largely responsible for the organizing of their

\* See Report of Commissioners on Manual and Practical Instruction, Part II, s. 2, p. 27.

districts. Hence, even in respect of preliminary arrangements, a great deal must be left undetermined, as regards details. The intention of the Board is, as was strongly recommended by the Commission, to give a great deal of liberty to each district, and even to each school, to introduce subjects which suit local circumstances, and to be guided largely by the advice and experience of the Head and local Organizers and of the School Inspectors in deciding what shall be done in each case. The experience of France, for example, in attempting to introduce into primary schools a rigidly formulated system of Manual Instruction which has largely failed, except in Paris, demonstrates the wisdom of trying to impose any uniform scheme upon all the National Schools of the country. On the other hand, the success of Sweden in introducing *Sloyd* into so many of the primary schools, even in country districts, encourages the Board to hope that, if they introduce these subjects only so far as the local circumstances and the teaching capacity of each school will permit, they will ultimately succeed in introducing Manual and Practical Instruction into all the schools.

## PART II.

Action recommended with a view to introducing into National Schools in Ireland each subject of Manual and Practical Instruction dealt with in the Report of the Commission:—

### (I.) KINDERGARTEN.

As the idea of education embodied in the Kindergarten System is one to be kept in view at all stages of school life, a study of its principles and some knowledge of its methods should be regarded as indispensable elements in the training of all teachers, male as well as female, even though they may never have to take charge of an Infants' class. The Board, therefore, recommend that Organizers competent to instruct teachers in these principles and methods shall be located in various centres, and that the teachers in the neighbourhood of each centre who are not already trained in Kindergarten ideas, shall, as far as possible, be required to attend classes for instruction in this system. The Board propose that, in schools where there is a sufficient number of teachers and infant pupils, Kindergarten work shall have a prominent place in the instruction of the Infants' and Junior classes. The special features to be introduced into each school will depend so much on the peculiarities of each case, upon the capabilities of each teacher, upon the accommodation in each school, and upon other local circumstances, that the Board think it unwise to draw up any particular recommendations; but they propose to provide the managers and teachers with the skilled advice of the Head and local Organizers as well as of the members of the ordinary Inspection Staff to assist them in framing schemes to suit their requirements.

In order to encourage teachers to give Kindergarten instruction intelligently and efficiently, the Board consider that a grant should be given depending specially upon the degree of success achieved, as reported by the Inspectors.

In view of the Board, a part of the remuneration of the teachers for their school work generally should take the form of a Merit Mark, dependent on the general efficiency and discipline of the school, all local and other circumstances being taken into account. This grant should not be paid in full in any school in which Kindergarten methods are not introduced as fully as circumstances permit.

### (II.) EDUCATIONAL HANDWORK.

The Board propose, in the first instance, that the training of the teachers in this subject shall be carried out by the local Organizers who are to teach Kindergarten methods, as they think it well to keep clearly in view that Educational Handwork is a development of Kindergarten principles suited to all the classes in primary schools. In a large number of National Schools, however, it may be difficult to introduce Educational Handwork in its higher developments, but it is obviously desirable that special incentives should be held out to encourage the introduction of this subject.

In the Report of the Commission Educational Handwork is divided into—

- (a) Hand and Eye Training.
- (b) Woodwork: *Sloyd*.

(a) *Hand and Eye Training*.—The Board consider that many managers and teachers will be anxious to introduce some one or more of the subjects included under this head into their schools, and, consequently, recommend that the Kindergarten Organizers shall also be competent to organize Hand and Eye Training, and that managers and teachers shall receive such encouragement to introduce this subject as is given to the case of Kindergarten. Provisions should be also made for contingent expenses, such as the cost of equipment and of materials, which should not be allowed to fall on the teachers.

(b) *Woodwork: Sloyd*.—There are few places in Ireland which afford facilities at present for the development of this advance form of Educational Handwork. Consequently, it will not be necessary to ensure that all the Kindergarten Organizers are competent to give instruction therein; but it is proposed that the Organizers in large towns, such as Dublin, Belfast, and Cork, shall be fully competent, and it is proposed that a fully qualified Organizer shall be available for the Training Colleges.

In connection with this subject, which can be conveniently worked by means of the Cùltre System, it is proposed to encourage the association of Managers with the view of utilizing common centres. Such a system, however, can be worked only in towns, and it will be some time before it can be properly organized. It is proposed to encourage it in the same way as Hand and Eye Training. It will also be necessary to provide building and equipment grants, and to ensure that the expense of working this branch does not fall on the teachers. As the expense of building, equipment, and maintenance of a woodwork centre is considerable, and the school arrangements intricate (probably to a greater extent than in the case of any of the other forms of Manual and Practical Instruction), special regulations will have to be made where this system is introduced. These special arrangements, however, cannot be made until after consultation with the Managers, and Head and local Organizers, as well as the ordinary staff of Inspectors.

### (III.) DRAWING.

It is proposed that Drawing shall be compulsory in all schools in which the teachers have certificates of competency in that branch, and that permission shall be given to uncertified teachers to introduce the subject. As a great many teachers are not certificated to teach Drawing, and comparatively few have had any instruction in the art of teaching the important branch of Mechanical Drawing, it is proposed to appoint a Head Organizer with his subordinate local Organizers in Drawing.

A good deal of latitude should be permitted to Managers, Teachers, Organizers, and Inspectors, to arrange programmes suitable for the various schools. For example, in one school Mechanical Drawing might deserve special attention, and in another a development on the lines of Artistic Designing might be of more importance. Such freedom of selection will be especially required in schools where Educational Handwork is introduced, as it is very important that Handwork and Drawing should be taught in connection with each other.

The present system of payment for the teaching of Drawing need not be altered for the present, but modification will be necessary if the changes in the Results System already referred to are introduced.

### \*(IV.) ELEMENTARY SCIENCE.

This may be conveniently divided into—

- (a) Object Lessons.
- (b) Experimental Course.

The Board propose to make this subject compulsory in all National Schools as soon as trained teachers can be provided. In order to train the teachers, it is

\* Ibid. pp. 4, 21, 22, &c.

\* See Report of Commission on Manual and Practical Instruction, pp. 26-30.

proposed that a Head Organizer and the local Organizers under his direction shall possess special qualifications for this purpose. In the first instance, special attention will be devoted to the training of teachers in the giving of Object Lessons, as the junior classes, who are to benefit by this instruction, are by far the most numerous. Whenever an Inspector recommends a teacher as competent, it is proposed that such teacher shall be permitted to give Object Lessons without special training; but as best methods of instruction can be easily acquired, it would be inadvisable to give a general permission to teachers indiscriminately.

So far as possible, the Board desire to train teachers to give instruction in Elementary Science to the senior classes in their schools. A few teachers are already qualified, and whenever there are such teachers it is proposed to encourage them to introduce suitable courses into their schools. The detailed syllabus of science courses given in Appendix A of the Report of the Commissioners will be a sufficient guide for the present. Managers, however, will be at liberty to submit for approval detailed syllabuses for their schools, prepared with the advice of the Inspector and Teacher, and of the local Organizer if possible. It is proposed that the Science Head Organizer and subordinate local Organizers, according as they learn from experience what can be done in their several districts, shall subsequently draw up specimen courses of Elementary Science (including Object Lessons) suitable for the different classes of schools, and shall submit them for the approval of the Board.

The Board consider that in reference to this subject also the method of encouragement recommended in the case of Kindergarten should be employed.

#### (V.) AGRICULTURE.

It is proposed that the present method of teaching Agriculture by means of a text-book should be gradually changed to instruction in the elements of the sciences that have a practical bearing upon Agriculture. As the present method is of little value it should cease to be obligatory, the teachers, however, being permitted to continue giving instruction as at present until they have had an opportunity of being trained in the new method.

This latter, it is proposed, shall in the first instance be designed on the lines of the French course given in Appendix D of the Report of the Commissioners. This course begins with a series of Object Lessons and continues with a course of Experimental Science, covering in both instances the subjects and sciences (Elementary Physics, Chemistry, and Biology) specially underlying Agriculture, all treated as far as possible in the form of simple experiments in which the children can assist, and which in many instances they can carry out for themselves. This course might indeed be prescribed in its entirety, but it has been in operation for so short a time in France that it is wiser to arrange that the Head and local Organizers shall draw up schemes of Elementary Science Instruction (including Object Lessons) suitable for the country schools in their neighbourhood, to be submitted to the Board for approval.

In this way it is proposed to introduce gradually into each district in Ireland, Elementary Science Instruction (including Object Lessons, in line of the present text-book teaching in Agriculture. The various courses thus designed will be better suited to the requirements and possibilities of the schools than any general system which could be prescribed for the whole of Ireland. Variety and freedom of choice are especially desirable in the case of the sciences underlying Agriculture, on account of the different circumstances of different schools and the various systems of Agriculture in operation in different districts.

The Board proposed that until the teachers have had an opportunity of being trained in the new method, the present system of payment for the teaching of Agriculture shall be continued, and that the schools in which the new method is introduced shall be encouraged to teach it in the same way as in the case of Elementary Science.

#### (VI.) COOKERY, LAUNDRY WORK, AND DOMESTIC SCIENCE.

It is proposed to increase from four to twelve the staff of Element Teachers by whom instruction is now given in Cookery and Laundry, and to make it part of their duty to give instruction to Teachers.

In order to introduce Domestic Science into girls' schools, it is proposed that the course of Elementary Science (including Object Lessons) in such schools shall be so arranged as to have a special reference to Domestic Science, and that this course shall be developed and encouraged in the same way as the other forms Elementary Science already dealt with.

#### (VII.) NEEDLEWORK.

The Board recommend that four assistants be appointed to help the Directors of Needlework in improving the methods of teaching Needlework in National schools, as they are satisfied that the necessity for such improvement is pressing. The appointment of these Assistants would also conduce to a very great economy of school time.

#### (VIII.) SINGING.

To improve and extend Singing in National Schools the Board propose the appointment of a special Inspector of Musical Instruction, one of whose chief duties will be to organize this subject in as many schools as possible. At the same time it is contemplated to pay a modified grant to schools where Singing is taught by ear only, as it appears that similar encouragement given in England has considerably increased the amount of Singing taught, and ultimately has led to a great increase in the value of the teaching.

#### (IX.) DRILL AND PHYSICAL EXERCISES.

In order to encourage School Discipline, Drill, and Physical Exercises, the Board propose that the same system of encouragement be followed as in the case of Kindergarten.

## APPENDIX XXIX.

(Forwarded by the Board of National Education in Ireland.)

### MEMORANDUM OF MR. DOWNING—1899.

SOME MEMBERS URGENTLY FEELING WITH A VIEW TO THE MORE EFFICIENT INSPECTION OF SCHOOLS.

Recent reforms have made a very considerable addition to the work of the inspectors. Numerous special reports on efficiency of service are now required, and these involve careful and lengthened inspections of many schools. Practical tests in teaching also make a new and very considerable demand on the inspectors' time. The inspectors, in their general reports, complain almost unanimously of the want of sufficient time for efficient inspection.

Already the strain of duty is very severe in some districts, and the difficulty of providing the necessary assistance for completing the work of inspection is beginning to be acutely felt. This pressure is increasing, and likely to increase very considerably still.

The increase of inspection, as distinguished from examination, is a most valuable improvement, and it is to be regretted that it cannot at once be much further extended, but that is impossible until the system of examination is simplified.



It was intended that there should be a diminution of the work of examination as a set-off to the increase of inspection; but as yet nothing has been done towards modifying the system of examination. It seems now absolutely necessary to deal with this matter at once, even though the time may not be ripe for completing a scheme. There should be no difficulty in designing arrangements suitable to present circumstances and in harmony with the improvements which the Commissions have in view.

The duties of the head inspectors also have recently undergone a large modification, in consequence of which the head inspectors cannot give sufficient care to the small districts under their immediate inspection, and have far too little time at their disposal for their proper avocations. They should be at once relieved of their districts.

There are then two matters calling urgently for consideration, namely—

- (1) A re-arranging of districts; and
- (2) A modification of the system of examination of pupils.

In re-arranging the boundaries of the districts, the question as to the most profitable way of employing the inspectors' assistants is involved, as well as that of the distribution of the present head inspectors' districts amongst the district inspectors.

The present division into districts does not, by any means, distribute the work equally amongst the inspectors. There are two ways of proceeding to remedy this defect.

One way is to re-arrange the boundaries of the districts so as to make a more equable distribution of the work. There are local circumstances that render it very difficult, if not impossible, to effect this—the chief difficulty arising from the limited number of towns suitable for district centres.

The second and most feasible way is to make a certain number of the districts sufficiently large to afford continuous employment for an assistant in each, or between two.

There is great waste of time and expense in sending the assistant so frequently as at present from one district to another; and the scheme has several other serious objections that cannot be discussed here.

The duties of the assistants, too, should be reconsidered; there is no reason why they should continue to be limited, as at present, to examining for payment of results' fees. The dividing of the school accounts, for instance, is work very suitable to be assigned in part to the assistants.

In considering a modification of the present system of examination for results, a great deal might be done as once towards progress in the direction to which the Commissioners desire the National system to advance, by means of a revision of the programme. For instance, in the case of Kindergarten, let the conversational object lesson, which is its chief feature, be made compulsory. From the recent reports it may be inferred that such lessons are already given in a majority of the schools. There will be no hardship in requiring their introduction into all schools. Any teacher can exhibit some object to a class, and lead on some conversation about it. At first, no doubt, many teachers will do it awkwardly, but, with practice, improvement is certain to follow, and it is desirable that a beginning, however feeble, should be made. There is an abundance of books in the market suitable to give hints to those teachers who require them. The programme, instead of prescribing "two suitable exercises" for infants, should require a certain number of conversational object lessons, and their proper occupation for the children at all other times.

A certain time each week should be fixed as a minimum to be devoted to the conversational object lessons, say, three half-hours for each group of classes. Infant and first classes should form one group, second and third another.

There should be no individual examination of infants under seven years of age. The individual examination in Kindergarten is distinctly contrary to the spirit of the system.

Even in first, second, and third classes the assignment of individual marks should cease at once, and the inspectors should vote their estimate of the value of the instruction given in each subject as "excellent," "good," "satisfying," or "bad," as the case may be, after a sufficient class test.

Grammar and Geography should be omitted from programme of third class, and the theory at present paid for these added on otherwise.

The sanction of the Treasury should be at once sought for changes such as these. It should be remembered that a long notice of changes must be given, and the initiation of any measures will take time; so that unless the matter is fixed at once there may elapse before any progress is made.

There is no reason why the programme in Arithmetic should not be at once placed on a rational basis.

Let the scope of the instruction in this subject be limited to what is really useful, and limit on that being taught rationally. Make it obligatory (1) that the knowledge of numbers should be introduced by means of objects—pebbles, beads, or the like—or the formal "Arithmeticon"; (2) that each new process be introduced and explained by means of easy mental calculations; (3) that when learning the compound rules the pupils should be made acquainted with the coins in circulation, and the weights and measures in common use—specimens of these weights and measures to be kept in every school, as well as a simple balance. The pupils should be required at this stage to weigh and make actual measurements. In connection with these rules, an elementary knowledge of Measurement should be introduced at the proper stage.

The examination in Arithmetic should be mainly oral, and the cards should be wholly discarded.

The programme in Geography is so out of accord with the principles of rational instruction that it should be at once altered. It should in future run somewhat on these lines:—

Class IV.—A plan of the school and of the school premises, and a map of the neighbourhood to a radius of three miles.

- .. VI.—Ireland.
- .. VII.—Great Britain.
- .. VIIA.—Europe.
- .. VIIB.—The British Empire.

Pupils after being examined twice in sixth class should not be recognised at all as pupils unless brought something new—at least two extra branches.

Provision should be made for an annual examination of teachers in Elementary Natural Science. Some of the College authorities have been inquiring as to what preparation they should be making for next session with a view to the instruction of the Queen's scholars in this branch. If a syllabus were inserted in the revised programme it would give an initiative and guidance in regard to such instruction.

(Signed), E. D.,

## APPENDIX XXX.

(Forwarded by the Board of National Education in Ireland.)

*Strictly Confidential.*

## MEMORANDUM.

The following matters are considered in this Memorandum:—

- (a.) The Re-organization of the System of Payments Salaries, &c., to the Teaching Staffs of National Schools.
- (b.) The Revision of the School Curriculum and System of School Organization.
- (c.) The Re-organization of the Inspection Staff.

## PART I.

## THE RE-ORGANIZATION OF THE SYSTEM OF PAYMENTS OF SALARIES, &amp;c., TO THE TEACHING STAFFS OF NATIONAL SCHOOLS.

The State aid to the staffs of all National Schools in 1897-8 was £1,128,956. Deducting from this, £119,832 paid to Monastery and Convent Capitation Schools, and £94,880 paid in salaries to pupil teachers, monitors, and special teachers in Model Schools, to monitors in ordinary National Schools, workmistresses, junior assistants, &c., there remained a balance of about £944,224, which was paid to the classed teachers of ordinary Model, Monastery, and Convent Schools, and to the classed teachers of small Capitation Schools, in salaries, results fees, gratuities, &c. These teachers numbered (including principals and assistants) 11,781—and the State payment to them represented, in round figures, an average of £80 per annum for each.

About £225,840 was paid to all the schools in results fees, and it was this sum, practically speaking, that represented payment for actual work done in the schools. The other payments depended on the classification of the teachers, the number of children in average attendance, &c.

The results payments, though only about one-fourth of the total grants, involve so much labour that nearly the whole staff of the inspection staff is absorbed with results examinations, and a large section of the staff of the Central Office is constantly engaged in work appertaining to the results system. This method of payment on individual passes has now comparatively few advocates, and has long since been abandoned in England and Scotland.

The Commissioners, in their recent report to His Excellency the Lord Lieutenant, on the recommendations of the Manual and Practical Instruction Commission, quoted from the report of that Commission as follows:—

"At the outset of our Inquiry we received important evidence that the introduction of subjects of manual and practical instruction would necessarily involve a substantial change in the present method of testing the instruction given in the schools. It is therefore necessary to describe briefly the system of examination and inspection of primary schools which prevails at present in Ireland.

"National Schools are examined for results fees once a year, but incidental visits are made whenever the inspectors can find time and opportunity. On account of the amount of time taken up by the examinations for results fees, these incidental visits are necessarily rare. The results examination consists in the testing of the pupils in all the subjects taught in the school, and upon their answering the questions of the school is mainly judged. The pupils who have not made 100 attendances are not examined, and, so far as they are concerned, there is no definite test of the value of the instruction they receive, except that which may be applied by the inspector when making an incidental visit. Fees are paid to the teacher for each pupil passed at the results examination, the amount payable being assessed by a necessarily laborious process in the Education Office on the basis of a return furnished by the inspectors.

"The results fees system, under which a considerable amount of the teacher's income is dependent on the individual answering of the pupils, was introduced into Ireland 1871-2: it had been in operation in England for ten years previously.

"In England the examination of the pupils for the purpose of assessing the grant was at first confined to Reading, Writing, and Arithmetic, but this was found unsatisfactory in practice, inasmuch as the range of work tended to become more and more restricted to these subjects alone. Consequently in 1887 a small payment, not depending on the number of passes, was made to those schools in which subjects other than the 'three R's' were taught in the higher classes. In 1893 these extra subjects were differentiated into 'Class' and 'Specific' subjects. The former were subjects such as Grammar, Geography, History, which admitted of being taught according to a graduated programme, in all the classes of the school. Payment for these subjects was not made on the basis of individual passes, but according to the proficiency of the class as a whole. Specific subjects were more advanced subjects, such as Mathematics, Languages, Domestic Economy, taken, as a rule, not by whole classes, but by selected pupils in the highest classes. Payment for these subjects was made on the basis of individual examination. In 1893 the number of obligatory subjects was increased, and while individual examination in the three R's was still insisted on, a Merit Grant was also provided for, to be paid according to the condition of a school or class as a whole, the special difficulties of the teacher, owing to local circumstances, &c., being taken into consideration. In 1899 this system was superseded, and 'Class' examination or examination by sample was, except in the case of specific subjects, made the test of school work. Since 1896, in schools which have maintained for a sufficient time a standard of work 'well above the level of efficiency,' examination of the pupils has largely been replaced by inspection of the teaching. In other cases a 'sample' or 'class' examination may still be held if the inspector is not satisfied with the state of the school after a formal inspection.

"In Scotland the mode of examination as a basis for payment of grants has undergone a very similar modification. In that country, payments by results, even in the case of the 'three R's,' was not introduced till 1873, and from the very first, certain other subjects, viz., those referred to above as class subjects, were paid for according to the success of the class as a whole. As early as 1880, class examination was applied to the 'three R's' also, but in the case of children in classes under VI. only. In 1880 individual examination in the 'three R's' was abolished in all the classes, except for the purpose of granting labour certificates. In the Scotch code of the present year changes have been introduced which are intended to have the effect of combining inspection of methods in the classes generally, at visits without notice throughout the year, with an individual examination of pupils in or beyond Standard VI., towards the end of the school year. On this examination merit certificates will be awarded which shall attest individual proficiency in the whole range of a primary school. It should be explained that no results fees attach to these individual examinations, though their collective result may be an element in determining the rate of grant to be paid to a school.

"The results fees system when introduced into Ireland undoubtedly had beneficial effects on the general character of the work then done in the National Schools. But evidence has been given to us of the benefits that have resulted from the successive changes made in the English and Scotch Educational Systems, whereby the system of individual examination has been gradually replaced

by one of inspection; and while the scope of one Commission seems to prevent us from expressing an opinion upon the general question as to whether a similar modification might not with advantage be made in Ireland, we consider that as regards the practical subjects, of which we recommend the introduction, such a change is absolutely essential. To secure the best efforts from Manual and Practical Instruction, the inspectors should be at liberty to test the progress of the pupils by more flexible methods than can be applied under a rigid system of individual examination. Time should be available for frequent incidental visits. Experience has shown that, even in reference to the present subject of the programme, this cannot be secured so long as the existing system is maintained."

and they added:—

"The change in the system of payment of teachers thus recommended by the Commission is at present under consideration, and detailed plans are being worked out by the officials of the Board. The matter is necessarily one of great complexity, and will require prolonged as well as careful consideration before any definite scheme is finally decided upon. The recommendations made in this Report are quite independent of it. Besides, as contemplated by the Board, it is not a matter that will involve any increase of expenditure. The Board, therefore, have not deemed it advisable to make any further reference to it in this Report."

In that Report the Commissioners, in view of the possibly great delay thus indicated in remodelling the system of payments to teachers, suggested as a temporary measure the encouragement of certain special subjects by Grant Grants, such as are given in England and Scotland; and, for other subjects, a continuance of the present method of remuneration, but under somewhat altered conditions.

At the time of the Commissioners' Report to His Excellency, however, the matter of the re-organisation of the system of payments to the school staffs had occupied the attention of the Education Office for some months, various methods of payment had been proposed and discussed, and the consideration of the question was much further advanced than the Commissioners were aware.

Various schemes had been devised for modifying the existing results system alone, and it was proposed, if possible, to avoid the necessity for legislation in connection with any new general plan for the payment of the teachers that might specially concern itself. The Customs and Excise Grant (£75,000 per annum), and the School Grant (10s. per head on the average attendance), being administered under the Local Taxation and Irish Education Acts respectively, could not, it was assumed, be disbursed in any other ways than those prescribed in the Acts, without legislation. But the passing of the Agriculture and Technical Instruction (Ireland) Act of 1899 removed the difficulty as regards the Customs and Excise (Local Taxation) Act, and, as a result of a small portion of the Irish Education Act of 1892 would give the Commissioners and the Treasury a comparatively free hand to make whatever arrangements for payment of the teachers that might seem most advisable, it was thought better that in any general scheme to be submitted to the Board, provision should be made for the complete abolition of the present complicated and unsatisfactory methods of remunerating the teachers.

But before making any suggestions on the subject allowances had to be made for the special and almost unique circumstances of Irish Primary Schools.

Some of these peculiar circumstances are as follows:—

- More than one-half of the schools are small, with average attendances ranging from 10 to 20.
- More than one-half are attended by boys and girls—and one-fourth by girls, or girls and infants, and less than one-fourth by boys only.
- Most of the schools have only one teacher or one teacher and a teacher.
- Many of the teachers are not skilled and not trained.

- The re-organisation (quartile, tripartite, &c.), is complicated and antiquated. Moreover, there are practically eight "classes" or "standards" of pupils recognised.
- The programme is very extensive, embracing many extra branches.
- The social circumstances of the pupils vary considerably (even in the same school), but the great mass of the pupils are extremely poor.
- A considerable number of the school-houses, especially in the towns, are good and well furnished; but a great number are bad, wretchedly furnished, and uncomfortable.
- Local assistance to the schools or co-operation in their management, except in the case of the clergy, is very limited.

For many of the reasons just specified—such as smallness of the schools, the nature of the attendance, the absence of local co-operation, &c., the system of capitation payments which is adopted in England and Scotland would not suit the circumstances of Ireland. But the facts that in Ireland there are no School Boards, and that the teachers are paid individually from the Central Office, and not directly by the local managers, may be considered determining factors against any general system of Capitation Grants. Moreover, the Capitation Grants, even in England, are not now regarded with much favour, and in the Report of the English Education Department for 1897-8 they are referred to as "a rather complex system of grants, chaotic in their working, but indispensable to the development of any general idea of the curriculum which might normally be expected from every Elementary School." Nevertheless, such a plan of payments was actually prepared and considered, but was set aside as not feasible.

Before proceeding to formulate a general scheme of payments it was first considered in what way the money now paid in results fees could be better disbursed, and it was found that this money might be distributed in any manner the Commissioners and the Treasury arranged, without any necessity whatever for having recourse to Parliament. This money could be paid with greater advantage to education, with more satisfaction to the teachers, and with an immense saving of official labour in many ways other than by fees for individual schooling of the pupils. It might be distributed, for example:—

- In giving an increase of salary to the class salaries of principals, the salaries of assistant, industrial teachers, junior assistants, and workmistresses, and to the Capitation Grants to convent, monastery, and small schools.
- In increasing the class salaries of principal teachers, the salaries of industrial teachers, junior assistants, and workmistresses, and the Capitation Grants to convent, monastery, and small schools, and in giving these salaries to all assistant teachers.
- In giving Capitation Grants for special subjects of Manual and Practical Instruction recommended by the present Commission, and grants of special salaries, equipment grants, &c., in connection with the same subjects.
- In giving grants under a combination of above plans (a) (b) (c).
- In giving annual increments of salaries to all teachers, and in giving special salaries to head teachers in all National Schools.
- In giving Capitation Grants on the total average attendance for proficiency in all the ordinary subjects of the Programme, including Manual and Practical Instruction, Drawing, &c., after the local circumstances of each school, the social condition of the pupils, the proficiency generally displayed, and the degree of organization and discipline obtained (including Physical Drill and manual department) had been considered.

It would extend the limits of this Memorandum unduly to discuss each of the above plans in detail. Any one of them, however, would be less involved than the present system. The method of distribution outlined in (a) is the simplest in character, and the

best plan calculated to give most satisfaction to the teachers. The greater the portion of a teacher's income that is fixed, and the less of it that is precarious (dependent on contingencies and liable to fluctuation), the more contented the teacher will be with his lot and the more he will be inclined to put his heart into his work. Similar remarks apply to plan (b) as to plan (a.) This plan would, however, have the special merit of removing what is known as the "Assessors' Grievance." The plan under (c) might commend itself to the members of the Manual and Practical Instruction Commission, and there would be no difficulties in making an equitable distribution of the money if it should be adopted, but the objection might be raised that £238,640 per annum is too large a sum to expend solely on Manual and Practical Instruction, out of a total grant of £1,120,980. The plan under (d) being a compromise, would possibly have many advocates, while the plan (e) would be specially pleasing to the teachers. The plan (f) resembles the method under which the State Grants are at present distributed in England and Scotland, modified so as to suit the peculiar circumstances of Irish Primary Schools.

But none of these plans would go far enough in the simplification of the system of remuneration of the teachers. The present results system based on individual examination would, no doubt, be abolished; but the greater portion of the teachers' incomes would still continue to be paid under the laborious and complicated arrangement of class salaries, capitation grants, gratuities, &c. The present cumbersome system of school accounts would still have to be maintained almost intact, the temptation to the teachers to falsify their returns in order to secure or to increase their incomes would remain as strong as ever, the elaborate, costly, and unsatisfactory methods of classification and promotion by annual examinations and "highly efficient" service would still be continued, and, in fact, except the results examinations of individual scholars would no longer be held, things would practically remain as they are now. Under such circumstances, there would be grave obstacles to the introduction of new subjects of instruction into the schools, and it is to be feared that, if an attempt were made to encourage special branches by Merit Grants, some of the worst features of the Results System would be perpetuated.

The organization of the school work and the school curriculum could not be materially changed unless a radical reform in the system of payments generally was effected, a reform that would practically remove the element of precariousness from the incomes of the teachers, and that would at the same time so simplify the work of the inspectors and the staff of the Central Office that nearly the whole time of the majority of the Commissioners' offices could be devoted to the principal business of the Board—namely, the education of the people. It is evident, too, that with the abolition of the results system, special provision should be made for encouraging deserving teachers, punishing or controlling undeserving teachers, and for stimulating instruction in the schools, and that this provision should be automatic and continuous. The following plan of distribution of the whole income of the teachers was accordingly devised to meet all these requirements—

**PROPOSED NEW SYSTEM OF PAYMENT OF THE WHOLE INCOME FROM THE STATE OF TEACHERS OF DAY NATIONAL SCHOOLS.**

1. The Government Funds at the disposal of the Commissioners for the payment of the Teaching Staffs consist at present of (a) the money voted annually, but not under any special Act of Parliament; (b) the School Grant under Irish Education Act of 1892; and (c) the Customs and Excise Grant. The actual payments consisted of the following items in 1897-8:—

|                                    | £                 |
|------------------------------------|-------------------|
| (a.) Salaries and Gratuities, ...  | 598,815           |
| Results Fees, ...                  | 228,640           |
| (b.) School Grant, ...             | 249,480           |
| (c.) Customs and Excise Grant, ... | 79,339            |
| <b>Total, ...</b>                  | <b>£1,120,160</b> |

2. The distribution of the portion of the funds under (a) is made in accordance with rules drawn up by the Commissioners, and sanctioned by Treasury Regulations. This portion of the fund could, therefore, be disposed of in any manner the Commissioners and the Treasury might arrange. The portion of the funds under (b) is distributed in accordance with the provisions of the Fourth Schedule of the Act of 1892, and legislation might be required before the Commissioners could dispose of this portion of the funds otherwise than as set forth in the Schedule referred to. The portion under (c) will be allocated in future for the purposes of the Agriculture and Technical Instruction (Ireland) Act, 1899; but the Commissioners will get a Treasury Grant of an equal amount in lieu of it.

3. A very short Act of Parliament in some such terms as the following would remove any existing difficulties in dealing freely with the monies under (b):—

"Whereas under the Irish Education Act of 1879, 56 and 56 Vic., c. 42, certain monies are placed at the disposal of the Commissioners of National Education in Ireland for the purpose of primary education.

"Be it enacted that the portion of Section 18, Sub-section (1) of the Irish Education Act of 1879, commencing with the words 'in accordance with the provisions' and ending with the words 'Fourth Schedule to this Act,' be repealed, and in place thereof there be substituted the words 'for the general purposes of the Commissioners of National Education as approved by the Treasury.' Also that Section 18—Sub-sections (2), (3), (4), and (5), together with the Fourth Schedule to the Act be also repealed, and that all National Schools (except such as may be specially allowed by the Commissioners of National Education to charge school fees), be heretofore free from school fees for children 8 to 15 years of age. Provided always,—That no National teacher at present in the service is to suffer a loss of income in consequence of this Act.

"This Act shall take effect from 1900, and may be cited as the 'Educational Finance (Ireland) Act, 1900.'"

4. Provided that an Act in the foregoing or similar form was passed, or that it was decided by the Treasury that such an Act was not necessary, the Commissioners might then proceed thoroughly to reconstruct and reorganize their system in its financial and educational elements.

5. As already stated, out of the total grant, a sum of £944,524 was paid in 1897-8 to the classed teachers of National Schools.

6. For the purpose of a new financial arrangement all classed or provisionally classed teachers might be divided into three grades—the first or highest grade containing two divisions. The number of teachers in each grade above the 3rd should be fixed, and be, say, as follows:—

|                              | Men   | Women |
|------------------------------|-------|-------|
| 1st Grade (1st Section), ... | 300   | 250   |
| 1st „ (2nd Section), ...     | 1,000 | 700   |
| 2nd „ ...                    | 2,450 | 1,800 |

The numbers in the 3rd Grade could not be fixed without the formation of a 4th or probationary Grade. The numbers in the 3rd Grade would, it is estimated, be about 2,100 men and 3,400 women. The numbers in the various grades should, however, be subject to revision by the Commissioners and the Treasury whenever necessary.

All teachers appointed for the first time, no matter what their attainments or qualifications may be, should enter the 3rd Grade and take seniority rank according to the date of their first appointments.

7. In this connection it would become necessary to prepare a Roll or Register of National Teachers, in which would be shown for each teacher the Register number, the name, the date of birth, date of first appointment to the service, the names of first, second, third, &c., schools in which he was employed, the date of entering and leaving each school, and finally the date of quitting the service. This Roll, which should have an alphabetical Index, would be useful in many

ways, besides showing at a glance the service of each teacher. It would enable the Officers of the Commission to trace the career of every teacher with facility, and would thus be a great aid to the Board in deciding upon the merits of the respective candidates for promotion to the higher grades. The Roll should

be revised every year, the necessary changes, whether promotions or depressions, being noted therein, together with any other information that experience might render necessary.

8. The Roll of National Teachers might take the following shape:—

| Reg. No. | Name of Teacher.  | Date of Birth. | Date of Entry to Service. | 1st School. |    | 2nd School. |    | 3rd School. |    | Date of Retirement, Dismissal, or Death. |
|----------|-------------------|----------------|---------------------------|-------------|----|-------------|----|-------------|----|--|
|          |                   |                |                           | From        | To | From        | To | From        | To |  |
| 35569    | John Smith ..     | 1-1-58         | 1-1-77                    |             |    |             |    |             |    |  |
| 35570    | Martin Jones ..   | 7-4-56         | 3-5-77                    |             |    |             |    |             |    |  |
| 35571    | Stephen Pearch .. | 3-7-53         | 2-7-83                    |             |    |             |    |             |    |  |
| 35572    | W. Henry Green .. | 4-8-54         | 6-2-86                    |             |    |             |    |             |    |  |
| 35574    | David White ..    | 6-2-53         | 5-2-85                    |             |    |             |    |             |    |  |
| 35575    | Thomas Lewis ..   | 3-5-54         | 2-2-85                    |             |    |             |    |             |    |  |
| 19576    | James Banks ..    | 2-8-59         | 3-1-88                    |             |    |             |    |             |    |  |

9. The 3rd Grade should in future consist of all unretired principal teachers (in addition to all trained principal teachers appointed for the first time) and of all assistants, whether trained or untrained.

Promotion from the lower grades to the higher in the case of vacancies should depend on—

(a) Training; (b) Position in school; (c) Ability and general attainments; (d) Good service; (e) Seniority.

No future teacher should be eligible for promotion to the 2nd Grade unless trained in a recognised Residential or Day Training College, and occupying the position of principal teacher, and then only if in the opinion of the Commissioners he is entitled to promotion on the grounds of ability and attainments, good service, and seniority. In estimating the ability and attainments of a teacher his classification, University degrees or diplomas, Science and Art certificates, &c., should be considered.

Promotion from the 2nd Grade to the 1st Grade (2nd Section) should be made on the same general principles as from the 3rd to the 2nd Grade, but promotion to the 1st Grade (1st Section), might be regarded as the "blue ribbon" of the National Teachers' Profession, and should be made only on account of long service, success in teaching, and exceptional ability.

10. Teachers should be eligible for promotion to the position of Junior Inspector of National Schools under the conditions set forth in the third part of this Memorandum.

11. In future all annual examinations of teachers, except monitors, pupil teachers provisionally classed teachers, and students of Training Colleges, should be abolished. After finally leaving a Training College, and receiving his diploma and certificate, a teacher should be done with examinations.

12. The training certificate should be full and comprehensive, setting forth in some detail the attainments of the Queen's scholar, such as classification, University Degrees, proficiency as a school-leaver, special diplomas or certificates held by the teacher, &c.

13. The Commissioners should periodically fill vacancies in the higher grades, in accordance with the specified conditions.

14. The classification of teachers as now understood should be abolished for all future teachers. The present system of promotion should be abolished for all teachers.

15. A special scale of salaries should be fixed for each grade—rising each by annual increments to a fixed maximum. This scale should cover all emoluments from the State. The increments, however, should not be granted as a matter of course to all teachers, but only to teachers whose schools are reported as progressing satisfactorily.

16. According to a return in the Commissioners' Report for 1895, the average incomes of certain classes of teachers from State sources were as follows:—

| MALES. |     | £   | s. | d. |
|--------|-----|-----|----|----|
| I.,    | ... | 189 | 13 | 7½ |
| II.,   | ... | 108 | 18 | 7½ |
| III.,  | ... | 90  | 12 | 7½ |
| IV.,   | ... | 78  | 4  | 5  |

## FEMALES.

|       | £   | s. | d. |
|-------|-----|----|----|
| I.,   | 118 | 1  | 6½ |
| II.,  | 92  | 18 | 0  |
| III., | 70  | 14 | 5  |
| IV.,  | 61  | 11 | 9½ |

## Males.

|             | £  | s. | d. |
|-------------|----|----|----|
| Assistants, | 60 | 10 | 8  |

## Females.

|             | £  | s. | d. |
|-------------|----|----|----|
| Assistants, | 40 | 0  | 2½ |

This return, owing to the confusion of incomes of teachers of modified grant schools, &c., shows averages somewhat in excess of the true average incomes of the teachers generally.

From an examination of the materials from which the return was prepared it would appear that the maximum salary of male teachers, derivable from the State was, in the vast majority of cases, under £150 a year, about one hundred and thirty male teachers had incomes between £150 and £180, and about eighty had incomes over £180. In the case of the female teachers, the vast majority had incomes from the State of under £120 a year, about one hundred and thirty had incomes between £120 and £150, and about fifty had incomes of £150 and above.

17. Taking the total annual amount available from the State for the payment of classed or provisionally classed teachers as about £260,000, the following scales of payments for the three grades, into which it is proposed to divide the teachers in future, has been drawn up. The scales are in line of all emoluments from the State, and provide for annual increments of salary during thirty-six years of the teachers' school life, and are liberal on the whole, as compared with the existing rates of payment. Were all the teachers paid at the maximum rates of each grade, and were the grades full, the total cost would be £1,135,850 annually. On the other hand, were the teachers paid at the minimum rates for each grade, and were the grades full, the total cost would be £796,100 annually. The actual cost would, it is estimated, work out in practice ultimately to about £900,000 per annum.

## PROPOSED SCALES.

## MIN.

|                          | Minimum. |    |    | Annual Increment. |    |    | Maximum. |    |    |
|--------------------------|----------|----|----|-------------------|----|----|----------|----|----|
|                          | £        | s. | d. | £                 | s. | d. | £        | s. | d. |
| 1st Grade (1st Section). | 151      | 0  | 0  | 5                 | 0  | 0  | 181      | 0  | 0  |
| 1st Grade (2nd Section). | 110      | 0  | 0  | 5                 | 0  | 0  | 130      | 0  | 0  |
| 2nd Grade ..             | 79       | 0  | 0  | 3                 | 0  | 0  | 109      | 0  | 0  |
| 3rd Grade ..             | 52       | 0  | 0  | 2                 | 0  | 0  | 78       | 0  | 0  |

## WOMEN.

|                          | Minimum. | Actual Increment. | Maximum. |
|--------------------------|----------|-------------------|----------|
|                          | £ s. d.  | £ s. d.           | £ s. d.  |
| 1st Grade (1st Section). | 121 0 0  | 5 0 0             | 126 0 0  |
| 1st Grade (2nd Section). | 62 0 0   | 3 10 0            | 129 0 0  |
| 2nd Grade ..             | 66 0 0   | 2 10 0            | 91 0 0   |
| 3rd Grade ..             | 30 0 0   | 2 0 0             | 65 0 0   |

18. This scale and the foregoing conditions of promotion should be compulsory on all teachers, except the teachers of Convent and Monastery Schools paid by capitation. Existing teachers, however, should rank in the grades of the scale to which their actual incomes from the State correspond, and which shall position as principals or assistants permit. If such teachers are not in receipt of salaries from the State equal to the maximum of the grade to which they would thus, respectively, become attached, they should be eligible for advancement in salary to such maximum in the same way as other teachers, i.e., by annual increments. But such teachers should not be entitled to promotion from one grade to another, or from the 2nd to the 1st Section of the 1st Grade, except on the usual conditions, provided that in the case of untrained teachers who were not deterred from promotion by the rules hitherto in force, the absence of a teaching diploma should not render them ineligible for promotion, if all other conditions are complied with.

19. Should an existing principal teacher have an actual income from the State greater than that fixed as the maximum of the 1st Section of 1st Grade, or should he be on a scale with a higher maximum (as in the case at present with certain teachers in Model Schools, &c.), he should retain such greater income or better scale as a personal one, during good behaviour and so long as he remains a principal in the same school. A similar rule should apply to existing assistants, but an assistant on promotion to a principalship should have his actual salary as assistant as his initial salary as principal. Moreover, the cases of highly-classed assistants should be specially considered on their promotion to principalships.

20. As an example of the application of the new scale to the case of an existing teacher, the following will suffice:—Supposing the present income from the State of a male principal teacher is £99 15s. 6d. per annum, he would in future under the New Scale become a 2nd Grade teacher, rising from £90 by annual increments of £3 to a maximum salary of £105. In this connection fractions of £1 should be treated as £1. Thus £99 15s. 6d. should be regarded as £99.

21. For the purposes of the Teachers' Pension Act, existing principal teachers should be allowed to pay for the pension of their educational class, irrespectively of the grades of teachers to which their actual salaries from the State would give them the right to belong. But as regards future teachers, in the 3rd Grade they should be allowed to subscribe only for 3rd class pensions; in the 2nd Grade for 2nd class pensions; and in the 1st Grade (both sections) for 1st class pensions. In fact, for the purposes of the Pensions Act the new grades should for future teachers take the place of the old classes. This would necessitate a slight change in the Pension Rules.

22. No future teacher of a school in which the average is under 20 should have any claim for salary beyond the minimum of the 3rd Grade, and this should be the lowest rate of remuneration for the teacher of a recognised National School, even if the average is only 10. But grant care should be made to be taken to prevent the undue multiplication of very small schools.

No future teacher of a school in which the average attendance is under 30 should have any claim, while in such school, to promotion to the 2nd Grade.

No teacher of a school in which an average of at least 50 is not maintained should have any claim while in such school to promotion to the 1st Grade, and no teacher of a school should have any claim to

promotion to the 1st Section of the 1st Grade unless the school maintains an average attendance of at least 70 pupils.

23. But while a teacher should not be promoted unless his school had the average required by the preceding paragraph, he should as far as possible be safe-guarded against diminution of income owing to circumstances affecting the attendance, such as sickness, &c., over which he has no control, and so long as the attendance is sufficient to give full occupation to a teacher, his salary should not be seriously reduced. If the attendance at a school in which a principal teacher of the 1st Grade is employed declines, the salary of such teacher should not be reduced unless the average falls below 35 permanently, and similarly in the case of a principal teacher of the 2nd Grade, salary should not be reduced unless the average falls below 30 permanently. Should, however, the decline in the average be due to the teacher's inefficiency or neglect of duty, the salary should be liable to reduction at any time, irrespectively of the numerical extent of the decline, at the discretion of the Commissioners.

24. Assistant teachers should continue to be recognised on the same averages as are required at present. No new assistant, however, should be recognised in any school unless the average attendance for the preceding calendar year was sufficient, and in the case of new schools, no salary should be paid to any assistant until the Commissioners are satisfied that the average attendance is sufficient. No assistant should under any circumstances be continued for more than one year in a school where the average is insufficient, and the grant should be liable to be cancelled before the end of a year if the Commissioners are satisfied that the decline in the attendance is a permanent one.

25. Principal teachers who may be out of employment for a time should have a claim to retain their grade, provided they obtain re-employment as principals within a year. If, however, they do not obtain re-employment within a year, the Commissioners should determine whether they can, when re-employed as principals, retain their former grade, or in what lower grade they can be recognised. This regulation should not apply to principals who have been dismissed from their schools for irregularities, breaches of rule, &c. Principal teachers thus re-employed, however, and principal teachers transferred from one school to another, should not be allowed to retain their grade and consequent emolument unless the conditions as to average attendance (paragraph 23) are complied with.

26. The time during which a teacher is out of employment should, as a rule, not count for the purpose of an increment of salary.

27. The conductors of Capitation Convent and Monastery Schools should receive an annual grant of 30s., 35s., or 40s. per pupil in average attendance, in lieu of all their present emoluments from the State. The rate of the Capitation Grant, in future, to be determined by the Board after consideration of the work done in each school, and the reports of the inspectors and managers thereon. For the present such conductor of a Convent Capitation School should receive the rate approximating most closely to, but not less than, the actual State income of the school per head, calculated on the average attendance. The cases of Convent Schools having actual incomes from the State greater than those represented by a 40s. Capitation Grant, to be specially considered at the end of one year.

28. The salaries of workmistresses and industrial teachers should be regulated according to an incremental scale—say, for the former, an initial salary of £12 rising by triennial increments of £2 to a maximum of, say, £18, and for the latter an initial salary of, say, £20, rising by triennial increments of £2 to, say, £30. Workmistresses and industrial teachers having actual salaries greater than the above, to retain them as personal. Junior literary assistants are now dying out, and it is scarcely necessary to fix a scale for them. Temporary assistants and temporary workmistresses might be paid according to the lowest rates fixed for permanent assistants and permanent workmistresses, for actual service. Monitors and pupil teachers have scales already.

29. Some of the advantages that would accrue from the payment of the teachers in the manner just indicated would be:—

- (a.) The abolition of the Results System.
- (b.) Economy in the cost of the Central Office (estimated at about £8,700 per annum in one department alone), and the consequent liberation of portion of the Commissioners' funds for useful educational purposes.
- (c.) A great simplification of the payments and a proportionate economy of clerical time and labour in the Central Office.
- (d.) A great economy of time and labour of the Inspectors by the abolition of the Results Examinations.
- (e.) A great economy of time and labour in the Exchequer and Audit Department, London.
- (f.) A great simplification of the school accounts, and consequent economy of time of Inspectors and teachers.
- (g.) Increased satisfaction on the part of the teachers, who would have definite and increasing income, instead of a precarious and fluctuating income, as at present.
- (h.) A great freedom of instruction and classification of the pupils in the schools.  
The freedom of classification of the pupils and the facilities for the rearrangement of the School Fees-table to suit the exigencies of particular schools or school districts, would clear the way for the introduction of an organized system of Manual and Practical Instruction.
- (i.) Increased facilities for encouraging earnest teachers or for controlling negligent teachers.  
The power to grant or withhold the annual increment of salary and the fact that promotion from one grade to another would depend on good service, would set up a powerful stimulus to the exertions of the teachers.

30. Of course, the schools should continue to be examined and the progress of the pupils tested by repeated inspections, but individual examination of all the pupils of a school in all the subjects of the programme, except in very special cases, should be abolished. On the other hand, it should be only in very rare cases that examination in some form should be dispensed with altogether. Even the best schools are liable to become retrograde if not tested from time to time by a public examination, which arouses the energies of the teachers and pupils and enables parents to judge of the progress of their children and the merits of their instructors.

31. The teachers, knowing that their future welfare would depend largely on their official reputation, would, when relieved of the necessity of preparing themselves and their pupils for annual examinations, devote more of their time to study and to mental culture, which, while going a long way towards raising their own status, would also tend to improve their usefulness as public instructors. They can devote their attention to Education and the methods of producing it rather than to devices for earning results fees.

## PART II.

### THE REVISION OF THE SCHOOL CURRICULUM AND SYSTEM OF SCHOOL ORGANIZATION.

The time of the average pupil in National Schools is at present occupied by Reading, Writing, Arithmetic, Grammar, Geography, Agriculture, Needlework, Book-keeping, &c., together with some one or more of the extra branches; and not only is it difficult to attend to this array of subjects, but the teacher is compelled, if for no other reason but the shortness of the school hours, to give comparatively little attention to instruction in each of them. The result too often is that no branch is well taught, and many pupils leave school without even a fair knowledge of reading, writing, and arithmetic.

If the results fees system is abolished, the present Programme of Instruction should be swept away at the same time, and its place supplied by a programme that would include certain essential subjects for all

National Schools but that would be so flexible, at the same time, as to be capable of adaptation to the peculiar circumstances of Irish Primary Schools, and to the special requirements of the localities in which the schools are situated. Outside the essential subjects, which should be taught as far as possible in every primary school, managers and teachers should be left free to teach other useful branches.

There are three matters that should always be provided for in a Primary School:—1st, and most essential, the equipment of every child for the work of life by giving him a knowledge of Reading, Writing, and Arithmetic; 2nd, the cultivation of the senses and of the intelligence by Hand, Eye, and Ear training, Elementary Science, Object Lessons, &c.; and, 3rd, the preservation of a sound mind and a healthy body by physical drill and exercise.

The Day School Programme subjects should be confined to those that are necessary to give pupils of a Primary School a sufficient education for their prospective needs.

The ordinary Day School subjects should be (a) Reading, (b) Writing, (c) Arithmetic, (d) Kindergarten and Manual Instruction, (e) Drawing, (f) Elementary Science, (g) Cookery and Laundry Work, (h) Needlework, (i) Singing, (j) School Discipline and Physical Drill.

The ordinary subjects only should be taught within the four hours allotted to secular instruction.

Extra subjects should be limited in number and should be taught only outside the four hours allotted to secular instruction. Extra subjects should be paid for according to individual passes or in a similar manner to that provided in the English Code. The extra subjects should be confined to the higher branches of Mathematics and Science, Modern and Ancient Languages, Instrumental Music, &c. Even these subjects should be tolerated in the Primary School course, only so long as there is no organized system of Secondary or Intermediate Schools.

It is not at all likely that under the New Regulations extra branches would be taught to any great extent, and the cost would be accordingly very limited—possibly not exceeding £2,000 per annum.

Which of the ordinary subjects of the Programme should at present be made compulsory is a question that would require careful consideration, but at a future date, when the schools have been reorganized, all should be made compulsory in every Primary School attended by girls, and all, except Needlework, Cookery, and Laundry Work, in schools attended by boys.

There is a consensus of opinion amongst persons interested in primary education that the instruction at present given in Grammar and Geography has very little educational value. The rules of Grammar are, no doubt, learned by heart, and the pupils acquire some knowledge of parsing, but most of this is forgotten after the pupils leave school, and if they wish to speak or write grammatically it is by observation of correct speakers and writers, they are enabled to do so, and not by having recourse to the rules of Grammar. In the same manner the geographical information obtained at school is comparatively worthless in adult life. While at school children commit to memory, with great labour, the names of countries, heights of mountains, &c.—facts which no doubt are interesting in themselves. But the children form no correct ideas of what the countries, mountains, &c., are like, until such time as travel enables them to see the actual places, or a perusal of books, &c., opens their minds and lets in a flood of sound and useful geographical light. Similar remarks apply to History to a certain extent.

Geography, Grammar, and History are omitted as special subjects from the proposed Programme, but it is intended that, under the head of Reading, efficient instruction in these branches should be given, and hence the time allowed for this subject should be longer than for the other branches. Reading should also include Spelling. On two days per week the Reading Lessons should be from *Geographical Readers*, and on two days from *Library Readers*, and on one day from *Historical Readers*. The simpler grammatical principles should be inculcated during the Reading Lessons. The Reading Lessons should also be illustrated by Maps, Diagrams, Simple Objects, &c.

Writing should be from Headlines on two days, from Dictation on one day, and two days might be

devoted to Composition. Senior boys, if it is considered desirable, might get instruction in Book-keeping during the time allowed to the Writing Lesson. *Arithmetic* should be confined to the simpler rules for the great body of the pupils, but if there were senior pupils who had mastered these rules, they might be allowed to study the higher rules, and Algebra, Mensuration, or Euclid.

Official syllabuses or schedules of instruction in all the branches should be prepared for the guidance of the teachers. These syllabuses should allow of great freedom of selection on the part of managers and teachers.

In connection with the reorganisation of the school work, it is suggested that "Home Lessons" should as a rule be abolished. The preparation of "Home Lessons," no doubt, relieves the teacher from a great deal of labour, but when the miserable condition and limited accommodation of the homes of a very large section of the pupils are considered, it will be evident that the preparation of "Home Lessons" is, in many cases, absolutely impossible. Books, too, are required for "Home Lessons," and these are not always procurable.

Many poor children are deterred from attending a

school by fear of corporal punishment for "not knowing their lessons." Even in the case of the better classes of children "Home Lessons" take up a great portion of the time that should be devoted to exercise in the open air, and thus the brain is often over-stimulated and the intelligence developed at the expense of the general health of the body. There should be no detriment to the attendance of children, and it should be remembered that a sound body is, as a rule, of no less importance to a pupil of a *Primary School* than a cultivated mind. Instead of Home Lessons, teachers should encourage home reading and the establishment of "Reading Circles," as in England and elsewhere. They should also endeavour during school hours to teach the children "how to learn" by exercising their intelligence in connection with the subjects of instruction, and avoid merely cramming their memories with undigested facts.

A Time Table should be drawn up for every school, and should be submitted to the inspector for approval. The Time Table should have special regard to the requirements of the locality in the matter of education. The following are examples of tables in which all the subjects of the New Programme are provided for in a week of five school days of four hours each:—

#### TIME TABLE—BOYS' SCHOOL.

SHOWING NUMBER OF MINUTES devoted to SUBJECTS each day.

| Day of Week  | Reading | Writing | Arithmetic | Kindergarten, &c. | Drawing | Elementary Science | Cookery, &c. | Needle-work | Singing | Physical Drill | Recreation | Total No. of Minutes |
|--------------|---------|---------|------------|-------------------|---------|--------------------|--------------|-------------|---------|----------------|------------|----------------------|
| Monday ..    | 60      | 30      | 30         | —                 | 45      | —                  | —            | —           | 25      | 20             | 30         | 240                  |
| Tuesday ..   | 60      | 30      | 30         | 30                | —       | 45                 | —            | —           | —       | 15             | 30         |                      |
| Wednesday .. | 60      | 30      | 30         | —                 | 45      | —                  | —            | —           | 25      | 20             | 30         |                      |
| Thursday ..  | 60      | 30      | 30         | 30                | —       | 45                 | —            | —           | —       | 15             | 30         |                      |
| Friday ..    | 60      | 30      | 30         | 45                | —       | —                  | —            | —           | 25      | 20             | 30         |                      |

#### TIME TABLE—GIRLS' SCHOOL.

SHOWING NUMBER OF MINUTES devoted to SUBJECTS each day.

| Day of Week  | Reading | Writing | Arithmetic | Kindergarten, &c. | Drawing | Elementary Science | Cookery, &c. | Needle-work | Singing | Physical Drill | Recreation | No. of Minutes |
|--------------|---------|---------|------------|-------------------|---------|--------------------|--------------|-------------|---------|----------------|------------|----------------|
| Monday ..    | 40      | 30      | 30         | —                 | —       | —                  | 30           | —           | 20      | 10             | 30         | 240            |
| Tuesday ..   | 60      | 30      | 30         | 30                | —       | 30                 | —            | 30          | —       | 10             | 30         |                |
| Wednesday .. | 60      | 30      | 30         | —                 | 40      | —                  | —            | 30          | 20      | 10             | 30         |                |
| Thursday ..  | 60      | 30      | 30         | 30                | —       | 30                 | —            | 30          | —       | 10             | 30         |                |
| Friday ..    | 40      | 30      | 30         | —                 | 30      | —                  | 30           | —           | 20      | 10             | 30         |                |

The curriculum, which is merely outlined here, would cover a good sound commercial education such as is required by the majority of pupils of National Schools. Saturdays are not regarded as school-days at present, but it is desirable that the schools should meet for at least two hours on Saturdays for repetition of lessons, special subjects, &c.

National Schools are at present organised on the systems known as Bipartite, Tripartite, or Quadrupartite. The adoption of any particular one of these systems depends as a rule on the average attendance and the number of teachers. Sometimes a combination of two systems is adopted. The systems may be explained in a general way thus:—

*Bipartite*.—School divided into two sections—one on the floor (standing), while the other is engaged in the desks.

*Tripartite*.—School divided into three sections—one on floor, one in desks, and one in gallery.

*Quadrupartite*.—School divided into four sections—half on the floor, one-fourth in desks, and one-fourth in gallery.

Under all these systems the different sections change their relative positions after each lesson. The lessons are usually of half an hour duration each, so that there is a good deal of marching and noise between the lessons, and in badly-managed schools a great deal of confusion. The different sections are engaged at different parts of the Programme at the same time.

When it is remembered that the majority of Irish National Schools have only one teacher, it will be at once evident that the present systems of organisation are entirely unsuitable for such schools. Under the bipartite system, for instance, a teacher has to instruct one half of his pupils seated in the desks, say at writing, while the other half, standing on the floor, are under his instruction, say in reading or arithmetic. To add to a teacher's difficulties, his small school may be divided into eight different classes, each class with a different programme.

These systems of organisation may be feasible in large schools, with two or more teachers; but, even in such schools in England and Scotland, they are discarded as quite out of date and old-fashioned.

There are various systems of school organisation that are much simpler and more effective than the bipartite, tripartite, &c.; but it is suggested that the system which would best suit the majority of Irish schools is one under which every child would be under instruction in the same subject at the same time. This would enable a single teacher to work a small school efficiently. A single teacher would have no difficulty in securing the attention of 30 or 40 children at reading or any one subject at the same time. For example, take the case of a teacher with a school of, say, 23 pupils ranging from 5 to 15 years of age. Of course, these children would have different degrees of proficiency in, say, reading, but a skilful teacher could



## EVENING SCHOOLS.

instruct the whole school formed into one class for reading at the same time, if he commenced with the most junior, and asked the seniors to explain difficulties in spelling, &c., experienced by the juniors. When he came to the seniors the juniors would benefit by the teacher's explanation of their difficulties. Or the teacher might get some of the more advanced pupils to instruct the juniors while he was engaged with the seniors, &c.

The number of classes or standards is entirely too large, and should be reduced at least to four.

Every child in a school should have seating accommodation and should be seated during the school hours, except during recreation and the time for Physical Drill.

Every school should be made comfortable by heating in winter and ventilation in summer, and no school should in future be taken into consideration with the Board unless the manager personally undertakes to have it comfortably furnished, heated, and lighted.

Every school should have a small library and a small museum of natural objects, &c., furnished as far as possible by the pupils themselves. Each school should have a free stock of school books, &c., for the use of the poorer pupils.

Every school should have a lavatory, and children who from any cause did not come clean to school should have facilities for washing their hands and faces, combing their hair, &c., at the school. This is most essential for health in the poorer localities in Ireland.

In cities and towns where there is a good water supply, swimming baths should be provided in connection with the larger schools, and grants towards providing baths and lavatories should be available from the State.

Local committees should be formed where possible to co-operate with the manager in providing for the wants of the school.

The school children might be stimulated to a greater industry by a system of school prizes, the cost of which should be defrayed by local subscriptions or endowments, or by the State in the case of very poor schools. These prizes might be distributed by the manager at stated times after an examination conducted by the teacher, and they should be given as rewards for regularity of attendance, politeness, personal tidiness and good conduct, as well as for literary attainments.

The immediate work of revision of the Programme and recognition of the schools would be materially assisted by the organisers and inspectors whom it is proposed to appoint for the introduction of manual and practical instruction.

In schools in which the standard of education has been recognised for years as "excellent" a regular inspection might be dispensed with, at the discretion of the Commissioners, but in every case the schools should be visited at some fixed time at least once a year. But most schools should be regularly inspected once, and in addition be visited each year as often as circumstances will permit.

In all cases where there was no regular inspection, and in other cases, the managers and teachers should themselves hold periodic examinations of the pupils. These examinations should be as public as possible, and the parents of the children should be encouraged to be present at them.

To ensure that the payments should be made impartially for work displayed by the teachers, it would be desirable that the local manager of each school should furnish to the Commissioners each year, immediately before or immediately after the time fixed for the annual inspection of the school, a confidential report on a form to be supplied by the Board, in which he should set forth any matters that in his opinion should influence the Commissioners (a) in paying the salary at a higher rate; (b) in paying the salary at an inferior rate; or (c) in refusing the salary or any portion of it. This report should be considered at the same time as the inspector's report.

The teacher of each school should prepare a table, immediately prior to the time of the annual inspection of the school, showing the progress made during the year by the pupils individually, or, where no progress had been made, giving the reasons. This "Progress" table should be forwarded along with the inspector's and the manager's annual reports to the Education Office.

Evening schools in England and Scotland are intended not merely for persons who have not had sufficient opportunities for attending Day Schools, and whose education has consequently been somewhat neglected, but for persons of all ages from 14 years upwards, who may desire to improve themselves either mentally or physically.

Under the Code of 1895, Evening or Continuation Schools may meet any hour after 4 p.m., and may assume the character of Literary Clubs or Technical and Scientific Associations, and may become not alone sources of instruction and improvement, but also of amusement and recreation.

The general idea is to work such schools on much the same lines as Science and Art Classes, that is through the aid of local Committees of Superintendence.

There is a wide range of subjects to select from, including the three Elementary subjects. The schools in a locality may be really Technical, Agricultural, Literary, or Scientific Evening Schools, or a combination of one or more of these branches. They may be held in any suitable buildings approved by the inspector, and instruction may be imparted by any qualified person.

The scheme of these Evening schools is, in reality, a most comprehensive and elastic application of public money in aid of local effort for evening instruction and amusement.

If Evening Schools are to be maintained or extended in Ireland, the present rules of the Commissioners would require serious alteration.

The Results Examination System has been established in England and Scotland for Evening Schools, and in Ireland a similar course should be followed. There can be no second opinion that the application of the results examination system in Evening Schools can have nothing but an injurious effect on such schools.

Adults as a rule have an abhorrence of examinations, particularly when they have nothing to gain by undergoing them; and the same feeling largely prevails the youths and other persons who attend Evening Schools. They go to the schools, at great personal inconvenience perhaps, for their own mental improvement, and they find that they are converted into mere fee-paying machines, for the teachers have to undergo the ordeal of examinations, and have to pay for all this, while they must follow the routine of the School Class Programme, instead of devoting their time, say, to reading, writing, drawing, or some other subject in which they are particularly backward.

Again, the Regulations on instruction in Evening National Schools are too numerous and too stringent, especially as regards (a) the number of extra branches that may be taught, and (b) the complete exclusion of pupils of Day Schools from all evening classes.

The remuneration of the teachers is inadequate and too precarious to induce good teachers to take charge of Evening Schools.

The rule requiring an Evening School to be in actual operation for six months before it can be examined is calculated to deter persons from opening such schools.

The minimum average (25) for payment of salary is too high.

It would not be feasible to adopt a system of fixed salaries for Evening Schools, such as is recommended in this Memorandum for Day Schools, but a Capitation Grant in lieu of all emoluments from the State would be much simpler and more satisfactory than the present system of payments.

The following rules should be substituted for the existing ones:—

1. The Commissioners will consider an application for a grant to an Evening School from any manager of a National School, or from any committee formed to manage such school, if not connected with a National School.

2. Such Evening School must not meet before 4 p.m., on any day, except Saturday, when the meeting must not take place before 3 p.m.

3. A meeting must be of at least two hours' duration.

4. A school must meet at least on three evenings each week during the school period (six months), but may meet four times, or oftener, each week.

5. The two hours of a meeting must be devoted to regular instruction only.

## PART III.

## THE REORGANIZATION OF THE INSPECTION STAFF.

In the estimates for National Education (Ireland) for the financial year ending the 31st March, 1930, provision is made for an Inspection Staff, consisting of the following Officers:—

|                                 | £   | s | d           |
|---------------------------------|-----|---|-------------|
| 2 Chiefs of Inspection, Salary, | 650 | — | 25—750 each |
| 2 Head Inspectors, ..           | 350 | — | 60—600 ..   |
| 66 District Inspectors, ..      | 250 | — | 10—600 ..   |
|                                 |     |   | 15          |
| 12 Inspectors' Assistants, ..   | 150 | — | 10—250 ..   |

There are also attached to the Inspection Staff the following Officers:—

|                                  | £   | s | d           |
|----------------------------------|-----|---|-------------|
| 1 Director of Needlework, Salary | 150 | — | 10—200 each |
| 1 Examiner in Music, ..          | 200 | — | — — — ..    |
| 2 Organising Teachers, ..        | 150 | — | 10—250 each |
| 1 Examiner in Handicraft, ..     | 11  | — | — — — ..    |

At the Easter and July Examinations of Teachers and Monitors, Assistant Superintendents are employed at a total cost of about £250 per annum.

The total Estimate for Salaries is £394,551, and for personal expenses, travelling, &c., £118,945, gross total, £513,496.

The proposals in this memorandum are mainly confined to the Chiefs of Inspection, Head Inspectors, District Inspectors, and Inspectors' Assistants. The total estimate for the salaries of these officers is £338,890, and for their personal and travelling expenses is £123,600, gross total, £462,490.

The Chiefs of Inspection are appointed from the ranks of the Head Inspectors by the Commissioners on the grounds of merit and service.

Head Inspectors are appointed from the ranks of the District Inspectors by the Commissioners, for service and efficiency.

District Inspectors are appointed by Competitive Examinations. National Teachers and Inspectors' Assistants are eligible as candidates, and are given certain advantages in marks for service, and certain privileges as regards portion of the examination not granted to outsiders. The present programme follows the lines of the Indian Civil Service and Higher Division of the Home Civil Service Examinations, but includes a Proficiency test. This programme was drawn up a few years ago, and it was then believed that it rather favoured the interests of the teacher candidates. But it has been found, however, that its effect is practically to exclude National Teachers from any chance of winning an Inspectorship, owing to the course being more suited to University students than to those who have not had the advantage of University training. This result is not satisfactory for many reasons. It is desirable that Inspectors of National Schools should, as a rule, be persons who have had experience of actual teaching in Primary Schools, and although some efficient National School Inspectors, who are University Graduates, have not had such experience, their success as Inspectors must mainly be attributed to their industry in familiarising themselves with the work of a National Teacher, after their appointment as Inspectors. It is also desirable that Inspectors of National Schools should be recruited largely from the ranks of the National Teachers, in order to give encouragement to the latter as a body. On the other hand, although the Commissioners are anxious to have men with University degree amongst their Inspectors, it has been found that some able men from the Universities, who have passed into the ranks of the Inspectors, having no opportunities of displaying their abilities owing to the somewhat monotonous routine of their work as Inspectors, have become dissatisfied, discontented, and unsatisfactory officers, while their culture and intellectual gifts have been practically lost to the country.

Inspectors' Assistants are appointed from the ranks of the First Class Trained National Teachers by competitive examination. The programme includes Latin and one other language, but is much simpler than the

6. The school must be held in suitable premises, suitably lighted and heated when necessary.

7. The average attendance entitling a school to continued recognition will be 10.

8. If the pupils desire it, some portion of each meeting should be devoted to reading and writing.

9. For each unit of the average attendance the managers of the school will be allowed a uniform fee of 17s. 6d., or of 13s.

10. The rate of the fee will be determined by the report of the inspector on the school at the end of session.

11. Payment will be made to the managers at the end of each quarter.

12. The managers will arrange with the teachers the amount of their remuneration.

13. The teachers may be classed or they may be unclassified persons (lay or clerical) approved by the inspector.

14. The teaching staff must be adequate.

15. No meeting can be attended by pupils of both sexes.

16. Persons over school age, children exempt from attendance at school, and children at school, who have passed the second stage of 5th class, are eligible as pupils of an Evening School. Monitors and pupil teachers are not eligible as pupils of Evening Schools. No person can be recognised as a pupil of more than one Evening School at the same time.

17. A Time-table for each school must be drawn up and submitted to the Commissioners for their approval.

18. Registers and roll books, approved by the Commissioners must be kept.

19. The school must be at all times open to inspection by Commissioners or their officers.

20. The Commissioners may, whenever they think fit, withdraw their grants from any Evening School.

21. A schedule of the subjects to be taught in Evening Schools must be submitted for approval at commencement of Session.

22. No political or polemical business, or business other than that of the school, is to be transacted during the time of the meeting.

23. The continuance of the grants will depend on the foregoing conditions and the nature of the inspector's report at the end of a school period.

24. Evening Schools will be supplied with books, &c., from the Commissioners' Stores on the same conditions as Day National Schools.

25. Evening Schools must not be conducted for the private profit of the manager or managers. All the State Grant must be expended on the schools and teachers.

26. The managers must submit a satisfactory statement showing how the State Grant will be disbursed, and must make a return of the expenditure at the end of the school period.

27. The scale of fees (if any) to be charged to the pupils must be submitted to the Commissioners for approval.

#### SUBJECTS OF STUDENTS WHO MAY BE TAUGHT IN EVENING NATIONAL SCHOOLS.

**Reading.**—Teaching reading to illiterates. Geographical and Historical Readers for most advanced pupils. Explanation of mother-tongue, of the grammatical forms in the sentences and of the correct methods of pronunciation. Cultivation of a clear, firm style of enunciation. Recitation.

**Writing.**—Teaching Writing to illiterates, more advanced writing, (Commercial, &c., Book-keeping), for others. Composition.

**Arithmetic.**—Simple rules for beginners, more advanced rules according to attainments of pupils.

**History.** Needlework (Girls). Drawing. Handicraft. Domestic Economy (Girls). Agriculture. Horticulture. Dairy Work. Laundry Work. Cookery. Hygiene. Irish, French, German, Latin, Greek, Nochi. Algebra. Mensuration. Physiology. Elementary Physics. Elementary Chemistry. Sound, Light, and Heat. Magnetism and Electricity. Botany. Navigation. Short-hand. Vocal Music. Human Physiology. Mechanics. Ambulance or First Aid.

examination for the Inspectorship, approaching somewhat the same standard as the examination for the Second Division of the Home Civil Service.

If the schemes of revision of the methods of payment to the teachers, and of reorganisation of the school work and school curriculum, outlined in Parts I and II. of this Memorandum, should be carried out, it would become absolutely necessary that a large proportion of the Inspection Staff should be promoted National Teachers. Under the new conditions Inspectors would not merely have to inspect schools, they would also have to advise teachers and managers as to school organisation, and give helpful hints on school management. For these purposes a knowledge of the details of the technique of a National Teacher's work is essential. This has already been recognised in England and Scotland, where the Sub-Inspectors, who form the main body of the Inspection Staff, are entirely, or almost entirely, promoted from the ranks of the Elementary School Teachers.

But, as in England and Scotland, there should be a higher section of the Inspection Staff that would exercise a general supervision and control over the work of primary education, not merely from the point of view of a National School Teacher, but also from the wider and loftier field of vision of the general educationist. This section, in the first instance, should be recruited from the present staff of District Inspectors, but the position of an Inspector of this higher section should be made attractive enough to induce men of wide and general culture, and of acknowledged standing as educationists (from the Universities and higher Educational Colleges) to seek the appointments in future. There should be, however, no barrier intervening between a National Teacher of adequate attainments and these appointments.

On the 30th September, 1898, there were 5,661 National Schools in operation in Ireland, and 8,611 were examined for results. As a rule an Inspector can examine only one school per day for results, and some large schools take two or more days. It has been estimated that, on an average, each member of the Inspection Staff (Head Inspectors, District Inspectors, and Inspectors' Assistants), has at present 120 days of results examination work in the year.

Under the new condition of things this work would be abolished, and the time saved could be devoted entirely to the inspection of schools. It would be possible for an inspector to inspect two, three, or possibly more schools every day. In many cases his inspections would be necessarily brief, and he could then make a number of "incidental" or "surprise" visits to schools in addition to the regular visits of inspection. The number of school districts in Ireland is 56, and the average number of schools in operation in each is 131. From a return prepared in this office some years ago, it appears that some inspectors paid as many as 400 visits, including inspections for results, to their schools in a year, while one or two paid over 600 visits in a year. This represents an average of about three visits to each school in a year under the present system, and, of course, the number could be nearly doubled under the new system.

There are many large and important schools, too, which it would be necessary to visit only once during the year under the new arrangements, though it would be desirable that every school should be visited at least twice. But there are many small and inefficient schools that would require many visits each year.

Taking all these matters into consideration, it has been estimated that an Inspection Staff, consisting of 98 inspectors of all ranks, would in the future be sufficient for the adequate inspection of all National Schools, but for some time it would be essential not to make any serious diminution in the number of the present staff. As vacancies occurred, however, the number of the staff could be gradually reduced to 68.

The following is proposed as the constitution of the re-organised Inspection Staff in future:—

|  | £   | £    | £          |
|--|-----|------|------------|
| 2 Chief Inspectors, selected from the present Staff, with salaries of, . . . . .   | 750 | — 25 | — 800 each |
| 22 Senior Inspectors, composed of the present Head Inspectors and 18 selected District Inspectors, with salaries of, . . . . . | 350 | — 20 | — 700 ..   |

44 Junior Inspectors, composed of portion of the present Staff of District Inspectors and Inspectors' Assistants, with salaries as under (for new appointments), 22 at 500 — 15 — 400 each  
22 at 150 — 10 — 300 ..

Inspectors at present in the service who are not promoted to the position of Senior Inspectors should retain their actual scale.

The redundant Inspectors and Inspectors' Assistants should be retained for the present until by vacancies they become absorbed in the permanent Staff. The Inspectors' Assistants should be called, pending their promotion to the rank of Junior Inspector, Sub-Inspectors, and their maximum salary should be raised to £200.

The work of the Inspection Staff should be regulated by printed instructions, which should be revised annually.

There will be ample work for the redundant Inspectors and Inspectors' Assistants for some years to come in connection with the re-organisation of the school work.

The Junior Inspectors in future should be recruited almost entirely from the ranks of the National Teachers, and should be appointed by the Commissioners on merit after a qualifying examination. No person should be eligible for the position, who had not served for some years as a teacher of a Primary School.

The staff now proposed appears out of proportion so far as numbers are concerned, with the staffs in England and Scotland. If we consider the population and attendance at the schools in these countries, but it must be remembered that it is the number of schools and the nature of the localities in which they are situated as regards facilities for travelling, &c., that must determine the number of inspectors, and not the number of children attending the schools. In England and Wales there were in 1897-8, 19,900 schools, with 30,847 departments, and an Inspection Staff of 847—or, on the average, one inspector for every 37 schools, or for every 56 departments. In Scotland there were 3,696 schools, with 2,355 departments, and an Inspection Staff of 31 persons, or, on the average, one inspector for every 60 schools, or for every 66 departments. In Ireland the proposed staff will represent one inspector for about 180 schools.

The following table shows the relative estimated costs of salaries of the Inspection Staffs in the three Kingdoms at present:—

| Country.             | Maximum Cost. | Minimum Cost. | Actual Cost. |
|----------------------|---------------|---------------|--------------|
| England and Wales .. | £ 171,300     | £ 98,150      | £ 154,388    |
| Scotland ..          | 25,400        | 15,500        | 20,224       |
| Ireland ..           | 41,100        | 22,900        | 34,661       |

The maximum estimated cost for salaries of the proposed staff in Ireland when reduced to its standard number would be £82,400, and the minimum estimated cost £19,100. The actual cost would be something under £30,000.

Provided this scheme is adopted, the cost of the Inspection Staff would be higher than it is at present for some years, owing to the promotions contemplated and the improved scale, without any immediate reduction in numbers. This increased cost would be about £900 for the first year, but as vacancies fell in the increase would be more than neutralised.

The questions of the cost of travelling and personal expenses cannot be gone into in this Memorandum, nor can any estimate on the subject be made at present. The conditions under which inspection work would be carried on by the proposed staff are so radically different from those existing at present, that until the new scheme in its entirety has been in operation for some time, no sound idea of the amount of travelling required can be formed. Of course, ceteris paribus, the new staff, being numerically smaller than the old, ought to cost less for personal allowances.

As regards the actual work of the Inspection Staff, the two Chief Inspectors should be entirely responsible

for the efficient inspection of the National Schools in the country generally. They should hold all investigations and inquiries of importance, visit or inspect any schools they thought necessary, and exercise general supervision over the inspectors. They should also have under their special charge the Training Colleges.

Each Senior Inspector should have charge of three inspection districts, and should have associated with him two Junior Inspectors. He should arrange with them the order of the work and should be responsible for its due performance. Every three districts should constitute an Inspection Circuit, and within the limits of such circuit the Senior Inspector and the two Junior Inspectors should have perfect freedom of movement. The Senior Inspector should arrange as to the schools that it was unnecessary to visit, or that it was necessary to visit frequently. The Circuit Inspectors should also keep themselves posted, as well as circumstances permit, on the provision for primary education, other than in National Schools within their circuits.

## APPENDIX XXXI.

(Forwarded by the Board of National Education in Ireland).

Confidential.

### NEW INSPECTION CIRCUITS.

LETTER OF INSTRUCTION TO CHIEF INSPECTORS AND  
THEIR MEMORANDUM THEREON.

OFFICE OF NATIONAL EDUCATION,  
DUBLIN, 31st December, 1900.

SIR,

I am directed to request that you, in conjunction with Mr. Purser, will at once consider the question of the arrangement of the Inspectors' Circuits, and report fully for the information of the Commissioners the result of your deliberations.

Your Report should be a joint one; and you should, when preparing it, bear in mind that it is the desire of the Commissioners that each school in a Circuit should, if possible, be inspected by three different inspectors in every three years, so as to satisfy the public generally, and the school managers and teachers more particularly, that the judgment by the Commissioners of the work done in the schools, and their decisions in the matter of promotions and grants of increments of continued good service salary, are sound and impartial.

You will also consider what arrangement of the Circuit work would best secure the object the Commissioners have in view, and say whether in your opinion it would be feasible, and, if feasible, whether it would be desirable to have a common Centre for each Inspection Circuit at which the three Inspectors of the Circuit would reside, or whether it would be better and more practicable to have one Centre for each Circuit where the Senior Inspector would reside, and two sub-Centres, connected by railway with the Senior Inspector's Centre, at which the two other Inspectors of the Circuit would reside.

If you do not approve of either of the plans mentioned you will be good enough to state in full your reasons for not approving of them, and you can make any suggestions that you think more suitable for carrying out the Commissioners' views.

But if you approve of the system of Centres and sub-Centres you should select sub-Centres that would not be very far apart from each other and from the Centres, so that the additional locomotion expense incurred by an interchange of work would not add considerably to the cost of the inspection establishment generally.

The Centres selected should be for of railway communication whenever possible, and should be as near the geographical centre of the Circuit as may be, so that (a) the Senior Inspector would be able to reach the confines of his Circuit with facility; and (b) that many schools would not be beyond the fifteen miles limit from the Centre.

You will further consider and report as to the arrangement of the work of the Inspection Staff of each Circuit in future. The number of schools to be

The advantages of the proposed schemes are:—

(1.) It would materially improve the position of the inspectors, and would thus encourage them to promote the success of the new scheme of re-organisation of the school work.

(2.) It would materially improve the position of the inspectors' assistants' assistants.

(3.) It would open the Inspectorate directly to the teacher, and would secure a majority of the places for them.

(4.) It would attract men of very great ability to the higher section of inspectors.

(5.) It would increase the efficiency of the work of inspection, and, as a consequence, the efficiency of the schools.

assigned to each Inspector; whether the Senior Inspector should have a small number of schools in the immediate vicinity of his Centre, under his own special charge; what arrangements should be made for doing the work of Inspectors that may be sick or on leave; the amount of control and the nature of the control the Senior Inspector should exercise over the other Inspectors, &c., are also questions on which the Commissioners desire your opinion.

Further, while remembering that the efficiency of the Inspection is the principal object to be attained by whatever arrangements may be ultimately adopted, the economy of the public funds should not be lost sight of, and any points that occur to you in this connection should be placed before the Commissioners.

As this matter is pressing you will be good enough to take it in hand without any avoidable delay, so that the Commissioners may be able to make the proper arrangements before the commencement of the financial year, 1901-2.

I am, Sir,

Your obedient servant,  
(Signed), P. E. LEMASS,

E. Downing, Esq.,  
Chief Inspector  
(A similar letter was addressed to Mr. Purser.)  
Secretary.

### MEMORANDUM OF CHIEF INSPECTORS.

Before finally adopting the principle of having every school examined by a different Inspector in each of three years, the following objections to it should be considered:—

1<sup>st</sup>. The Annual Report on a school should aim at describing not only the present condition of the school, but also the progress made since the previous examination. It is only the Inspector that examined in the previous year who can satisfactorily furnish such a report. No one else has the means of making a proper comparison.

2<sup>nd</sup>. The plan of having a different examiner each year will not be received favourably by managers or teachers. In the past there were often strong complaints whenever a school was examined by different Inspectors in successive years.

3<sup>rd</sup>. An Inspector who has not special charge of a definite district cannot be expected to take a lively interest in the schools. His examinations are likely to become perfunctory and wanting in sympathy with the children.

4<sup>th</sup>. Suppose the case of a school that is very unsatisfactory the first year, fairly satisfactory or good the second year, and again, bad the third year: if this school be examined by a different Inspector in each of those years, the deficiency found in the first and third years will be scouted by the teacher (perhaps by the manager also) to greater severity on the part of the two Inspectors who examined in these

years. Under the proposed arrangements this defence would certainly be set up for any year to which the teacher neglected his duty.

29. The first examination held by an Inspector in any school is very tedious. He must ascertain the history of the school from the school records, and must endeavour to find out any special circumstances that might modify his opinion of the merits of the teachers. Although the most troublesome, it is the examination the result of which he feels least confident about. His opinion is likely to be more decided and more correct at a second examination than at the first.

30. With this scheme of inspection most of the Inspectors must be absent from their homes for three-fourths of the year. They would have little home life.

31. The expenses of inspection would be very largely increased.

Adverting now to the question of centres, it is to be observed that, in several circuits, it will not be possible to find a town in which three Inspectors could procure suitable residences.

Some of the present districts are so badly provided with railway accommodation that, if Inspectors resided outside of them, great expense and very serious loss of time in reaching distant schools would be the result.

Several towns would have to be selected as centres within the fifteen mile radius of which not more than twenty-two schools exist. These schools, divided among three Inspectors, would give but twenty-four for each to be inspected from home: this means that each Inspector in such Circuits should be from home over 300 nights in the year. Between the increase of personal expenses thus incurred and the necessary increase of travelling expenses, a very considerable addition to the cost of inspection would be the result.

Before submitting any alternative scheme, we beg to offer a short statement of the English and Scotch inspection arrangements, so far as we have been able to ascertain them. The conditions as to distribution of population in Ireland and England are so dissimilar that we consider the arrangements generally prevailing in the latter are unlikely to suit Ireland, and it is with reference only to the more thinly-populated parts of Britain that we consider a comparison useful.

#### England and Wales.

In England and Wales there are ninety-eight inspection districts; for Ireland twenty-two are proposed. As the relative size of the two countries is something less than two to one, the districts in Ireland will be about two and a half times as large as in England. The Irish Inspectors will therefore have far more travelling, while the facilities for such travelling are much less.

The number of Sub-Inspectors in each district in England and Wales is not the same—varying from one to five—and in the more thinly populated districts the Inspector and his assistant (Sub-Inspector) live apart (see in English Blue Book—Eastern Division—Boston, South Colchester, and Bedford districts; in East Central Division—Northampton, Basingstoke, Winchester, and Portsmouth districts; in S.W. Division—Newton Abbot district; in S.E. Division—Canterbury, Ashford, Brighton, and Guildford districts; in Welsh Division—Denbigh, Pembroke, and Llanelli districts, &c.)

As regards Wales, which in some respects resembles Ireland, we find there are nine districts, which would make the area of each about 900 square miles; whereas the area of the Irish inspection districts will average about 1,400 miles. The population of a district in each country will be nearly the same—350,000 for Wales and 310,000 for Ireland.

#### Scotland.

Scotland still more closely resembles Ireland. Their area and population are nearly equal. Edinburgh and Glasgow may be compared to Dublin and Belfast; Dundee and Aberdeen to Cork and Limerick; Ayr to Londonderry, &c. The rest of the country is more thinly peopled and is largely rural. A consideration of the inspectors' districts ought, therefore, to be useful and instructive.

#### Edinburgh Group.

In the three Lothians (Districts 1 and 2) there are stationed three of His Majesty's Inspectors and four

Sub-Inspectors, all of whom live in Edinburgh, where both districts meet. The extreme distances to be travelled are moderate, and probably do not exceed twenty or twenty-five miles.

The counties north of the Lothians (viz., Berwick, Roxburgh, Selkirk, and Peebles) form District 3. His Majesty's Inspector in charge lives in Edinburgh, though the nearest point of his district must be twelve or fifteen miles away. His assistant lives in the district at Melrose.

His Majesty's Inspector and his assistant for District 4 (Dumfriesshire and Galloway) reside at Dumfries apparently, which is a fairly central position.

His Majesty's Inspector for District 5 (Fife) resides in Edinburgh, outside the Firth of Forth, and thenceforth outside his district. His assistant, the Sub-Inspector, lives in the district at Kirkcaldy.

District 6 embraces all Perth, except the parishes adjoining Stirling. His Majesty's Inspector lives in Perth town, and has no assistant.

District 7 includes the rest of Perth, nearly all Stirling, with Kinross and Clockmannan. His Majesty's Inspector and the Sub-Inspector reside at Stirling, which is a central position.

#### Glasgow Group.

District 8 includes part of Glasgow city, a little of Stirling, the islands of Hute and Mill (?). His Majesty's Inspector and his three assistants live in Glasgow.

District 9 takes in North Glasgow, with the neighbouring parishes in Lanark, and the island of Aron (?). His Majesty's Inspector resides in Glasgow; his assistant in Hamilton.

District 10 comprises the part of North Lanark round Airdrie. His Majesty's Inspector resides in Glasgow; the Sub-Inspector in Hamilton—both outside the district.

The southern half of Lanarkshire forms District 11. His Majesty's Inspector resides in Glasgow, outside his district; he has no assistant.

District 14 comprises the parish of Govan (part of Glasgow), containing 100,000 inhabitants, together with Dumbartonshire. His Majesty's Inspector lives in Hamilton (outside his district), and his one assistant in Glasgow.

District 15 embraces Renfrew and all Argyll, except Mull. His Majesty's Inspector and two Sub-Inspectors reside in Glasgow; another Sub-Inspector resides at Kilmaholm, between Paisley and Greenock.

Taking these last six districts, we find five of His Majesty's Inspectors and six Sub-Inspectors living in Glasgow—two and two respectively outside their districts; one of His Majesty's Inspectors and two Sub-Inspectors with residence in Hamilton—two outside their districts; and one Sub-Inspector living near Paisley.

District 12 embraces North Ayrshire, under His Majesty's Inspector and one Sub-Inspector, and

District 13 South Ayrshire, under His Majesty's Inspector, without an assistant. All three live in Ayr town.

South Forth forms District 16. His Majesty's Inspector and two Sub-Inspectors live at Broughty Ferry, near Dundee.

District 17 includes North Forth and Shetland (?), under one of His Majesty's Inspectors, with occasional assistance from a Sub-Inspector of District 16.

District 18 includes Berwick and Orkney (?), under His Majesty's Inspector, without a permanent assistant.

District 19 takes in Aberdeen and Kinross, under one of His Majesty's Inspectors and five Sub-Inspectors, who all live in Aberdeen town. There is an additional Sub-Inspector, without fixed residence, who assists in Districts 18, 19, and 20.

District 20 comprises Caithness, Sutherland, the eastern parts of Ross, and the southern parts of the other Highlands—probably not short of 4,000 square miles. His Majesty's Inspector lives at Dingwall, without any permanent assistant.

District 21 includes Elgin, Nairn, and Western Ross, and Cromarty (?), under one of His Majesty's Inspectors, without an assistant. He resides in Elgin.

District 22 comprises Inverness, with the islands of Skye and Lewis, under one of His Majesty's Inspectors and one Sub-Inspector. Both reside in Inverness town.

A summary of these arrangements shows that five of His Majesty's subjects live in Edinburgh, five in



## APPENDIX XXXII.

(Forwarded by the Board of National Education in Ireland—Extract from the "Freeman's Journal" of 1/3/90.)

THE COMING REVOLUTION IN THE SYSTEM OF NATIONAL EDUCATION IN IRELAND.—INTERVIEW WITH THE ARCHBISHOP OF DUBLIN.

Understanding that his Grace the Archbishop of Dublin will be absent from Dublin for the next few weeks, we (*Freeman's Journal*) thought it well, in view of the great interest excited by the recent speech of Dr. Sturkie, Resident Commissioner of National Education, to ascertain from his Grace, as a prominent member of the Board, whether any information in detail is as yet available for publication in reference to the coming changes in the system of instruction in the National Schools.

To a representative of ours who called at Archbishop's house yesterday his Grace stated that he could not feel himself at liberty to give any information on the subject in detail. He explained that the National Education Board occupies in Ireland a position corresponding to that of the Education Department in England. In both cases, when any change is to be made, not merely a change of a sweeping or revolutionary nature, such as it is now an open secret is contemplated to be made in our present antiquated Irish system, but even any change in matters of detail if the expenditure of money is in any way involved, the consent of the Treasury has to be obtained in the first instance, and whilst the matter is the subject of official correspondence with the Treasury, it has, of course, to be regarded as confidential.

"But," suggested our representative, "this has reference only to changes involving additional expenditure?"

"That," said the Archbishop, "is, I dare say, what the public think. But it is a very serious mistake. People sometimes refer to the grant of over a million and a quarter a year that is now administered by our Board, and they say—why talk about the Treasury; why not expend in a more rational way the money that you have? Now, we are no more able to alter the method of expending this money than we have than we are able to obtain a larger grant whenever we think it necessary. We cannot do either the one or the other without the sanction of the Treasury. Take, for instance that deadly incubus known as the results system. According to all accounts it had a marvellously beneficial effect when it was introduced. It was the means in thousands of cases of getting for the public something like value for their money. But its day is past. As a system, it does, I may say, nothing but harm now. In thousands of our National Schools it is simply trampling out whatever vestige of educational life is still to be found in them. Now, if you look at the Parliamentary Estimates, you will find that over £200,000 a year is given to us for the purpose of carrying on that harmful system. Probably enough, the Treasury would give us very little trouble if we said that we did not mean to ask them for this £200,000 a year in future. But we cannot, of course, afford to give up our claim to anything that we have; and when it becomes a question of changing the system, and of applying that money in a way that we know would be infinitely better than the present way in every educational interest, the leave of the Treasury (including the approval of the Treasury for the particular change that we propose to make) has to be obtained."

"This must make the work of reform a rather difficult one?"

"Well, I don't say that the Treasury is always unreasonable. But it is a discouraging thing, and it necessarily has a very deterrent effect, to feel beforehand that one can do nothing unless he can succeed in first instructing, and then converting, to his views a number of people whose very identity is unknown to him, who live, in fact during official hours, cloaked and masked, behind a sort of screen in London, like the judges we read of in the tribunals of the old Venetian Republic. It requires no small stock of persevering determination to take such a thing in hand at all. This deterrent effect of the system is its worst feature, and Lord Salisbury spoke words of wistful truth in what he

said in the House of Lords a few weeks ago—'The compass of its powers,' he said, 'that is of the powers of the Treasury, in governing every department of the Government, is not for the public benefit. I think much delay, and many doubtful resolutions, have been the result of the peculiar position which, through many generations, the Treasury has occupied.'

"It was a remarkable saying for a Prime Minister."

"But what he said a few evenings afterwards, when he deliberately returned to the subject, to explain his views more fully and more clearly, was even more remarkable. 'It comes home to us, too, more directly in this way,' he said. 'I did not assume,' he said, 'that it was only in large measures the difficulty was produced. But salutary reforms are built up by long series of useful changes. Individually, they are small, but in the aggregate they are large; and here I think the control of the Treasury has done harm. I think it has had the effect of discouraging, of impeding, and of taking away the freedom and diminishing the initiative, of the respective departments; I think it is an evil. Much of the immobility of the department is, I think, due to the existence of that control.' That is Lord Salisbury's view, admirably expressed, as you see. Now, I am in no way responsible for the designs of the National Education Board in the past. But in justice to its three wards of Lord Salisbury's should be borne in mind. If they were borne in mind, the 'immobility' of the Board, in the days now past, would not be so glibly made a ground of attack as it often is. Until after I became a member of the Board in 1865, I had not the faintest conception of the position of dependence in which it stood, or of the nature of the terribly tedious work that had to be faced if any real reform was to be effected. The one practical conclusion I drew from the positively appalling state of affairs that I thus became acquainted with was, that to attempt anything like patchwork would be an unjustifiable waste of time. The whole thing needed reconstruction. As regards the bulk of the National Schools, it was a case, not for reform, but for revolution, if those schools were to be made places of education in any true sense of the word."

"The Manual Instruction Commission was, I suppose, the beginning of it?"

"Well, yes, as regards public action. Here again you have an instance of how slowly things have to move. The National Education Board took up the question of reform in this direction in March, 1866. It so happened that just then there was a great deal of urgently-pressing work on hand, but by the month of August all preliminaries were arranged, and we had our public interview with the Lord Lieutenant. I am sure his Excellency lost no time over this matter. The Commission, however, was not issued until January, 1867. Its work was necessarily prolonged, but the work was completed, and the report signed in June, 1869. Mr. Redington's death this time twelve months caused, of course, considerable delay in the working out of any scheme of reform. Thanks to the energy and working power of our newly-appointed Resident Commissioner, everything was speedily got into working order, and the result, as the public, I trust, will soon be in a position to see for themselves, is a really comprehensive scheme of reform, one which, I am convinced, we should not have had in our time, but for the splendid capacity of our Resident Commissioner. I think it no breach of confidence to add that throughout the whole course of these proceedings the Commissioners have acted with absolute unanimity. Neither do I think it any breach of confidence to say that the work, in all its essential features, was completed and put finally out of hand, so far as the Board was concerned, more than three months ago. This makes some of the writing that we see in the newspapers these days rather amusing reading."

"And can your Grace add nothing to what Dr. Sturkie has told the public?"

"Nothing whatever, but I am afraid that the significance of some of the things that Dr. Sturkie said has been but very imperfectly appreciated. Take,

for instance, what he said about the terrible defect—in one sense, perhaps, the worst defect, of the existing system—the cast-iron rigidity of its programmes, with nothing left of local initiative, whether of managers or of teachers. This sort of thing was, of course, unequivocally condemned by the Manual Instruction Commission. You will find the necessity of making an end of it insisted upon again and again in the Report of the Commission. The Commission, as you know, was tied down to deal with only certain branches of school work. But you cannot have two plans combined. The system administered by our Board must either be a system of centralisation, or a system affording scope, and abundant scope, for intelligent local initiative. The Manual Instruction Commission by its unanimous Report made the continuance of the old system of centralisation impossible. I earnestly hope that both the managers and the teachers of our Irish National Schools will realise the opportunity that is going to be afforded them for the development of true educational work, and that they will apply themselves energetically to the discharge of the great duty that will thus devolve upon them."

"And as to the results system?"

"I have said almost quite enough about that. It, too, was condemned, as a matter of course, by the Manual Instruction Commission. Not merely was it condemned. Its further continuance was treated as an impossibility, and was shown to be an impossibility, if any reform at all was to be effected. Under that wretched system our Inspectors have, in great measure, become inspectors only in name. They are now little better than mere examiners. They must be set free to do their real work, the work that has been made impossible by the incessant and harassing duties imposed upon them in connection with the results system. This has been one of the worst consequences of that system, and even if it stood alone, it would make the abolition of the system a matter of imperative necessity."

"Dr. Sharke, however, stated that examination of the children would not be discontinued?"

"No, the Commissioners of National Education are neither an ignorant of the requirements of the work they have in hand nor the writers of some not very complimentary letters I have seen in the public press, on this and other aspects of the case, complacently assume us to be. Examination is an essential element in every system of school work. But that is a very different thing from making the income of an unfortunate teacher depend as it now depends upon the answering of the children. Good answering may or may not be a test of good teaching. But there are other tests, more direct and far surer. Examination in itself is, in fact, no better test of the work of a teacher than it is of the teacher's fitness for that work. My views on both branches of this subject are, I think, sufficiently well known."

"At the Manual Instruction Commission your Grace, in examining one of the witnesses, suggested that the system of promoting teachers by examination should be made an end of?"

"Yes; it was in my examination of Mr. Fitzpatrick, Professor of Method in St. Patrick's Training College, and I think he took substantially the view of the matter that I have always taken of it. But I say nothing of this now. My view is clearly stated in the Blue Book of the evidence for anyone who wishes to see it."

"The Commission made no recommendation on the point?"

"No; it was found unfortunately to be outside the scope of our inquiry. Otherwise it would have been dealt with by the Commission, and I am sure I can say that it would have been dealt with with the same unanimity that all the work of that Commission was done with from beginning to end."

"But we may assume that it will be a feature of the new scheme of re-construction?"

"On that point I regret I can give you no information. I think that, after all, you may be well satisfied with what I have felt myself free to say to you."

## APPENDIX XXXIII.

(Handed in by Mr. W. J. M. Sharke, LL.D., LL.D., Resident Commissioner of National Education in Ireland.)

1904.

### REPORT OF CONFERENCE OF SENIOR INSPECTORS OF NATIONAL SCHOOLS IN IRELAND.

Conference began on Wednesday, the 18th April, 1904, and terminated on Friday, the 19th April, 1904.

Present:—S. E. Stronge, M.A.; T. J. Alexander, LL.D.; E. P. Down, M.A.; J. B. Sturges, LL.D.; J. J. Hyde, M.A.; A. J. McEneaney, M.A.; H. Cox, W. Pellow, M.A.; J. F. Hogan; W. P. Heaton, M.A.; W. J. McClintock, M.A.; H. M. Beatty, LL.D.; C. Smith; W. A. Brown, M.A.; J. Ross, M.A.; J. P. Dalton, M.A.; J. J. Murphy; I. Craig, M.A.; L. S. Daly, M.A.; T. P. O'Connor, M.A.; W. R. P. Conolly, M.A.; P. J. Kelly.

#### CONFERENCE OF SENIOR INSPECTORS.

April 18th 1904, AND FOLLOWING DAYS.

#### SUBJECTS FOR CONSIDERATION.

##### I.—INSPECTION:

- (a.) Defects of present system.
- (b.) How it can be modified so as to secure greater uniformity in method and in standard of judgment as expressed in annual and other reports.
- (c.) How can services of Inspection Staff of each circuit be best utilized, so as (1) to avoid overlapping of work; (2) to secure a fair distribution of work amongst the staff, and thus prevent undue pressure on any individual or individuals; (3) to render the work more efficient and the expenditure on it more economical.

##### II.—SCHOOLSCHOOLS.

- (a.) Recommendation of building grants—accommodation to be provided.
- (b.) Recommendation of grants of salary and books to existing schools—requirements of locality—suitability of premises, &c.
- (c.) Provision for heating and lighting school-houses; suggestions.

##### III.—EVENING SCHOOLS:

- (a.) Accommodation.
- (b.) Staff.
- (c.) Attendance—uniform and uniformed.
- (d.) Inspection—defects of present system—remedies suggested.

##### IV.—IRISH AND OTHER EXTRA DEPARTMENTS:

##### V.—MEETINGS:

- (a.) Training.
- (b.) Monitors' centres for special branches.



## VI.—FETTERS:

- (a.) How can better attendance be secured?
- (b.) School prizes.
- (c.) Corporal punishment.
- (d.) Cleanliness.

## VII.—MANAGERS:

- (a.) Means to be taken to secure greater co-operation of Managers.
- (b.) Interviews.
- (c.) Suggestions to Managers as to class-rooms—amalgamation of small schools, or departments, &c.

Should an Inspector desire to bring any other subject of importance before the Conference, he will be good enough to advise the Secretaries, marking the envelope with the words, "Conference—confidential."

Each Inspector should bring with him (1) a list of the Evening Schools in each section of his circuit; (2) a list of schools in each section in which Irish is taught.

The Conference will open at 10.30 a.m., and will assemble in a room provided for the purpose in 29 Marlborough Street.

P. E. LEMASS,

W. J. DILWORTH,

Secretaries.

OFFICE OF NATIONAL EDUCATION.

DUBLIN, April, 1904.

I. (b.) It is desirable that for the purpose of securing uniformity, the Senior Inspector in each circuit shall inspect a few schools in each division of the circuit after the District Inspector has held the annual inspection.

I. (b.) A school to be marked "Good" is one in which there is evidence that English, oral and written, is taught with skill and care, and in which a sound foundation of Practical Arithmetic is laid, due attention as far as possible being paid at the same time to the other subjects of the programme.

The general appearance of the schoolroom and premises as to tidiness, the discipline and cleanliness of the pupils, as well as the trustworthiness of the records, are also to be taken into account. If the school is strikingly defective in the latter points, "Good" cannot be awarded.

I. (b.) To secure "V.G." a fair advance on the requirements for "G." should be in evidence. Drawing or Singing (and both, where feasible), should be taught. "G." being represented by 6 or 7 on a maximum of 10, "V.G." should be numerically 8. Similarly "E." should reach 9 or 10 without any considerable defect.

I. (c.) 1. There is practically no overlapping of inspection work.

2. It is desirable that each Senior Inspector, in conference with his colleagues, should divide the present circuits into two geographical divisions, and that each Junior Inspector should be in charge of one of the two divisions. With the view of relieving the Junior Inspectors, the Senior Inspector shall furnish annual reports on at least 20 per cent. of the schools in his circuit—those schools being, as a rule, ones of higher efficiency and greater importance.

3. This will be duly given effect by the adoption of Paragraph I. (c) of the July Conference of 1903.

II. (a.) That the poor localities of Ireland (e.g., such as those scheduled under the Congested Districts Board) be scheduled, and that the Commissioners grant five-sixths of the cost of building schools in such localities.

## III.—EVENING SCHOOLS.

(a.) It is desirable that an Evening School should provide a space of 8 square feet, and sitting accommodation for each pupil on rolls.

(b.) That the Capitation Grant be paid on the basis of 30 pupils in average attendance for each teacher.

(Rule XIII. to be changed accordingly.)

(c.) It is desirable that mixed Evening Schools should no longer be recognised.

(d.) That applications for aid to new schools, and notices of re-opening schools previously recognised, should be forwarded to the Education Office at least

fourteen days before the first meeting of the Session, and applicants should at the same time advise the Inspector.

Under no circumstances, save very exceptional ones, can an Evening School be closed without due notification being sent to the local Inspector. Severe weather will not be recognised as an exempting cause.

It is desirable that the following additions and alterations be made in the Rules for Evening Schools:—

Add to Rule II.—Save under very exceptional circumstances, an Evening School should not meet on Saturdays.

The number of recognised meetings per week of an Evening School should not exceed four.

Rule VII. to be changed in accordance with following resolution:—

That in an efficiently conducted Evening School where 25 per cent. of the pupils in attendance are successfully taught two or more of the subjects specified as advanced branches, a fee of 15s. or 17s. 6d. may be paid per cent of average attendance.

The following shall be recognised as advanced branches in Evening Schools:—

Advanced Arithmetic and Algebra.  
Geometry and Measurement.  
Irish.  
French.  
Latin.  
Shorthand.  
Type-writing.  
Elementary Science.  
Model Drawing.  
Geometrical Drawing.  
History (A period only).  
Agriculture.  
Cookery.

Rule XV.—All persons over 18 years of age are eligible as pupils of Evening Schools. Children, or young persons under that age who are exempted or exempt from attendance at Day Schools under the provisions of the Irish Education Act of 1892, and in places where the Act is not enforced, children unable for satisfactory reasons to attend Day Schools, are eligible as pupils of an Evening School, but no pupil can be enrolled in an Evening School and Day School at the same time. No person can be recognised as a pupil of more than one Evening School at the same time.

Other persons not included in those defined as eligible pupils may attend these schools, but cannot be taken into account in the calculation of average attendance.

Rule XVII.—It is desirable that the recording of the attendance be completed each evening before the hour appointed for the commencement of sitting.

That a Register should be in use in every Evening School as per pattern copy.

That the Roll Book be catalogued by a few leaves, similar to the leaves of a Daily Register Book to facilitate the calculation of averages.

That all written work should be dated and preserved for inspection.

That the principal teacher of every Evening School prepare, at the beginning of the session, a syllabus of the work to be done during the session.

That a progress Book be kept in every Evening School, and be fully posted up.

Rule XX.—It is desirable that the following provision be added:—

In industrial centres, however, where subjects introductory to technical instruction are taught, a relaxation of this Rule may be made.

## Proposed New Rule.

That a teacher who is not discharging his duties in his Day School efficiently be not recognised as the teacher of an Evening School.

## IV.

In order to secure that the instruction in Extra Subjects shall be continued during three years, it is desirable that the fee for the first year shall be reduced, and that for the third year increased, so that the fees for the first, second, and third year shall be in the proportion of 4, 5, and 6.

## V.—MONITORS.

(c.) It is desirable to give practical effect to the Circular re Christian lessons.

(d.) That Inspectors endeavour, by their personal influence, to create centres for the instruction of monitors in special branches.

## VI.

(a.) It is desirable that the Act of 1862 be amended.

(b.) That Inspectors use their influence towards the giving of school prizes.

(c.) That a Corporal Punishment Book be kept in all schools; that in all cases in which such punishment is inflicted, the name of the pupil, the date, the offence, and the nature of the punishment inflicted, be entered in this book at once, and that the Principal only be at liberty to inflict such punishment.

(d.) It is desirable that Inspectors should, on every occasion where they deem it useful or necessary, enter in the Observation Book remarks on the cleanliness and tidiness or otherwise of the pupils, so as to give importance to this feature of school life.

The use of slates, being conducive to the spread of disease and want of cleanliness, should be reduced to a minimum, and, where possible, abolished.

That the Commissioners communicate with the Local Government Board with a view to securing that the Local Sanitary Officer visit the schools of his locality at least twice a year (as is done in County Londonderry), and report specially on the condition of the officers and premises.

That the provision of a door mat and a jug and basin be regarded as indispensable in every school.

(e.) Where a small boys' school and a small girls' school are held in adjoining rooms in the same building, it is desirable that boys and girls of the lower standards be taught in the school conducted by the mistress, and that boys and girls of the higher standards be taught in the school conducted by the master.

That the examination for admission to the Training Colleges be gradually made more difficult and of greater breadth, so that a superior type of person may be obtained. To this end it is desirable that candidates should be allowed to present themselves in certain optional subjects, such as languages, &c.

## TIME TABLE.

The Time Table should show at the foot a form to contain a summary of the time per week after roll call assigned to each subject by standards.

A form of Time Table should be sent to each school every year.

NUMBER OF SCHOOLS IN WHICH IRISH IS TAUGHT, ALSO THE NUMBER OF EVENING SCHOOLS IN EACH CIRCUI.

|              | Evening<br>Schools. | Irish. |
|--------------|---------------------|--------|
| Kilmorey     | 45                  | 111    |
| Larne        | 21                  | 197    |
| Galway       | 52                  | 136    |
| Castles      | 129                 | 176    |
| Baltimore    | 70                  | 94     |
| Sligo        | 115                 | 45     |
| Cough        | 52                  | 22     |
| Derry        | 71                  | 60     |
| Loughfoyle   | 66                  | 20     |
| Ballyvaughan | 41                  | 14     |
| Crowe        | 82                  | 12     |
| Bellahy (2)  | 41                  | 16     |
| Portlinton   | 40                  | 33     |
| Bellahy (1)  | 22                  | 9      |
| Arragh       | 29                  | 19     |
| Cork (1)     | 25                  | 97     |
| Cork (2)     | 26                  | 128    |
| Waterford    | 35                  | 62     |
| Gloucester   | 18                  | 74     |
| Danville     | 41                  | 32     |
| Dublin (1)   | 34                  | 29     |
| Dublin (2)   | 15                  | 20     |

## EASTER EXAMINATION.

We think the hours of the annual Easter Examination should on no account exceed six, exclusive of lunch time, that Penmanship and Dictation might be combined, and that the time (two hours) assigned to the General Information Paper and to Composition might be reduced to one hour each.

It is desirable that the time hitherto allowed for the following be shortened:—

|  |                    |
|--|--------------------|
| Grammar,<br>Composition,<br>Geography, | History,<br>Music, |
|--|--------------------|

and that Writing and Spelling be marked on the Dictation Exercise.

## 2.

## CONFERENCE.

## CHURCH 18.

## Submitted,

Refer to Chief Inspectors for  
personal and observations.

DONE, J. J. H., P. E. L.,  
26:1:10, 26:1:10.

CLOSING,  
25:1:10.

## GIVEN,

I beg to report that I held to-day a conference at the Limerick Junction with my colleagues in this Circuit.

The following points engaged our attention, were fully discussed, and substantial agreement was arrived at in regard to them:—

(a) Preparation for daily work on the part of the Teachers. If this is fairly done there is no need to insist on a Weekly Syllabus of Work also. In the case of young teachers this preparation should necessarily be fuller than in the case of teachers of experience. Our aim should be to secure that the notes made should be such as are useful to the teaching and not merely to please the Inspector. Reading texts are to be marked and annotated.

I have noted each paragraph. A.P.

(c) The Chief Inspectors forwarded recently a draft circular on the subject of daily preparation for work. This ought to be issued as soon as possible. I consider Mr. Welch is one of the Inspectors who are too exacting in this matter. A.P.

(b) Teacher's Attendance Record. To insist on a record in every school and to advise that it be kept in the Bell Book as is done at present in the great majority of the schools.

(c) Accounts for Extra Exercises. To have these invariably kept in the ordinary Bell Book and not in exercise books as has been the practice in this Circuit.

(d) To urge on the teachers the necessity for drawing up a clearly outlined plan of work and a plan of Object Lessons for the whole year in advance and to encourage the keeping of Nature Observations such as we find already in a few schools.

(e) To require that Time Tables and Lists of Books be sent in punctually by the teachers every year. To assist us in this we feel bound to express a hope that these forms will be issued in good time from the Education Office.

(f) To discourage the practice observed in several schools of having only a single copy Story Reader for a whole group of pupils.

(g) To get rid of the use of slates in all Standards for Writing and Drawing.

(h) To urge the teachers to do more for the personal cleanliness of the pupils, and to institute "a morning inspection as to cleanliness" as required by the Practical Rules. Also to press for better internal and external ornamentation of schools by the cultivation of window plants, shrubs, flowers, creepers, &c.

(i) To insist on the use of the Punishment Book.

(j) Instead of the weekly half-hour lesson in Drill that finds a place on so many Time Tables to encourage a daily lesson of ten minutes in this branch, this lesson to form a break in the longer half of the day. In country schools especially we think that a half-hour lesson in Drill is quite unnecessary, and that if this is given only once a week it does very little to render the pupils smart and alert.

(k) To encourage Oral Composition, a dreadfully backward subject in this Circuit. In a great many cases here the pupils are not taught to speak and they have no idea how to frame a sentence. "Dumb" children are a peculiar product of Irish education. In no other civilized country is, I believe, such a state of affairs to be encountered. Certainly not in England and America. In the latter country especially great attention is given to this matter of Oral Composition.

Articulation, too, is defective in many cases. I had recently an opportunity of discussing this subject at great length with one of the Professors of University College, Cork, and he tells me that in recent years the articulation and speaking powers generally of students who come to College have deteriorated so markedly that more than one Professor has complained to the College Council on the subject.

(l) Home Lessons. It was agreed that instead of having a special compartment reserved for these on the Time Table it would be much better to have them taken at the time for the subject to which each refers.

(m) Dictation. One lesson a week should suffice for this, the pupils always to prepare the page on which the passage is to be found.

(n) "Fair Copies." To discourage this practice. The whole of the work of the pupils should be shown and not merely the polished product of several efforts.

(o) A comparison of our standards of marking schools. My personal conviction is that a great many of the schools of this Circuit are too highly marked and I told this quite plainly to my colleagues. I find schools marked "V.G." which are not nearly on a par with one another, and it seems to me that the marks were not awarded with due discrimination. The experience of Mr. Cole, Junior Inspector, who worked for three months in this Circuit tells with mine. Mr. Cole reduced the award in 78 per cent. of the schools he inspected here. Mr. Carroll, a recently appointed Junior Inspector, who, however, had several years' experience as a teacher, also expressed to me his surprise at several of the awards.

Mr. Kelly, another Junior Inspector, who worked in this Circuit last summer was equally emphatic in his disagreement with several of the awards he was acquainted with, and I feel sure that many of the marks I find would not have been awarded by Messrs. Dewar, Daly, P. J. Kelly, Keith, and P. J. Fitzgerald—to name only these Inspectors with whose work and methods I have some acquaintance.

I am, Gentlemen,  
Your obedient Servant,  
W. H. WINTER.

The Secretaries,  
Education Office, Dublin.

(b) This is proper, except where an official book or one ordered by the manager is provided. A.P.

(c) This is proper until the official book for the purpose (if it is with the printer) is sent out to the manager. A.P.

(d) This should be done unless the official plans of work (see programme and "Notes for Teachers") is adopted. A.P.

(e) Inspectors should certainly do so, but the omission last year was due to late delivery of forms from E.O. A.P.

(f) The Inspectors have no authority for this. Even in 3-teacher schools the programme allows "grouping" for the story book. A.P.

(g) This is proper. A.P.

(h) This is proper, but if it is meant to imply neglect of this matter in the past I venture to think it needless to say and unparliamentary to do so without which Mr. W. A. Brown has presided. A.P.

(i) Certainly. A.P.

(j) I approve of this, but some latitude must be left to teachers. A.P.

(k) Speaking is very indistinct on the part of young and old in Ireland. It is strange that there should have been "deterioration" in recent years, since oral composition and speaking lessons become part of the ordinary school course. Perhaps Mr. Welby and his informant have become more critical and exact. A.P.

(l) I approve of this, but I know some very good teachers prefer taking home lessons at a special time, or leaving them as pupils arrive. A.P.

(m) This is a matter of opinion. If teacher is doing good work his plans should not be interfered with.

(n) Certainly.

(o) This paragraph has no business here. I disapprove of Mr. Welby's dragging in the names of other Inspectors, and of his opposing the opinions of experienced Inspectors like Mr. Cole and Mr. Carroll to that of men like Mr. McEury and Mr. Yates. Some Inspectors at their first visits to schools are rather apt to come to conclusions which they have to modify subsequently. A.P. 28/1/10.

Confidential.

## MEMORANDUM.

CO. DUBLIN. DOLPHIN'S BARN NATIONAL SCHOOL.  
Roll No. 12608.

Manager—Very Rev. Canon Ryan, D.D., P.P.,  
Dolphin's Barn, Dublin.

Assistant Teacher—Mrs. Kathleen Bourke, 2<sup>nd</sup> class,  
3rd grade, not trained; 50 years of age;  
33 years' service. Salary—£51 10s. 0d.  
(inclusive of residual capitation grant);  
did not join the Pension Scheme.

Mrs. Bourke has been an assistant teacher in this school since 1888, and has discharged her duties on the whole with a very moderate degree of efficiency. The reports on her work for the past three years have been very unfavourable. The following statements regarding her appear in the reports since 1906:—

General Report, 19th September, 1906.—Mrs. Bourke's work "fair." "The teachers are industrious, but they have not sufficient command of the methods required for the successful instruction of large classes to secure satisfactory results."

General Report, 27th August, 1907.—Mrs. Bourke—"fair."

General Report, 7th and 8th October, 1909.—Mrs. Bourke—"middling." "Mrs. Bourke can do little for the progress of her pupils until she keeps them under proper control." In connection with this report the manager was requested to inform this teacher that, should the next General Report on her work be also of an unfavourable character serious action might have to be taken regarding her.

General Report, 24th and 25th August, 1910. School—"middling." Mrs. Bourke—"fair." "The standard of work in the school continues to be very low, and discipline is far too lax." On 24th September, 1910, Mrs. Bourke was admonished and informed that if she was to retain her position she must discharge her duties with much greater efficiency in future.

General Report, 22nd September, 1911.—School—"middling." Mrs. Bourke—"middling." "The educational result of the teaching in this school is of the poorest kind, as the pupils make no effort to learn."

On consideration of this and the preceding reports the manager was informed that the work done by this assistant teacher was unsatisfactory, and she was warned that the Senior Inspector would furnish a special report regarding the manner in which she performed her duties at the end of the school year, and should his report be unfavourable, the Commissioners might be obliged to withdraw her salary from her.

The Senior Inspector visited the school on 14th June, 1912, and made the following report concerning the assistant, Mrs. Bourke:—

"I visited the school by special order to report on the division taught by the principal teacher and by one of the assistants, Mrs. Bourke.

"Mrs. Bourke is not only ignorant of the proper methods of teaching the subjects included in the programme for her class (senior infants), but she is utterly incapable of maintaining even the semblance of order and discipline. At all the lessons given in my presence to-day many of the pupils paid little or no attention, and, of course, derived very moderate benefit. At the 'conversation lesson' the children were allowed to shout their answers collectively. The drill lesson was a hopeless failure; the exercises were of no value, and in any case were badly carried out, as Mrs. Bourke had hardly any control over her pupils. Her kindergarten lesson was altogether worthless. The children under her charge are receiving no training in any proper sense of the word. I consider this teacher hopelessly incompetent."

In regard to this statement of her case, Mrs. Bourke has furnished a statement declaring that she always worked conscientiously and efficiently, that the overcrowding of the infants' departments made proper discipline very difficult, if not impossible, and that she trusts that the Commissioners will deal leniently with her.

Office of National Education,  
Dublin, 3rd January, 1913.

Confidential.

## MEMORANDUM.

CO. DUBLIN. DOLPHIN'S BARN NATIONAL SCHOOL.

Roll No. 12608.

Manager—Very Rev. Canon Ryan, D.D., P.P.,  
Dolphin's Barn, Dublin.

Principal Teacher—Miss Mary Connolly, 2<sup>nd</sup> class,  
2nd grade, untrained; 51 years of age; 32  
years' service; did not join the Pension  
Scheme. Salary—£90 (exclusive of residual  
capitation grant). Average attendance  
of pupils—177. Staff—principal  
and 3 assistant mistresses.

Miss Connolly has been principal teacher of this school since 1883. The attendance consists of infant boys, and of girls of all school ages, the great majority, however, being at the lower standards. The school has for many years past been conducted with only moderate efficiency, but since 1909 the reports have been very unfavourable, especially to the principal teacher.

At the general inspections of 1906, 1907, and 1909 the mark "fair" was assigned to the school, but a good deal of the work was reported as unsatisfactory. Thus in his general report of 27th August, 1907, the Inspector said:—

"Reading is clear and emphatic, and, making allowance for the recent holiday break in the instruction, the school may, perhaps, be described as fair. Apart, however, from the good features already noted and the tactical singing of the pupils, there is little proficiency and less training in the school, neither thought nor self-reliance nor discipline receiving proper attention."

In the general report dated 7th and 8th October, 1909, the school was classified as "middling." In the course of his minute the Inspector wrote:—

"This large and important school is not at all conducted in an efficient manner. Discipline is lax; ineffective and in some cases positively harmful methods of teaching are adopted; the organisation of the senior department is defective and leads to much waste of time; and the overcrowding of the infants' department is a serious hindrance to progress. . . . Miss Connolly's work, either as principal or as teacher of a division, is feeble, and in large measure ineffective. She should take her duties much more seriously."

Miss Connolly's attention was officially directed to these statements and she was informed that should the next general report on her work be also of an unfavourable character serious action might have to be taken regarding her.

The next general report dated 24th and 25th August, 1910, was also "middling" both in regard to the state of the school and to the principal's work. The lady Inspector who visited the school wrote as follows:—

"The standard of work in this school continues to be very low, and discipline is far too lax. The school generally, and especially the infants' department, is much overcrowded: I understand, however, that steps are being taken to remedy this defect."

In view of the continued low efficiency the principal teacher was severely reprimanded and warned that unless she applied herself earnestly to her work during the current school year so as to raise the proficiency to the required standard, the question of ceasing to recognise her as principal teacher would have to be considered.

The next general report, however, dated 22nd September, 1911, showed no improvement. The school was again marked "middling," and the Inspector stated:—

"The educational result of the teaching in this school is of the poorest kind, as the pupils make no effort to learn. In face of this fact, no suggestions for the improvement of methods are of the least use. Until the children develop a spirit of work, now conspicuously absent, no improvement on the present low proficiency of the school will be possible."

On consideration of this report the manager was informed that the principal teacher appeared to be unable to discharge the important duties of her position with the necessary skill, and unless an improvement was effected at an early date the Commissioners would be unable to continue to recognise her in her present position. Miss Connolly was warned that the Senior Inspector would visit the school about the close of the school year and would furnish a special report regarding the state of the proficiency and the manner in which she was carrying out her duties, and should this report be unfavourable the Commissioners might be obliged to withdraw salary from her.

The Senior Inspector made a special inspection of the school on 14th June, 1913, and furnished the following statement concerning the principal teacher:—

"The work done by the principal, Miss Connolly, is largely ineffective, for she appears to be incapable of maintaining proper discipline. Her pupils are inattentive and restless, and have not been trained to work with steadiness. They show little ability to answer questions requiring the exercise of some thought, though they are by no means deficient in natural intelligence. I gave the Third Standard pupils,

17 in number, an easy arithmetical problem which involved merely the multiplication of 29 by 13, and the subtraction of the result from 500. Not a single pupil obtained a correct answer, and only two out of the number present (17) showed any knowledge of the method of solution.

"The object lesson given by Miss Connolly was totally ineffective owing to the lack of discipline in the class. The written exercises are not at all corrected with sufficient thoroughness. No proper foundation is laid in Geography, and Grammar is taught with little intelligence."

A copy of the foregoing statement having been furnished to the teacher, she has replied stating that she always endeavoured to discharge her duties as efficiently as the difficult circumstances of the school would permit, that the majority of the senior pupils are of a very irregular class, and that she hopes that a further trial will be afforded her.

Office of National Education,  
Dublin, 3rd January, 1913.

## APPENDIX XXXIV.

(Forwarded by the Board of National Education in Ireland.)

### NOTICE TO MANAGERS AND TEACHERS OF NATIONAL SCHOOLS.

The Commissioners of National Education have approved of the following scheme for awarding Higher Certificates to teachers of marked ability independently of the Grade in which they rank.

Teachers may be awarded Higher Certificates provided they fulfil the following conditions:—

#### I. EFFICIENCY.

During the five years immediately preceding the application for the award of a Higher Certificate the inspectors' reports on the teacher's work must have been at least "good," three out of the five being "very good" or "excellent."

#### II. SCHOLARSHIP.

The teacher must have attended during a third year of training, at a course of lectures in an approved syllabus at a University or at an institution recognised by the Commissioners, and have passed the necessary examination at the end of the course, or

The teacher must present evidence of having successfully prosecuted a suitable special course of studies in connection with some public teaching and examining body.

By Order,  
P. E. LAMMAS,  
W. J. DILLWORTH,  
Secretaries.

Office of National Education,  
Dublin, April, 1913.

## APPENDIX XXXV.

(Forwarded by the Board of National Education in Ireland.)

### CIRCULAR TO INSPECTORS OF NATIONAL SCHOOLS.

#### *Merit Marks assigned to Schools after General Inspections.*

Referring to the circular of June, 1911, in which the inspectors were informed that "in future in the case of all schools the merit mark of the previous school year should not be altered by any Inspector below the rank of senior Inspector until a conference has been held with the latter officer . . ." the Commissioners regret to find that this instruction seems to have been misunderstood by some Inspectors who have apparently thought that they were not at liberty to alter the mark, because they were below the rank of senior Inspector.

We are accordingly directed to intimate that it would be a serious misconception on the part of any Inspector if he thought he should surrender his own judgment and

repeat the mark assigned in the preceding year; and the Commissioners desire it to be clearly understood that an Inspector should in every instance assign the mark which in his view, and having regard to the terms of the circular referred to, properly represents the worth of the school. Should the mark so assigned differ from that given at the preceding general inspection the Inspector should, of course, confer with the senior Inspector, as laid down in the circular of June, 1911.

By Order,  
P. E. LAMMAS,  
W. J. DILLWORTH,  
Secretaries.

Office of National Education,  
Dublin, February, 1913.

## APPENDIX XXXVI.

(Compiled by Mr. D. FRIZZELL, Assistant to the Commissioners of National Education in Ireland.)

## STATEMENT OF THE PRINCIPAL DUTIES OF THE ACCOUNTANT TO THE COMMISSIONERS OF NATIONAL EDUCATION.

1. To be responsible for the general supervision and control of the business of the Accounts Department of the Commissioners' Office, and for the proper conduct of that business.

2. To prepare and submit to the Resident Commissioner (who is the Accounting Officer) the annual estimate of the amount of the Parliamentary Vote which will be required to meet the payments to be made by the Commissioners.

3. To sign jointly with the Resident Commissioner (or, in his absence, with one of the Secretaries) the advice to the Paymaster General of all payments duly authorised to be made out of the Vote, and to sign all cheques and other authorities for payments.

4. To take such steps as may be necessary to secure that no payment be made which has not been authorised by the Board and provided for in the Vote, or specially sanctioned by the Treasury.

5. To carefully watch the progress of the expenditure under each sub-head of the Vote, in order to be able to satisfy the Resident Commissioner respecting the same, and to bring specially to his notice for representation to

the Board any action taken or expenses authorised which would cause or tend to cause an excess beyond the amounts provided for under the respective sub-heads. Also to call the attention of the Resident Commissioner to any measure which the Board may desire to adopt which may have the effect hereafter of creating a new charge upon the Vote, in order that it may be brought to the notice of the Treasury.

6. To prepare and submit to the Resident Commissioner (the Accounting Officer) all correspondence with the Exchequer and Audit Department, viz:—(a) answers to audit queries; (b) monthly accounts; and (c) annual Appropriation Account.

7. To be the interpreter of the rules and regulations on questions relating to the payment of Teachers' salaries, etc., to the clerks who make such payments.

8. To act as Assessor of Income Tax for the Department.

9. To audit the accounts of the Training Colleges.

10. To supervise the preparation of all circulars or letters on financial subjects.

## APPENDIX XXXVII.

(Compiled by the Board of National Education in Ireland.)

## 1.

## NO. OF TEACHERS IN THE BOARD'S SERVICE ON THE 31st DECEMBER OF THE YEARS 1902 TO 1912.

| Year | Principals |       |       | Assistants |       |       | Total No. of Principal and Assistant Teachers | Manual Instructors and Junior* Assistant Mistresses | Work-mistresses and Industrial Teachers | Junior Literary Assistants | Temporary Teachers | Grand Total |
|------|------------|-------|-------|------------|-------|-------|---|---|---|----------------------------|--------------------|-------------|
|      | Men        | Women | Total | Men        | Women | Total |   |   |   |                            |                    |             |
| 1902 | 4,688      | 3,565 | 8,253 | 1,863      | 2,041 | 3,724 | 11,977  | 334   | 425                                     | 12                         | 29                 | 12,997      |
| 1903 | 4,666      | 3,599 | 8,255 | 1,868      | 2,099 | 3,787 | 12,042  | 356   | 303                                     | 11                         | 28                 | 12,144      |
| 1904 | 4,634      | 3,618 | 8,212 | 1,181      | 2,848 | 4,099 | 12,281  | 809   | 427                                     | 10                         | 14                 | 13,392      |
| 1905 | 4,583      | 3,626 | 8,180 | 1,219      | 3,119 | 4,338 | 12,527  | 715   | 362                                     | 7                          | 30                 | 13,631      |
| 1906 | 4,590      | 3,592 | 8,182 | 1,230      | 3,226 | 4,445 | 12,598  | 1,494   | 302                                     | 7                          | 11                 | 14,412      |
| 1907 | 4,547      | 3,534 | 8,101 | 1,230      | 3,384 | 4,604 | 12,705  | 1,845   | 272                                     | 6                          | 5                  | 14,833      |
| 1908 | 4,512      | 3,534 | 8,038 | 1,228      | 3,482 | 4,705 | 12,731  | 2,022   | 233                                     | 6                          | 5                  | 14,997      |
| 1909 | 4,489      | 3,468 | 7,957 | 1,246      | 3,698 | 4,944 | 12,841  | 2,331   | 216                                     | 5                          | —                  | 15,393      |
| 1910 | 4,476      | 3,434 | 7,890 | 1,223      | 3,718 | 4,939 | 12,829  | 2,501   | 194                                     | 5                          | 2                  | 15,329      |
| 1911 | 4,487      | 3,364 | 7,851 | 1,254      | 3,915 | 5,162 | 13,033  | 2,374   | 170                                     | 2                          | —                  | 15,579      |
| 1912 | 4,435      | 3,331 | 7,810 | 1,281      | 4,117 | 5,398 | 13,214  | 2,539   | 148                                     | 2                          | 4                  | 15,706      |

\*Manual Instructors to 1904. Junior Assistant Mistresses from 1905.

## 2.

STATEMENT as to the number of Teachers who received increments of salary each year since the introduction of the New System of Payments.

For the period prior to the 1st April, 1906, previous figures are not readily obtainable, but the number of Teachers who, within this period, were awarded increments in respect of service to the 1st April, 1906, and subsequently, may be stated approximately as:—

Further awards to Graded Teachers were:—

|  |     |                |
|--|-----|----------------|
| Within the year ended 31st March, 1906 | ... | 1,567          |
| Do.                                    | do. | 1907 ... 3,714 |
| Do.                                    | do. | 1908 ... 1,400 |
| Do.                                    | do. | 1909 ... 1,202 |
| Do.                                    | do. | 1910 ... 3,072 |
| Do.                                    | do. | 1911 ... 1,612 |
| Do.                                    | do. | 1912 ... 1,614 |
| Do.                                    | do. | 1913 ... 1,598 |

Number of Teachers.—About 5,600.

OCEANO, 1913.

## 3.

RETURN showing for the years 1906 to 1912 inclusive the number of teachers who were debarred from obtaining promotion or increment (a) because the reports on their work did not reach the prescribed standard of efficiency; (b) as result of reports of Inspectors relating to buildings or equipment of schools.

(a)

| Year    | Number debarred from promotion | Number debarred from obtaining increment | Total |
|---------|--------------------------------|--|-------|
| 1906 .. | 666                            | 2,286                                    | 2,952 |
| 1907 .. | 873                            | 2,971                                    | 3,844 |
| 1908 .. | 739                            | 2,819                                    | 3,558 |
| 1909 .. | 668                            | 2,213                                    | 2,881 |
| 1910 .. | 838                            | 2,807                                    | 3,645 |
| 1911 .. | 748                            | 2,000                                    | 2,748 |
| 1912 .. | 887                            | 2,681                                    | 3,568 |
| 1913 .. | 877                            | 2,200                                    | 3,077 |
| 1914 .. | 860                            | 2,526                                    | 3,386 |
| 1915 .. | 696                            | 2,522                                    | 3,218 |

NOTE.—In the year 1906 and subsequently, the numbers include teachers who in the preceding year or years were also debarred from obtaining promotion or increment.

(b)

No teacher was debarred from obtaining promotion or increment solely as result of reports of Inspectors relating to buildings or equipment of schools.

## APPENDIX XXXVIII.

RETURN showing the number of teachers compulsorily retired in each year by the Board of National Education before attaining the age for retirement on full pension for the 24 years from 1888 to 1912, inclusive.

(In this Return are included not only the teachers who were dismissed by order of the Board but also the very much larger number of cases in which retirement followed on a threat of serious action or withdrawal of salary if improvement in the school were not effected.)

| Year. | Number of Teachers. | Year.     | Number of Teachers. |
|-------|---------------------|-----------|---------------------|
| 1888  | 4                   | 1890      | 30                  |
| 1889  | 6                   | 1900      | 44                  |
| 1890  | 6                   | 1901      | 32                  |
| 1891  | 6                   | 1902      | 15                  |
| 1892  | 6                   | 1903      | 20                  |
| 1893  | 6                   | 1904      | 27                  |
| 1894  | 10                  | 1905      | 44                  |
| 1895  | 15                  | 1906      | 14                  |
| 1896  | 20                  | 1907      | 10                  |
| 1897  | 23                  | 1908      | 9                   |
| 1898  | 28                  | 1909      | 14                  |
|       |                     | 1910      | 10                  |
|       |                     | 1911      | 11                  |
|       |                     | 1912      | 10                  |
|       |                     | 25 years. | 447 teachers.       |

## APPENDIX XXXIX.

Number of teachers to whom it was intimated that unfavourable action might be taken in their regard for not satisfactorily teaching subjects introduced by the Revised Programme of 1900:—26.

## APPENDIX XL.

*(Forwarded by the Board of National Education in Ireland).*

## 1.

## RESOLUTIONS OF THE BOARD IN 1899 RELATIVE TO THE NEW SYSTEM.

AMENDED SCHEME OF ADMINISTRATION OF VOTE FOR  
ELEMENTARY EDUCATION (IRELAND).

1899.

Consideration of the several proposals of an amended Scheme of procedure submitted by the Resident Commissioner for the better carrying out of the work of this Department, as per Memorandum already issued to the Commissioners.

Mr. W. J. M. Sturges, Resident Commissioner, moves a series of resolutions dealing with the general principles of this Scheme:—

Ordered:—

- (a) That the resolutions of the Resident Commissioner be approved.
- (b) That application be made to Her Majesty's Treasury for sanction to the adoption of the same, as constituting an improved system of regulations for the work of this Department.

The Resolutions are as follows:—

1. That after the termination of the current financial year, the system of payments to National School Teachers, generally known as the "Results System," in which portion of the remuneration of the Teachers is made dependent on the individual answering of pupils in each of the subjects of the School Programme, be discontinued, and that no further examinations of Schools for "Results" be held after the 31st March, 1900.

2. That after the termination of the current financial year, the separate payments to Classed or Provisionally Classed Teachers of Model, Convent, and Ordinary National Schools, in Special Salaries, Class Salaries, Capitation Grants, Good Service Salaries, Results Fees, School Grant, Grant in lieu of Customs and Excise Grant, Gratuities, &c., be discontinued.

3. That on and after the 1st April, 1900, all Classed or Provisionally Classed Teachers of Model, Convent, and Ordinary National Schools be divided into three Grades, the first or highest Grade having two sections, and that the maximum number of Teachers to be recognised as ranking in the Second Grade, and in each section of the First Grade, respectively, be fixed by the Commissioners and the Lords of Her Majesty's Treasury. These numbers to be subject to revision, according to the necessities or requirements of the public service.

That entrance into any grade be in accordance with rules approved by the Commissioners and the Treasury, and that promotion from one Grade or Section of a Grade to another, be determined by similar rules.

The promotions to depend mainly on (a) Training, (b) Position in School, (c) Ability and general attainments, (d) Good Service, and (e) Seniority.

In every case of promotion a positive recommendation from the Inspector to be required.

4. That all Annual Examination of Teachers, except Provisionally Classed Teachers, Queen's Scholars, Pupil Teachers, and Monitors, be abolished after 1900.

5. That the "Classification" of Teachers as now understood, be abolished for all future Teachers after

1900, and that the present system of promotion be abolished for all Teachers after the same date. The case of Queen's Scholars at present in Training Colleges to be reserved, and other cases involving hardship to be specially considered.

6. That after the 1st April, 1900, all Classed or Provisionally Classed permanent Teachers then in the service, and all other permanent Teachers appointed on or after that date as Principals or Assistants of Model, Convent, or Ordinary National Schools (except Teachers of Convent Schools paid by capitation), be paid in lieu of all ordinary emoluments\* from the State, salaries at fixed rates, according to scales approved by the Commissioners and the Treasury, for each Grade of Teachers. The scales in each case to provide for a minimum salary, rising by increments to a maximum, and to be so arranged that no Teacher in any Grade on the 1st April, 1900, will receive a fixed salary of less amount than his or her average annual income from the State during the three years ending on the 31st December, 1899, or the 31st March, 1900 (as may be afterwards determined), or less than such Teacher's actual salary for the year ending on either of the dates mentioned (as may be afterwards determined).

The Teacher to be given an option in each case. Also that provision be made for the cases of Teachers having incomes greater than the highest specified in the Scales.

7. That the Conductors of Convent and Monastery Schools at present paid by Capitation fees, Results fees, &c., receive, on and after the 1st April, 1900, a Capitation fee in lieu of all ordinary emoluments from the State.

8. That the case of Workmistresses, Industrial Teachers, Temporary Assistants, Temporary Workmistresses, and Junior Literary Assistants be specially considered, and scales of fixed salaries be drawn up for each.

9. That the School Programme, School Curriculum, and System of School Organisation be revised and amended so as to secure greater simplification of the work of the Teachers, with increased efficiency in the general plan outlined in the Resident Commissioner's memorandum.

10. That the present Rules in the Commissioners' Code in relation to Evening Schools be abolished, and that Rules similar to those in the Resident Commissioner's Memorandum be drawn up and submitted to the Treasury for approval.

11. That the Inspection Staff be re-organised on the plan drawn up by the Resident Commissioner, and that application be made to the Treasury for sanction of the new scales of salary.

That Teachers of National Schools be eligible for promotion after the 1st April, 1900, to the rank of Junior Inspector on special conditions.

That the present system of appointment of Inspectors by competitive examination be suspended.

That the question of the mode of selection of the Senior Inspectors be reserved.

\* Ordinary emoluments consist of:—Class or other Salary, School Grant, Customs and Excise Grant, Results fees (for subjects taught wholly or partly within school hours), Gratuities, &c.

## 2.

Copy of Board's Order (B) of 7th January, 1902.

(a.) That all written orders and directions given by the Secretaries to any official either of the Interior or of the Outdoor Departmental Staff, or to other officers of the Board, shall be assumed by the officers to whom they shall have been given to have been made by the authority, general or special, of the Board, or of the

Resident Commissioner, but this rule shall not enlarge the authority of the Secretaries as between them and the Resident Commissioner and the Board.

(b.) That, subject to the preceding rule, the Secretaries, Financial Assistant Secretary, and Chief Inspectors, shall be independent of each other, and under the direct authority of the Board and the Resident Commissioner.



Copy of Board's Order of 26th April, 1903.

That the Board feel constrained to reprimand Mr. Parnor for not acting at once on the order he received from the Secretaries, and that his attention be directed to the resolution of the Board of 7th January, 1902, viz.—'That all written orders and directions written by the Secretaries to any official either of the Indoor or

of the Outdoor Departmental Staff of the Board, shall be assumed to have been made by the authority, general or special, of the Board or of the Resident Commissioner'; and that he be informed that the Board consider that the instructions given in the letter of the Secretary of 21st April were sufficiently definite, and should have been carried out without question by him.

Copy of the Board's Order, 7th June, 1904.

That the position and emoluments of the Secretaries, which existed previous to 1900, be restored.

## APPENDIX XLI.

(Forwarded by the Board of National Education in Ireland).

A RETURN of all Schools inspected by Mr. WHEAT during his first year in charge of CLOWAN CIRCUS, with merit mark assigned to each school, and also the merit mark assigned to the same school for previous and subsequent years.

### MERIT MARK.

| Roll No. | School.                  | School Year, 1898-9. | School Year, 1899-10. (Mr. Waddy). | School Year, 1900-11. | School Year, 1901-12. | Roll No. | School.                  | School Year, 1898-9. | School Year, 1899-10. (Mr. Waddy). | School Year, 1900-11. | School Year, 1901-12. |
|----------|--------------------------|----------------------|------------------------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|----------|--------------------------|----------------------|------------------------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|
| 487      | Gealgus ..               | G.                   | G.                                 | G.                    | G.                    | 1007     | Ballybooby Girls'        | V.G.                 | G.                                 | G.                    | G.                    |
| 492      | Moyno Boys'              | F.                   | F.                                 | F.                    | F.                    | 10134    | Rockdown ..              | V.G.                 | G.                                 | G.                    | V.G.                  |
| 613      | Tober ..                 | G.                   | G.                                 | F.                    | F.                    | 10400    | Anderson ..              | G.                   | F.                                 | F.                    | F.                    |
| 1539     | Northwanner ..           | G.                   | F.                                 | P.                    | G.                    | 10402    | Marfield ..              | G.                   | F.                                 | G.                    | G.                    |
| 1677     | Handlstown ..            | F.                   | M.                                 | V.G.                  | V.G.                  | 10591    | Garrydoole Boys'         | V.G.                 | G.                                 | G.                    | G.                    |
| 1775     | Claverfield ..           | G.                   | F.                                 | F.                    | F.                    | 10602    | Garrydoole Girls'        | V.G.                 | G.                                 | G.                    | G.                    |
| 2077     | Curry ..                 | G.                   | G.                                 | F.                    | F.                    | 11230    | Bilboa Girls'            | G.                   | G.                                 | G.                    | V.G.                  |
| 2245     | Coolmayne ..             | G.                   | G.                                 | G.                    | F.                    | 12093    |                          |                      |                                    |                       |                       |
| 15463    |                          |                      |                                    |                       |                       | 11297    | Barrow ..                | G.                   | M.                                 | F.                    | F.                    |
| 2445     | Templetoole Boys'        | V.G.                 | G.                                 | G.                    | G.                    | 11298    | Larnebrook Girls'        | F.                   | F.                                 | F.                    | G.                    |
| 2444     | Templetoole Girls'       | V.G.                 | V.G.                               | V.G.                  | V.G.                  | 11349    | Bellinacorney ..         | G.                   | M.                                 | M.                    | F.                    |
| 3339     | Macdys ..                | G.                   | M.                                 | M.                    | G.                    | 11433    | Larnebrook Boys'         | F.                   | M.                                 | F.                    | F.                    |
| 3546     | Carraig-on-Suir P. L. U. | G.                   | F.                                 | G.                    | G.                    | 11735    | Kilbarrow Boys'          | F.                   | F.                                 | F.                    | F.                    |
|          |                          |                      |                                    |                       |                       | 11746    | Kilbarrow ..             | F.                   | M.                                 | M.                    | F.                    |
| 3647     | Charles P. L. U. Boys'.  | G.                   | F.                                 | G.                    | G.                    | 11872    | Carraig-on-Suir Con.     | K.                   | E.                                 | K.                    | E.                    |
|          | Do. Girls'               | G.                   | G.                                 | F.                    | F.                    | 11946    | Pinose ..                | G.                   | F.                                 | F.                    | F.                    |
| 4072     | Graymown ..              | G.                   | F.                                 | F.                    | F.                    | 11948    | Carraigbeg Boys'         | G.                   | G.                                 | G.                    | G.                    |
| 4133     | Burrisokane Boys'        | V.G.                 | G.                                 | G.                    | G.                    | 12189    | Carraigbeg Girls'        | F.                   | F.                                 | M.                    | *                     |
| 4221     | Kyle Park ..             | G.                   | F.                                 | F.                    | F.                    | 12249    | Clonmel Convent ..       | V.G.                 | V.G.                               | G.                    | G.                    |
| 4470     | Tour ..                  | V.G.                 | G.                                 | G.                    | G.                    | 12532    | Morton St. Convent       | R.                   | V.G.                               | V.G.                  | V.G.                  |
| 15229    |                          |                      |                                    |                       |                       | 12533    | Clonmel P. L. U.         | G.                   | M.                                 | F.                    | F.                    |
| 4513     | Bahally ..               | V.G.                 | G.                                 | V.G.                  | V.G.                  | 12540    | Clonmel Boys'            | G.                   | F.                                 | F.                    | F.                    |
| 4524     | Neen ..                  | V.G.                 | F.                                 | F.                    | F.                    | 12541    | Clonmel Girls'           | G.                   | G.                                 | F.                    | G.                    |
| 5008     | Clontarf ..              | F.                   | G.                                 | F.                    | G.                    | 12607    | Clontarf Boys'           | V.G.                 | V.G.                               | V.G.                  | V.G.                  |
| 5102     | Clontarf Model ..        | G.                   | G.                                 | V.G.                  | V.G.                  | 12618    | Clontarf Girls'          | G.                   | G.                                 | G.                    | G.                    |
| 5423     | Kilbangan Boys'          | F.                   | G.                                 | F.                    | F.                    | 13014    | St. Mary's (Clontarf)    | G.                   | G.                                 | F.                    | F.                    |
| 5429     | Kilbangan Girls'         | G.                   | G.                                 | G.                    | G.                    | 13210    | Polbarrow Monastery      | G.                   | F.                                 | G.                    | G.                    |
| 5780     | Laragh ..                | G.                   | F.                                 | G.                    | F.                    | 13247    | Bellinacorney ..         | G.                   | F.                                 | G.                    | G.                    |
| 5918     | Powersdown ..            | V.G.                 | V.G.                               | V.G.                  | V.G.                  | 13248    | Templetoole Boys'        | V.G.                 | F.                                 | F.                    | F.                    |
| 7132     | Shanally ..              | G.                   | F.                                 | F.                    | F.                    | 13571    | Templetoole Infant       | F.                   | F.                                 | F.                    | F.                    |
| 7243     | Bilboa Boys'             | G.                   | G.                                 | G.                    | G.                    | 13571    | Bernacorney Convent      | E.                   | V.G.                               | V.G.                  | E.                    |
| 15992    |                          |                      |                                    |                       |                       | 13620    | Comaradine ..            | G.                   | F.                                 | F.                    | F.                    |
| 7302     | Kilnashill ..            | G.                   | G.                                 | G.                    | F.                    | 13640    | Charles (2) ..           | V.G.                 | G.                                 | V.G.                  | G.                    |
| 15993    |                          |                      |                                    |                       |                       | 13640    | Kilnashill Boys'         | V.G.                 | G.                                 | G.                    | G.                    |
| 7486     | Cappanore Boys'          | G.                   | G.                                 | G.                    | G.                    | 13640    | Kilnashill Girls'        | V.G.                 | V.G.                               | V.G.                  | V.G.                  |
| 7568     | Trillick ..              | F.                   | F.                                 | F.                    | Midd.                 | 13648    | Ballyford Boys'          | G.                   | F.                                 | F.                    | F.                    |
| 7586     | Grangemockler Boys'      | G.                   | Midd.                              | F.                    | F.                    | 14081    | Ballyford Girls'         | G.                   | G.                                 | G.                    | F.                    |
| 7586     | Grangemockler Girls'     | V.G.                 | G.                                 | G.                    | G.                    | 14081    | Colman ..                | G.                   | G.                                 | G.                    | G.                    |
| 7668     | Lough ..                 | G.                   | F.                                 | F.                    | F.                    | 14081    | Kilnashill ..            | V.G.                 | F.                                 | F.                    | F.                    |
| 7752     | Castle Iny Boys'         | G.                   | V.G.                               | V.G.                  | V.G.                  | 14087    | Kilnashill ..            | V.G.                 | G.                                 | V.G.                  | V.G.                  |
| 7753     | Castle Iny Girls'        | F.                   | G.                                 | G.                    | G.                    | 15127    | Shroob ..                | G.                   | F.                                 | F.                    | F.                    |
| 7855     | Grangemockler ..         | F.                   | G.                                 | G.                    | G.                    | 15127    | Cappanore Convent        | V.G.                 | G.                                 | G.                    | G.                    |
| 8034     | Kilbarrow Girls'         | F.                   | Midd.                              | Midd.                 | F.                    | 15250    | Carraig-on-Suir ..       | V.G.                 | G.                                 | G.                    | G.                    |
| 8469     | Upchurch Girls'          | V.G.                 | G.                                 | G.                    | F.                    | 15250    | Galle ..                 | V.G.                 | V.G.                               | V.G.                  | V.G.                  |
| 8733     | Moyno Girls'             | G.                   | F.                                 | F.                    | G.                    | 15254    | Bellinacorney Convent    | V.G.                 | G.                                 | F.                    | G.                    |
| 8747     | Upchurch Boys'           | G.                   | V.G.                               | G.                    | G.                    | 15254    | Moynashane Boys'         | G.                   | F.                                 | V.G.                  | V.G.                  |
| 8805     | Peckard Convent ..       | V.G.                 | G.                                 | G.                    | G.                    | 15254    | Moynashane Girls'        | V.G.                 | F.                                 | F.                    | F.                    |
| 9467     | Templetoole Convent.     | G.                   | F.                                 | V.G.                  | V.G.                  | 15413    | Garradilla ..            | V.G.                 | G.                                 | G.                    | G.                    |
| 9745     | Glennare Boys'           | V.G.                 | F.                                 | G.                    | F.                    | 15795    | St. Mary's (Templetoole) | V.G.                 | V.G.                               | G.                    | V.G.                  |
| 9746     | Glennare Girls'          | V.G.                 | V.G.                               | V.G.                  | G.                    | 16035    | Cashel Downy ..          | V.G.                 | V.G.                               | V.G.                  | V.G.                  |
| 9830     | Ballybooby Boys'         | G.                   | F.                                 | G.                    | G.                    |          |                          |                      |                                    |                       |                       |

\* amalgamated with 11909.

## APPENDIX XLII.

(Forwarded by the Board of National Education in Ireland).

## MEMORANDUM AS TO GRADING SCHOOLS AND TEACHERS.

A. PUSAN,  
12/10/00.

The Inspectors of each circuit should at a Conference make out a classified list of the schools under the following heads:—

- (a) Bad.
- (b) Middling.
- (c) Fair.
- (d) Good.
- (e) Very good.
- (f) Excellent.

The schools under (a), (b), (c) would be 3rd grade schools; (d) 2nd grade schools; (e) 1<sup>st</sup> grade schools; and (f) 1<sup>st</sup> grade schools, without any regard to the average attendance.

In drawing up these lists the Inspectors should in the first instance give the teachers the benefit of any doubt.

There would be a different programme for each grade of school, more extensive for every advance in grade. The Inspector should be at liberty in individual schools to modify the grade programme to suit the needs of a locality.

Regarding the programme might be as follows, these representing the maximum to be attempted:—

## PROGRAMME—LOWEST GRADE SCHOOLS.

**Reading.**—Not more than three Literary Readers exclusive of Primer to be used (say I, III, for 2nd and 3rd standards; IV, or V, for higher standards). Explanation to require special attention.

**Writing.**—Headlines mainly even in highest section.

**Spelling.**—Oral in Junior, oral and written in Senior.

**Composition.**—Juniors, oral answering in complete sentences. Seniors, do., but also on paper, and short letters.

**Grammar.**—No formal lessons; correction of errors.

**Arithmetic.**

- Section (a).—Merely oral and mental up to 20.
- (b) All simple rules and easy examples, and mental up to 50.
- (c) Simple and compound rules. Easy reduction and proportion. Mental work.

**Geography.**

- Section (a).—Local: seasons, notions of earth, etc. Elementary.
- (b) and (c) Do., with outlines of Ireland and rest of United Kingdom; chief divisions of land and water, chief countries.

**Singing** (if teacher is musical).—Six school songs.

**Drill.**—Very elementary exercises (during play time).

**Needlework.**

- (a) Knitting; sewing on buttons.
- (b) Knitting; bennet, running.
- (c) Stitching, gathering button holes, patching.

Teacher not to be allowed to teach an Evening School, or have Monitors, or teach Extras, unless he is reckoned as 2nd grade.

## PROGRAMME—2ND GRADE SCHOOL.

**Reading.**—May have a Reader for every class and may use Historical Reader (grouping should, of course, be carried out where possible).

**Writing.**—Headlines till penmanship is good; then may write various exercises, including Bookkeeping.

**Spelling.**

- (a) Mainly oral.
- (b) Oral and written.
- (c) Mainly written.

**Composition.**

- (a) Mainly oral.
- (b) Written answers in full sentences.
- (c) Letters and simple descriptions.

**Grammar.**

- (a) Mainly oral.
- (b) Correction of errors. The sentence. Etymology.
- (c) Dittos; easy syntax.

**Arithmetic.**

- (a) Mental up to 50.
- (b) All simple rules; compound rules; reduction; mental to 100.
- (c) Proportion; vulgar and decimal fractions; easy practice and interest.

**Geography.**

- (a) As in lower grade school.
- (b) Ireland and Great Britain.
- (c) Europe and World.

**Singing** (if teacher musical).

- (a) and (b) As in lower grade.
- (c) More songs; chords of doh. and sol.

(Should teacher be very capable, he can carry instruction further).

**Drill.**—More advanced.

**Drawing and Manual Instruction.**—Course to be mapped out.

**Elementary Science and Common Objects.**—Course to be mapped out.

**Needlework.**—More advanced than in lower grade schools; in highest section to include "making up."

Teacher may teach Evening School, may have Monitors, and may teach Extras outside school hours.

## PROGRAMMES.

1<sup>st</sup> Grade School.

All foregoing; those at end of list more fully.

Boys to add elementary measurement to arithmetic.

Girls need not take elementary science in the classes in which cooking and household management are taken. At least one Extra should be taught to boys of highest section.

Girls of highest section to learn "cutting out."

Teacher may have Evening School, have charge of Monitors, and teach two Extras.

1<sup>st</sup> Grade.

Still more advanced. Should as a rule have VII. and VIII. standard.

Teaching should be thorough, and pupils should display considerable intelligence as a result.

Teacher should have all privileges that can be allowed. He might be given the services of a limited number of Pupil Teachers.

Of course, in all grades great weight should be attached to discipline, moral tone, order, neatness, cleanliness, etc., etc.

Schools classed "(a) Bad" should be noticed for withdrawal of grants at the end of at most two years unless improved in proficiency meanwhile; salary at only minimum of 3rd grade to be paid while "Bad."

Schools classed "(b) Middling" would continue to be recognised so long as they did not deteriorate, but the teachers would be entitled only to minimum of 3rd grade salary or the slight advance on that they might receive by an occasional increment which would accrue if they happened any consecutive three years to do fair work.

Schools classed "(c) Fair" might earn for their teachers salary up to maximum of 3rd grade by triennial increments.

Schools classed " (d) Good " will if the average attendance is sufficient entitle the teacher to 2nd grade salary, if he or she is recognised as of 2nd grade efficiency.

Similarly, Schools classed " (e) V-good " and " (f) Excellent " will entitle their teachers to 1<sup>st</sup> grade and 1<sup>st</sup> grade salary, respectively, if the teachers are recognised as of 1<sup>st</sup> and 1<sup>st</sup> grade efficiency. But a teacher of a lower grade efficiency can receive only the salary of such lower grade until promoted, even though put in charge of a higher grade school.

#### AS REGARDS TEACHERS.

An ex-Monitor, ex-Pupil Teacher, or other untrained Teacher, can rank as a rate only as Assistant and be entitled at most to 2nd grade salary.\* Until trained he must work his way up to the maximum salary of that grade by triennial increments. (Exceptional treatment should at present be shown to untrained Assistants of long standing, both as regards eligibility for Principalship and as to promotion when their services have been very efficient).

A trained person, who was not a Principal when entering the College, should receive on first appointment after leaving the College his or her salary on entering, or the minimum of 2nd grade if not before employed as teacher, and if in charge of a 2nd grade school must work his way up to top of grade by triennial increments. If appointed to a 2nd grade school, or if his school by efficient service becomes 2nd grade, such teacher at the end of the first triennial period of efficient service may be advanced to the maximum salary of 2nd grade, and after three more years of efficient service be promoted to 3rd grade.

If such teacher is appointed to a 3<sup>rd</sup> grade school, his progress as far as 2nd grade will be exactly the same. He will spend three years on minimum salary of 2nd grade; and on maintaining the efficiency of the school will then become entitled to the maximum salary of 2nd grade, and after three more years of efficient service will become entitled to promotion to lowest scale of 3<sup>rd</sup> grade. "High Efficiency" should be required for any promotion beyond this.

But should such a teacher having reached 2nd grade fail to maintain the status of his school as 2<sup>nd</sup>, he should

\*I consider the minimum salary of 2nd grade should be increased; the increments correspondingly decreased.

then teach the maximum salary of 2nd grade only by triennial increments. Should a school and teacher merit the higher classification, but the average attendance not reach the required standard, the teacher while in charge of it would not be entitled to increase of salary to such other grade, but on getting charge of a larger school might at once be granted provisionally payment of salary of next higher grade than that previously paid on.

Should a teacher fail to keep a school up to the grade it had reached, it should after one year's further trial be reduced to rank—teacher's salary being similarly diminished. But no teacher of 35 years of age or upwards should be so depressed unless his inefficiency is due to neglect or misconduct. He may, however, be required to resign on pension should the interests of the school demand such a course.

Principals of large schools should receive an extra payment for every 45 pupils above 140 in average attendance.

Assistants in fair and better schools will be entitled to reach maximum salary of 3rd grade by triennial increments. For special efficiency in large or important schools the first Assistant may be advanced to 2nd grade salary, and may be even himself be reckoned as 2<sup>nd</sup> grade after appointment as Principal to an efficient school of 1<sup>st</sup> or 1<sup>st</sup> grade, while other very efficient Assistants may be similarly reckoned as 2nd grade. (This grading would be on the recommendation of the Inspectors).

No. of schools expected in each grade in a District with 450 schools:—

Bad, 46; Middling, 90. These would probably tend to diminish.

Fair, 135.

Good, 100. Perhaps 10 of these would have less than 50 pupils.

V. Good, 55. Perhaps 15 of these would have less than 20 pupils.

Excellent, 25. Perhaps 10 of these would have less than 10 pupils.

If the system of grading worked towards improving the schools as it ought to, the number in the higher grades should show considerable increase.

Convent schools should be treated exactly as ordinary schools, and not given any special privileges of classification or payment.

## APPENDIX XLIII.

(Forwarded by the Board of National Education in Ireland).

### REPORT OF FINANCIAL ASSISTANT SECRETARY.

Being an Extract from a Memorandum prepared for Sir A. MacDonnell, Under Secretary, 30/1/04, showing how the Commissioners' Rules in regard to awards of Good Service Salary and Grade Promotions of Teachers have been carried out for the first Triennial Period of Teachers' Service under the new System of Payments, ended 31/3/03.

#### FINANCIAL ASSISTANT SECRETARY'S REPORT.

Report for the First Triennial period of Teacher's Service under the New System of Payments ended 31st March, 1903, showing how the Commissioners' Rules in regard to Awards of Good Service Salary and Grade Promotions of Teachers have been carried out.

All teachers of ordinary National Schools are divided into three grades, and promotion from a lower to a higher Grade, and from the Second to the first section of the First Grade, depends upon (I.) training; (II.) position in school; (III.) ability and general attainments; (IV.) good service; (V.) seniority; and (VI.) sufficiency of average attendance as defined in the Code.

The following is the scale of grade salaries for Principals and Assistant Teachers, as provided by the Commissioners in their present Code of Regulations:—

| GRADE.  | Grade Salary. | Continued Good Service Salary—Triennial Increments. |                       | Maximum Income exclusive of Bonus and Capitation Grant. |
|---------|---------------|---|-----------------------|---|
|         |               | Increments.   | Number of Increments. |   |
| III. .. | £ 56          | 7   | 3                     | £ 77  |
| II. ..  | 87            | 10  | 2                     | 107 } Males   |
| I. ..   | 117           | 10  | 1                     | 127   |
| P. ..   | 139           | 12  | 3                     | 175   |
| III. .. | 44            | 7   | 3                     | 65  |
| II. ..  | 73            | 8   | 2                     | 81 } Females  |
| I. ..   | 97            | 8   | 1                     | 105   |
| P. ..   | 114           | 9   | 3                     | 141   |

(1) Assistants generally—Males, from £39 to £47; Females, from £44 to £53.

(2) Assistants entitled to bonuses under Irish Education Act, 1892—Males, from £56 to £96; Females, from £44 to £72 10s.

A maximum rate is fixed for Assistant Teachers and for each grade of Principal Teachers, and the regulations provide that such maximum may be reached by Triennial Increments of Continued Good Service Salary on fulfillment of necessary conditions as to satisfactory service, sufficiency of average daily attendance, etc.

Rule 205, Section II. (h.) specifies that "The grade salary may be supplemented by periodic awards of Continued Good Service Salary, according to the scale of Continued Good Service Salary arranged for the grade."

#### AWARDS OF TRIENNIAL INCREMENTS OF GOOD SERVICE SALARY; GRADING AND PROMOTION OF TEACHERS.

This work, which has proved one of the greatest and most troublesome operations in which the Department has ever been engaged, was begun soon after the expiration of the first three years of teachers' service under the new system of payments, namely 31st March last, and involved an examination of the claims of all teachers entered on the books prior to 1st April, 1903.

In June, 1903, a temporary or provisional grading of teachers took place, based entirely upon the incomes of the staff. All teachers who were then in receipt of salaries from £56 to £77 per annum (in the case of men), or between £44 and £63 (in the case of women), were placed in the III. Grade; men with salaries from £87 to £107, and women with salaries from £75 to £96 per annum, were placed in the II. Grade, men with £117 to £127, and women with £97 to £105 per annum were placed in the I<sup>st</sup> Grade, men with £175 or above, and women with £114 to £141 or above per annum were placed in the I<sup>st</sup> Grade. The salary taken into account in each case was irrespective of the Biennial Capitation Grant allowed. The Assistants were all placed in the III. Grade.

The foregoing division of teachers followed the scale approved by the Commissioners given above; but as the actual salary of existing teachers did not in very many cases correspond with the Grade Scale, those whose salary exceeded the maximum of III., of II., or of I<sup>st</sup> Grade, but did not come up to the minimum of II., of I<sup>st</sup>, or of I<sup>st</sup> Grade, respectively, were reclassified only as III., II., or I<sup>st</sup> Grade, respectively.\* This necessary arrangement gave rise to a great deal of murmuring on the part of some highly esteemed teachers who were placed in grades not corresponding to their classification, under the old rules, and angry correspondence from Managers; but it was unavoidable on the change from classification to grading, and, as explained to Managers, it was only provisional. Now, however, that the claims of all such teachers have been examined and the promotion lists have been completed, the status assigned to each teacher from 1st April, 1903, must be regarded as definitely fixed. The numbers of teachers in the different grades provided for in the original scheme as amended in 1903 were limited as follows:—

| GRADE.                  | Men.   | Women. |
|-------------------------|--------|--------|
| I <sup>st</sup> .. .. . | 300    | 270    |
| II. .. .. .             | 500    | 480    |
| III. .. .. .            | 2,500  | 2,000  |
|                         | 2,100  | 3,680  |
|                         | 5,400  | 6,070  |
| Total .. ..             | 11,470 |        |

These numbers, a close adherence to which is necessary for the financial stability of the new system of payments to teachers, have been somewhat altered as the result of the promotions of teachers now recommended for the Board's sanction (see page 52).

As it was obvious that if the increased annual amounts that became payable to teachers in each year were granted upon a loose award of Triennial Increments of Salary (even without promotions from a lower

to a higher grade), such grants would probably lead to payments in excess of the Vote in some years; and as the danger of exceeding the total grant for salaries would even more quickly result from the periodic promotions of teachers, if unduly extended, it became necessary to draw up and abide by clear, definite, and strict regulations under which the Department could safely and impartially carry out the two distinct actions of (1) awarding Good Service Increments and (2) Promoting Teachers. Accordingly the regulations were framed and issued for the guidance of Inspectors and the Office Staff, so as to enable them to deal uniformly with every variety of case that might arise.

The claims for Triennial Increments were dealt with first. The number of teachers, Principals and Assistants, serving on the 1st April, 1903, was 11,950. Of these—after eliminating new teachers who had not served three years, and such as were obviously ineligible from the fact of their having been fined or otherwise seriously censured for neglect of duty, etc.—there remained about 10,000 teachers to be dealt with. The following table of numbers was prepared in May, 1903:—

Number of teachers who on 31/3/1903 had served three years, 10,128. Number of Principals—Men, 4,348; Women, 3,328. Number of Assistants—Men, 790; Women, 1,902. Total, 10,128.

These were provisionally graded as follows:—

| GRADE.                  | PRINCIPALS. |        | ASSISTANTS. |        | CASES WHERE THE SALARIES ARE INTERFERED (included in the foregoing.) |        |
|-------------------------|-------------|--------|-------------|--------|--|--------|
|                         | Men.        | Women. | Men.        | Women. | Men.   | Women. |
| I <sup>st</sup> .. .. . | 231         | 191    | —           | —      | —  | —      |
| II. .. .. .             | 414         | 288    | —           | —      | 129  | 114    |
| III. .. .. .            | 1,311       | 817    | —           | —      | 255  | 185    |
|                         | 2,356       | 1,295  | 790         | 1,902  | 802  | 559    |
| Total                   | 4,262       | 3,218  | 790         | 1,902  | 1,219  | 879    |

Lists of all teachers who served three years, by Circuits and Sections of Circuits, giving names of schools, roll Nos., average attendance, present salaries, and grades, were prepared. The sheets were then sent to the different Inspectors, with the following letter of instructions:—

Office of National Education,  
Dublin, 24th June, 1903.

We are directed to call your attention to the following extract from Rule 205 II. (b.):—

"Awards of Continued Good Service Salary may be made to Teachers of Schools with an average attendance of twenty pupils or above, when the Commissioners are satisfied that the work done in the School is satisfactory, and that reasonable progress has been made in the proficiency of the pupils."

In connection with this matter, we enclose herewith lists of the teachers in your Section of the Circuit who may be granted increments provided the necessary conditions have been complied with, and in the case of every Teacher where an amount of increment is set forth you will write in the column headed "Notes or Observations," the word "Recommended," if you consider that the conditions laid down in the extract from the Rule quoted above have been complied with.

In cases where you consider the said conditions have not been complied with, you will write "Not Recommended." In the cases marked "Nil" on the Sheets, you need make no noting.

This is an extremely urgent matter, and the lists must be returned to this Office not later than Saturday next.

We are, &c., &c.,

F. E. LEMASS,

W. J. DILLWORTH,

Secretaries.

\* These teachers are referred to as Intermediate Teachers

On receipt of the Circuit Lists from the Inspectors, with their individual recommendations, the Office Staff prepared from these lists sheets setting forth the names of all teachers recommended by the Inspectors for award of Increment. When this was done the Office records were carefully examined in the case of each teacher, and the result entered on the sheet opposite the teacher's name. The reports of the Inspectors for the period preceding the 1st April, 1903, were then examined, and the character of the last reports set forth. The descriptive words "Excellent," "Good," "Fair," or "Bad" were entered on the sheets, and the whole of these files of documents were afterwards gone over by the two Examiners, who made the final notings upon each, prior to the grant or refusal of the Increment. This was a very laborious and trying duty. Upwards of 20,000 reports were examined by the Staff. The work of Principals and Assistants respectively as shown on the reports was disseminated.

No less than 2,220 teachers were debarred, and consequently excluded from consideration as regards Increments, owing to the fact that—

- (a.) They were found to be already at the maximum of their grades; or
- (b.) They had incomes greater than the maximum of their grades; or
- (c.) The average attendance at their schools would not warrant any increase of salary at present; or that they were
- (d.) Assistant Teachers promoted to be Principals who since 1/4/1901 had received special increases of salary greater than the increment of their grade.

Thus the number of teachers presumably eligible for Increment of salary from the 1st April, 1903, was reduced to 6,919.

It should be explained that in some cases teachers coming under heads (a.) and (b.) above, though ineligible for Increments, were eligible for advancement to higher grades, and accordingly the names of all such teachers were placed on special lists and forwarded to the Inspectors as candidates for promotion in grade.

In addition, all teachers who had received, or could receive, only a partial Increment of salary were likewise admitted to the Inspectors with instructions to recommend for promotion such as were deserving of advancement. (See page 20.) There were 1,500 such teachers.

The total number, therefore, of apparently eligible cases to be considered on this occasion was 6,919, and of these the number provisionally recommended by Inspectors for Increments was 6,196. When, however, the reports and Office records of those indicated by the Inspectors were re-examined, it was found that the number of cases which did not fulfil all the required conditions for grant as laid down by the Commissioners in their Order dated 9th June, 1902, was 2,042. The number of Increments granted was 3,706, giving a total annual increase under the head of Good Service Salary to teachers of £28,595. There are still some cases undecided.

During the progress of the work many points and queries arose for settlement. These were met by the issue of instructions to the Office Staff.

#### Convent Capitulation Schools.

The consideration of awards of increments to Convent Capitulation Schools was next taken up, and was conducted throughout by the Financial Assistant Secretary and his staff.

In the case of Convent Capitulation Schools no grading could be applied, but the net income per pupil of these schools was determined; and they were classified accordingly, in view of the requirements of Rule 130.

On the 19th June, 1903, the following communication was issued to the Inspectors:—

Confidential.

CONVENT SCHOOLS IN RESPECT OF CAPITULATION GRANTS.  
Financial Increments and Rates of Capitulation Grant.  
Immediate.

Office of National Education,  
Dublin, 19th June, 1903.

Sir,

Referring to Rule 136, Section II. of the Code, and particularly to the requirements of the Board under paragraph (b), we are directed to request you will

report in which of the under-mentioned Schools you can recommend that an increase in the rate of the Capitulation Grant should be made from the 1st April, 1903, taking into careful consideration the circumstances of each School, and the character of the educational work done in each School during the past three years. In expressing your judgment in regard to the work of the Schools, you will employ one of the following words: "Excellent," "Very Good," "Good," "Fair," "Satisfactory," or "Bad," as in the case of ordinary National Schools, and, as a rule, an increment should not be recommended unless you can say that the work done was "Excellent."

We are, Sir,

Your obedient Servants,

P. E. LEMASS,

W. J. DELWORTH, } Secretaries.

To

Inspector of National Schools.

On receipt of the Inspector's Special Reports, tables were prepared showing the rates per pupil per annum at which the different Convents were paid up to 31st March, 1903. From these tables and the special reports, a list of all Convents which fulfilled the required conditions was submitted, and an increment of 1s. per pupil per annum was in each case sanctioned.

Of the 293 Convent and Monastery Capitulation Schools, 238 were eligible for an increase; and of these, 212 succeeded in gaining the triennial increment, and 22 failed to fulfil all the conditions required for an increased grant.

The aggregate additions sanctioned represented an annual total charge on the Vote of £24,400.

It may be observed that a higher standard of efficiency than that required to gain an increment for ordinary schools was exacted in the case of Convent Schools. The reason of this distinction was that while an increment granted to an ordinary teacher paid personal salary will die with him, an increase to a Convent School is practically permanent and could not lapse except through inefficiency, which of course would rarely occur.

#### Grade Promotions of Teachers.

The next operation taken up was the Grade Promotion of Teachers in principal charge of schools. The plan adopted was as follows:—

Lists of three kinds were prepared by Convents embracing (1) Principals at the maximum of their respective grades, III., II., and I., who while this graded could not be awarded any increment; (2) those known as Subgrade Teachers; and (3) Teachers who had received only a partial increment, which, however, brought them to the top of their grade. The three sets of lists comprised no less than 3,500 Principals. As in the case of candidates for increments of Good Service Salary, the lists set forth full particulars as to present salary and grade of teacher, with the average attendance at their schools for the information of the Inspectors. Part of the sheet was reserved for Office noting as to teacher's career, &c.

On the 28th September, 1903, the following Circular of Instructions was issued to the Inspectors:—

#### TRIMMIAL PROMOTIONS OF EXPERIENCED PRINCIPAL TEACHERS.

Office of National Education.

Dublin, 28th September, 1903.

Sir,

With reference to the rules governing promotions of Teachers under the New System we are directed by the Commissioners to forward for your consideration the enclosed lists, marked A, B, and C (prepared from the books of this Office) of Principal Teachers appointed prior to, and who have served continuously for at least three years from 1st April, 1900.

### Lists.

These lists include (1) principals whose salaries are higher than the maximum of their present Grade, and who are thereby at present precluded from grant of terminal increment of Good Service Salary; and (2) Teachers at the maximum of III, Grade, II, Grade, or second division of I, Grade.\*

### Conditions of Promotion.

You will take special note of the following extracts from the Rules of the Commissioners applicable to candidates for promotion:—

Rule 195 (g.) Promotion of Teachers from a lower to a higher grade, and from the second to the first section of the highest grade, depends on (i.) training; (ii.) position in school; (iii.) ability and general attainments; (iv.) good service; (v.) seniority.

(h.) No Teacher of a school in which the average attendance for the calendar year is under thirty, is eligible for promotion to the Second Grade.

(i.) No Teacher of a school in which the average attendance for the calendar year is under fifty, is eligible for promotion to the First Grade.

(j.) No Teacher of a school in which the average attendance for the calendar year is under seventy, is eligible for promotion to the first section of the First Grade.

(k.) A Teacher promoted from a lower to a higher grade receives, on promotion, the salary fixed for the grade to which promoted, but without any immediate addition of Continued Good Service Salary. Teachers must, as a rule, remain three years on the maximum of a grade before becoming eligible for promotion to a higher grade.

(l.) No Teacher appointed for the first time, on or after the 1st April, 1900, is eligible for promotion beyond the Third Grade if not trained in a recognised Training College, unless under exceptional circumstances and by special order of the Commissioners.

(m.) Teachers in the service before the 1st April, 1900, who under the rules hitherto in force were not required to be trained as a condition of promotion to First Class, continue to enjoy a similar privilege with regard to graduation, but must qualify for promotion in other respects in accordance with the foregoing conditions.

Rule 197. The promotions of Teachers date from the 1st April of the calendar year in which granted, but no such promotions are warranted unless the average attendance for the calendar year in which granted, or for the calendar year immediately preceding is sufficient. If this condition as to average attendance is not satisfied the promotion must be deferred until the 1st January of the calendar year in which the average is sufficient.

Subject to the foregoing you are at liberty to recommend deserving Teachers in your Circuit whose efficiency judged by the work done in their schools, by the general condition of the schools and out-offices as regards sanitary and hygienic arrangements, by the cleanliness and brightness of the school-rooms, by their own neatness and that of the pupils, by the general discipline, &c., maintained during the past period of three years, would seem to warrant their promotion from a lower to a higher Grade. Your recommendations, however, should be governed by the following special regulations:—

A Teacher in the III. Grade shall not be promoted to the II. Grade unless the last three annual reports made upon his school by the Inspectors are marked at least "Good."

A Teacher in II. Grade shall not be promoted to I<sup>st</sup> Grade unless at least two of the last three annual reports on his school be marked "Excellent" or "Very Good."

\* N.B.—The cases of Teachers (Principals) who could receive only a partial increment of salary from 1/4/08 (by which, however, the salaries were brought up to the maximum of their present Grades) will be dealt with separately.

For promotion to I<sup>st</sup> Grade three successive annual reports marked "Excellent" or "Very Good" will be necessary.

Teachers who have incurred any serious censure during the three preceding years are ineligible for promotion.

Before deciding on your recommendations you will call together your colleagues in the Circuit and consult with them on the subject, and you will be most careful that the nature of your conference and of your recommendations is kept strictly confidential.

It is important that this duty should be discharged by you with as little delay as possible. If you require any information available in this Office, or should it be necessary to pay a special visit to any school in connection with this matter, notification should be sent to us within a reasonable time.

In addition to the ordinary claims for promotion that may arise under the rules, the Commissioners are prepared to consider special cases of Teachers of exceptional ability and success in their schools—particularly in large and important schools where Assistant are employed; and, accordingly, they now authorise each Senior Inspector to submit for the consideration of the Board, in a separate report, the names of any such Teacher in the Circuit that could be recommended for special and exceptional advancement.

We are, Sir,

Your obedient servants,

P. E. LEWIS,

W. J. DUNNAN,

Secretaries.

To .....

Senior Inspector, National Schools.

When the lists were returned with the Inspector's recommendations, the Office Staff entered in the appropriate columns of each list the character of the reports on each school for the past three years. Upwards of 3,000 reports were thus carefully examined, and all doubtful and exceptional cases were scrutinised by the Financial Assistant Secretary and Mr. Strong, Senior Inspector, who is at present assisting in this Department.

The following is a summary of the recommendations made and action taken on the 23 Circuit Lists just now completed.

It should be stated that in every case where a teacher has been promoted he will have a full increment of salary earned in his former grade added to his former actual salary on 31/3/1905. These additions to teachers' incomes will amount in the aggregate to an annual increase of £4,000.

The number of cases considered, the number of teachers promoted, and the number not yet decided upon, are set forth in the following table:—

|  |         |
|--|---------|
| Number of cases considered,              | — 3,005 |
| Number of Teachers promoted, —           | 482     |
| Number of cases rejected (or postponed), | — 3,006 |
| Number of cases not yet decided.         | 18      |
|  | — 3,024 |

### SUMMARY OF PROMOTIONS.

|  |          |
|--|----------|
| From III. Grade to II. Grade, Men                            |          |
| 296 Women 108,   | 572      |
| From II. Grade to I <sup>st</sup> Grade, Men, 96;            |          |
| Women 81,  | 67       |
| From I <sup>st</sup> Grade to I <sup>st</sup> Grade, Men 27; |          |
| Women 16,  | 43       |
| Total Promotions   | 482      |
| Increased charge per annum due to these Promotions,          | — £4,000 |

It is proposed, with the sanction of the Board, to notify the decisions taken on these Promotion Sheets to Managers after the completion of the current salary payments, and to pay off all arrears accrued since 1st April, 1906, with the next issue of salaries.

Assuming for the moment that the Board will approve of the recommendations on the sheets as they stand, the number of teachers in the different grades would now appear to be as follows:—

| Grade      | Men   | Women | Total  |
|------------|-------|-------|--------|
| P. .. ..   | 358   | 207   | 465    |
| P. .. ..   | 453   | 360   | 723    |
| II. .. ..  | 1,181 | 952   | 2,133  |
| III. .. .. | 2,486 | 3,721 | 6,207  |
|            | 4,948 | 5,230 | 10,178 |

On comparing the numbers in this Table with those set forth in the Table at page 17, it will be seen that the latter would admit of additional promotions to the following extent:—

166 (48 men and 68 women) to I.A. Grade;  
177 (77 men and 100 women) to I.P. Grade; and  
2,167 (1,119 men and 1,048 women) to II. Grade.

The numbers in III. Grade would then stand at 5,600, the original estimated number for that grade.

Before concluding this report upon the award of increments, &c., to teachers, there remain the following questions to which I would invite attention now, so that the Commissioners may give their ruling for the future guidance of the Office, and for the satisfaction of teachers who at the present triennial revision of their work and position have failed to obtain an increment of salary or promotion in grade.

The original idea on which the scheme of grading and increments was based was, I believe, that each revision of incomes and status should take place only every third year, and that if a teacher then failed to obtain promotion or an increment of salary he should have to await the result of the next revision three years later.

On this occasion, and up to the present date (8th January, 1904), 40 per cent. of the teachers have obtained increments and nearly 500 have secured promotion. These can, of course, afford to wait and wait three years for another increase; but until the numbers in the upper grades are complete and the computed full grant of triennial increments has been reached, it would not be in conformity with the general intention of the Commissioners to deprive teachers who have now failed of the opportunity of bettering their financial condition for three years to come. In the case of new teachers who have joined the service since April, 1900, it has already been decided that they can obtain increments of salary from the 1st April of the year following the completion of three years' good service, and therefore there must be an annual revision as regards the cases of these new teachers. But as to teachers who were in the service prior to 1st April, 1900, who failed to gain an increment or promotion, a ruling is required.

It is suggested that those who failed to gain increments, who got "Good" reports in two consecutive years of the preceding triennial period, but who did not obtain a "Good" report in the last year, should be eligible for an increment in 1904, or as soon as they succeed in gaining three years' "Good" reports. And, similarly, for the present, as regards promotions, if a teacher failed to obtain the three "Good," "Very good," or "Excellent" reports required from a teacher in his grade, he should next year, or as soon as he obtains the three qualifying reports necessary, be eligible for promotion.

This would, I think, be a financially safe concession for the next two years, and it would obviate many difficulties in dealing with existing teachers.

P. YORRO,  
Financial Assistant Secretary.

Education Office,

8th January, 1904.

# ADDENDUM

## TO MEMORANDUM PREPARED FOR UNDER SECRETARY ON THE 30th JANUARY, 1904.

After the completion of the revision of the Circuit Lists relating to the promotions of Teachers directed by Board's Order of 10th January, 1904, it became necessary to re-investigate the claims of many Teachers whose services and schools seemed to warrant this extra revision. A further examination was accordingly undertaken by the Department into the cases of more than 350 Teachers not as yet recommended by the Inspectors for advancement. The final result of the promotions of Teachers to higher grades this year is shown in the following Table, which embodies all orders of the Board up to date:—

Principal Teachers in the service on this date are graded as under:—

| Grade      | Males | Females |
|------------|-------|---------|
| P. .. ..   | 379   | 321     |
| P. .. ..   | 437   | 296     |
| II. .. ..  | 1,443 | 1,914   |
| III. .. .. | 2,445 | 2,117   |
| Totals ..  | 4,604 | 3,648   |

Assistant Teachers in the service on this date are in receipt of Grade Salaries as under:—

| Grade      | Males | Females |
|------------|-------|---------|
| P. .. ..   | 17    | 10      |
| P. .. ..   | 14    | 18      |
| II. .. ..  | 14    | 26      |
| III. .. .. | 1,043 | 2,026   |
| Totals ..  | 1,088 | 2,080   |

# SUMMARY.

| Grade      | Males | Females | Total  |
|------------|-------|---------|--------|
| P. .. ..   | 396   | 331     | 527    |
| P. .. ..   | 451   | 308     | 759    |
| II. .. ..  | 1,457 | 1,942   | 3,409  |
| III. .. .. | 2,488 | 2,722   | 5,210  |
| Totals ..  | 5,402 | 5,303   | 10,705 |

Education Office,

Dublin, 29th March, 1904.

## APPENDIX XLIV.

(Forwarded by the Board of National Education in Ireland.)

## I.

AVERAGE INCOMES FROM STATE SOURCES OF TEACHERS OF NATIONAL SCHOOLS FOR THE UNDER-SPECIFIED YEARS.

| Year. | Principals. |         | Assistants. |         |
|-------|-------------|---------|-------------|---------|
|       | Men.        | Women.  | Men.        | Women.  |
|       | £ s. d.     | £ s. d. | £ s. d.     | £ s. d. |
| 1896* | 83 17 10    | 79 10 5 | 60 19 0     | 49 0 2  |
| 1904  | 102 19 6    | 82 11 9 | 73 2 4      | 56 1 1  |
| 1910† | 112 2 9     | 90 1 10 | 81 0 4      | 66 7 4  |
| 1912† | 113 4 4     | 91 6 5  | 81 10 4     | 66 14 0 |

\* Exclusive of teachers of Model Schools, teachers who changed their schools in the year, those who did not give service during the entire year, or were promoted within the year.  
 † Exclusive of fees for extra subjects.

## 2.

## NATIONAL EDUCATION, IRELAND.

RETURN OF PAYMENTS TO THE TEACHING STAFF FOR THE UNDER-MENTIONED YEARS.

| Year. | From State Grants.       |                           |                            |           | From Local Sources.          |                            |         | Total for Year. |
|-------|--------------------------|---------------------------|----------------------------|-----------|------------------------------|----------------------------|---------|-----------------|
|       | National Education Vote. | Customs and Excise Grant. | Ireland Development Grant. | Total.    | Rates—(Contributory Unions). | School Fees and Local Aid. | Total.  |                 |
|       | £                        | £                         | £                          | £         | £                            | £                          | £       | £               |
| 1896  | 730,576                  | 74,073                    | —                          | 804,651   | 6,182                        | 144,272                    | 152,454 | 957,115         |
| 1898  | 1,015,343                | 75,563                    | —                          | 1,090,906 | 7,289                        | 40,377                     | 47,666  | 1,138,572       |
| 1900  | 1,130,599                | 5,666                     | —                          | 1,136,264 | 1,309                        | 37,697                     | 38,426  | 1,174,690       |
| 1902  | 1,225,006                | —                         | 26,524                     | 1,251,530 | —                            | 22,036                     | 22,036  | 1,273,566       |
| 1910  | 1,456,435                | —                         | —                          | 1,456,435 | —                            | 16,945                     | 16,945  | 1,473,380       |
| 1911  | 1,468,636                | —                         | —                          | 1,468,636 | —                            | 17,652                     | 17,652  | 1,486,288       |
| 1912  | 1,490,940                | —                         | —                          | 1,490,940 | —                            | 18,202                     | 18,202  | 1,509,142       |





## INDEX.

## A.

## Agricultural and Technical Instruction Department.

- Agricultural branch, types of colleges and schools under, *Gill*, . . . . . 7940  
 Capitalisation grant assessed on work done and explanation, *Gill*, . . 7931-00, 7905-8004, 8014-29  
 Comparison of system with that of National Board difficult, *Gill*, . . . . . 7939, 7947

## INSPECTORS:

- Complaints against, method of dealing with, *Gill*, . . . . . 8006-10  
 Conferences, *Gill*, . . . . . 7932-5  
 Interchange of districts, . . *Gill*, . . . . . 7958-63  
 Number and powers, *Gill*, . . . . . 7941-6  
 Question whether official visits would override verdict of, *Gill*, . . . . . 8005-6  
 Recommendations not invariably carried out, *Gill*, . . . . . 8010-11  
 Reports: . . . . .  
   Classification of schools in, *Gill*, . . . . . 7966-3  
   Unsatisfactory, procedure, *Gill*, . . . . . 7968-75  
   System commended, *Ford*, . . . . . 10063, 10089-71, 10090  
   Trouble taken to keep, up to developments which may arise, *Gill*, . . . . . 8000  
 Secretary, see *Gill*, T. P., . . . . . 7939-8030  
 Series of inspections throughout year and final inspection before grants are assessed, *Gill*, . . . . . 7984, 7991-94  
 System, and steps taken to secure tolerably uniform judgment of schools, *Gill*, . . . . . 7945-8030  
 Teachers, trouble taken to keep, up to developments which may arise, *Gill*, . . . . . 8006  
 Technical Instruction branch, types of schools under, *Gill*, . . . . . 7939-40  
 Week classified in two main divisions, *Gill*, . . . . . 7930

Agriculture, see under School Programme.

Ancient Order of Hibernians, Rules for guidance of teachers intended to preclude membership of, *Starkie*, . . . . . 11783-5, 12114-15

## Appeals:

Average number, question, *Dillworth*, 894, 1021; *McNeill*, 1855-8; *Parrell*, 3578-88; *Parver*, . . . . . 3849-51

## Belfast case,

*Dillworth*, 90-2, 759-68, 989-95, p. 187-200, I.; *Hynes*, 6843-4, 6779-84, 6961-70, 7144-50, 7031-62, 7182-3, 7068-72, 7195-9; *Bingham*, 7240, 7328-34; *Clerke*, 6724-32, 6847-53, 6976-7, 6734-43, 6982-94, 9632-4, 9642-3; *Ward*, 9303-13, 9408-34, 9494-993, 9518-30, 9557-63, 9729-31, 9765-92; *Starkie*, 11530-2, 11708-24, 12784-5, 12824-41, 13329-52, 13360-74, 13442-53.

## Clonmel case.

*Dillworth*, 943-71, 1002-8, p. 200-18, I.; *McNeill*, 1628-54, 1666-10; *Wynn*, 2267-37, 302-37, 2578-89; *Parrell*, 3560-15; *Parver*, 3997-4097; *Hynes*, 6713-52, 6817-29, 6966-48, 6970, 7008-30, 7056, 7063-7, 7073-83, 7123-55, 7161-87, 7191-4; *Clerke*, 6967-81, 6995-9031, 9175-6; *Ward*, 9303-18, 9565-8, 9717-28, 9729-30, 9774-85, 9787-92; *Starkie*, 11480, 11485-97, 11509-30, 11532-45, 11707, 11731-4, 12096-104, 12281-328, 13136-50, 13479-512, 13531-90, 13600-61, 13809-15, 13838, 13889-90, 13458-78, 13522-30; *Lemass*, 14396, 14406-8, 14463-63, 14567-85.

## Clondraff case.

*Dillworth*, 1151-6; *Parver*, 4576-722, p. 485-9, II.; *Ward*, 9446-52, 9793-908; *Starkie*, 11890-32, 11862-52, 12632-120, 11682-4, 12043-51.

## Appeals—continued.

have to be Countersigned by Resident Commissioner before being sent to Chief Inspector, *Starkie*, 12461.

Delay through delay in getting minute, *Starkie*, 13352

Delay not due to examiners, *Parrell*, 3446-6

Difficulty of suggesting alternative procedure, *Dale*, 10513-7, 10627-8, 10652-7, 10735-46.

Facilities for, and means of access to Board, *Dillworth*, 237-45, 894, p. 133-4, I.; *Clerke*, 3735-68, 3872-7; *Starkie*, 11810-2, 12364-99, 12412-22, 12454-60.

Fines and dismissals came before full Board, *Dillworth*, 530-7, 998-7; *Ward*, 9327-8; *Parrell*, 3397-8, 3421-5, 3678-9; *Lemass*, 14367-8.

should be heard before three Commissioners, *Commission*, . . . . . 7596-7

Investigation by Chief Inspector on, *Hynes*, 6735-69, 7054-61

Letters from managers enclosing notices of examiners, *Parrell*, . . . . . 3406-1, 3537-44

Nothing to prevent, *O'Connor*, . . . . . 3627-9

Number of cases obtaining redress, question, *Dillworth*, . . . . . 1019-13

Powers of Board vested in Resident Commissioner, *Ward*, 9326-4, 9337-8, 9381-7, 9378-82; 9322-63, 9668-78, 9882-9.

Number, *Starkie*, 1906-1912, 12481.

Procedure, *Dillworth*, 245, 254-6, 434-6, 550-7, 728-32, 996-7, 972-80, 1075-1132; *McNeill*, 1858-1907, 1987-95; *Wynn*, 2193-242, 2340-9, 2530-48; *Hynes*, 6965-90, 7092-6; *Clerke*, 6875-931, 8029-38; *Starkie*, 11585-669, 13438-47, 12636-42; *Hobson*, 14186-93, 14248-62;

Procedure under Results system, and comparison with present, *Dunning*, 4858-13; *Lemass*, 16942-6, 14346-62; *Starkie*, 11828-37.

Resolution of Board diverting themselves of authority, question, *Clerke*, 6774-845, 8939-55, 9089-125, 9116-8, 9177-88, 9206-7, 9243-50.

Right of Resident Commissioner to refuse to bring before Board, question, *Clerke*, . . . . . 8944-50

Rule taking away certain rights, question, *Parver*, . . . . . 4552-8

Security should be taken that Board is informed of all cases, *Bingham*, . . . . . 7417-8, 7459-9, 7480-8

Senior or chief inspector should inform teacher of object of visit of check inspection, *Ward*, . . . . . 9361-2

Standing committee for dealing with, desirable, *Parver*, 3836-41, 4046-57, 4230-40; *Ward*, 9329-36.

Teachers have not right to, in fullest sense of the word, *Twistram*, . . . . . 10308-21, 10362-4

Teachers should have right to re-inspection on, and divisional inspectors proposed, *Ward*, . . . . . 9694-701, 9742-3

Arithmetic, see under School Programme.

Association of Church of Ireland School Masters, resolutions read, *McHaffy*, . . . . . 8542-4

## B.

## Belfast case.

*Dillworth*, 90-2, 759-68, 989-95, p. 187-200, I.; *Hynes*, 6843-4, 6779-84, 6961-70, 7144-50, 7031-62, 7182-3, 7068-72, 7195-9; *Bingham*, 7240, 7328-34; *Clerke*, 6724-32, 6847-53, 6976-7, 6734-46, 6982-94, 9032-4, 9042-3, 9072-3, 9175; *Ward*, 9303-18, 9408-34, 9494-993, 9518-30, 9557-65, 9729-31, 9796-92; *Starkie*, 11530-2, 11708-24, 12784-5, 12824-41, 13329-52, 13360-74, 13642-53.

Belfast Employers' Association for Engineers, reply to Juvenile Advisory Committee quoted, *Ford*, 10010.

Belfast Teachers' Association, Deputation received by Resident Commissioner, February 6, 1911, and subsequent correspondence, p. 187-200, I.

**Belfast Municipal Technical Institute :**

|  |         |
|--|---------|
| Agas, diagrams, <i>Forth</i> , p. 481, II.   |         |
| Day Apprentice classes, apprentices product of National School, and standard of education law, <i>Forth</i> , .. | 9934-16 |
| Day division, grades and classes included in, <i>Forth</i> , ..  | 9847    |

**DAY TRADE PREPARATORY SCHOOL :**

|   |                     |
|---|---------------------|
| Best work Corporation of Belfast is doing, <i>Forth</i> , ..                  | 9869, 9871          |
| Entrance examination :  |                     |
| Candidates sometimes have not passed through 8th standard, <i>Forth</i> , ..  | 9867-9              |
| Failures, proportion and cause, <i>Forth</i> , ..                             | 9837, 9839-54, 9865 |
| Great bulk of applicants from national schools, <i>Forth</i> , ..             | 9837-8              |
| Number presenting themselves annually, <i>Forth</i> , ..                      | 9857, 9861, 9859-79 |
| Percentage of marks required to pass, <i>Forth</i> , ..                       | 9862                |
| Scope, <i>Forth</i> , ..  | 9849-50, 9865       |
| Great demand for boys, <i>Forth</i> , ..                                      | 9871-4              |
| Interval between boys leaving national schools and joining, <i>Forth</i> , .. | 10005-101           |
| Length of course, <i>Forth</i> , ..   | 9863                |
| Programme, <i>Forth</i> , ..  | 9853-6              |
| Regulations for admission, <i>Forth</i> , 9847-9, 9861-2                      |                     |
| Scholarships offered by Corporation, <i>Forth</i> , ..                        | 9870-1              |

**EVENING CLASSES :**

|   |                |
|---|----------------|
| Children enrolled in national schools discouraged from attending, <i>Forth</i> , .. | 9839-44        |
| Preparatory section :   |                |
| Entrance examination scope, and purpose, <i>Forth</i> , ..                          | 9814-50        |
| Ex-national school pupils, low standard of education, <i>Forth</i> , ..             | 9859, 9864-89  |
| Inspection, <i>Forth</i> , ..   | 9863-9         |
| Under National Board, and difficulty of working scheme, <i>Forth</i> , ..           | 9929-3, 9951-5 |
| Scope, <i>Forth</i> , ..  | 9914-26        |
| Started in 1902, <i>Forth</i> , ..  | 9922, 9963     |
| Number of students enrolled, and ages, <i>Forth</i> , ..                            | 9837-9         |
| Principal, see <i>Forth</i> , Francis, C., ..                                       | 9823-10104     |
| Time table of classes handed in, <i>Forth</i> , ..                                  | 9990           |

**BENSON, Rev. S. M., M.A., Chancellor of Connor :**

|   |                            |
|---|----------------------------|
| Increment, should be automatic unless some grave reason against, and power should not be left in hands of inspector to prevent teacher from getting, .. | 6064-70, 6093-100, 6118-28 |
|---|----------------------------|

**INSPECTORS :**

|  |                 |
|--|-----------------|
| Class of men inferior to that under old system, .. | 6021-31, 6183   |
| Examination by, advocated, ..                      | 6155-9          |
| Frequent changes and disadvantage, ..              | 6060-4          |
| Tone and manner towards teachers, ..               | 6014-13, 6160-7 |

**MANAGERS :**

|  |                             |
|--|-----------------------------|
| Extracts only from report sent to, and full report desired, ..     | 6129-34                     |
| Only receive notice of inspection on morning and inconvenience, .. | 6010-13, 6178-82            |
| Responsibility for school building, etc., question, ..             | 6095-6006, 6076-90, 6139-43 |

**MERIT MARK :**

|   |                 |
|---|-----------------|
| Due allowance for adverse circumstances not made on all occasions, .. | 6051-3, 6168-75 |
| Impressionist and tone examination, ..                                | 6043-56, 6071-5 |

|   |                         |
|---|-------------------------|
| Variation in standard, question, ..   | 6055, 6069              |
| Observation Book, question as to whether defects only are put in, ..  | 6183-8                  |
| Primary education, degeneration into denominational system, ..  | 6046, 6134-5            |
| School Premises, cleaning, responsibility of teacher question, and of possibility of children being employed on, as domestic economy training, .. | 6097-9, 6180-7, 6101-16 |

|  |                  |
|--|------------------|
| School programme, overloaded and question as to desirability of making certain subjects compulsory and leaving others to discretion of managers and teachers, .. | 6034-42, 6144-64 |
|--|------------------|

**BINGHAM, Reverend J., M.A., D.D., Minister of Dundonald, and Convener of the Committee on Elementary Education of the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church :** 7294-7478  
 Appeals, security should be taken that the Board is informed of all cases, 7417-8, 7438-9, 7460-8

**Belfast Class, .. .. .** 7240, 7338-34

**BOARD OF NATIONAL EDUCATION :**

|  |                                       |
|--|---------------------------------------|
| Authorised report of matters of public importance dealt with by, should be communicated regularly to press, ..                 | 7471-4, 7323                          |
| Commissioners, attendances of, each for year, should be recorded in annual report, ..  | 7323                                  |
| Conferences of managers and teachers with committees of, should be held, ..  | 7323                                  |
| Fundamental rules, question, ..  | 7477-8                                |
| Important changes in rules and regulations should be made known to public for reasonable time before coming into operation, .. | 7323, 7324-6, 7419-21, 7433           |
| Issue of rules retrospective in action not a fair thing, ..  | 7434-42, 7475-6                       |
| Resident Commissioner, too much power put into hands of, ..  | 7327, 7350-6, 7390-3, 7417-8, 7469-74 |
| Deputations, should be received by Board or by Committee of Board, and question of admission of press, ..                      | 7327, 7390-6, 7469-74, 7350-6         |

**INCREMENTS :**

|  |              |
|--|--------------|
| Slow rate a serious discouragement, and suggested remedy, .. | 7393, 7450-7 |
| Undergraded teachers, plea for, ..                           | 7308         |

**INSPECTORS :**

|  |                                    |
|--|------------------------------------|
| Appointments and mode suggested, ..  | 7275-84, 7305-19, 7367             |
| Conferences, general, of all circuits suggested as remedy to want of uniformity, ..  | 7254-61                            |
| Frequent changes and effect, ..  | 7246-4                             |
| Impressionist system objected to, and more detailed examination desirable, ..  | 7285-99, 7335-49, 7364-77, 7425-32 |
| Initial salaries should be raised in order to secure better qualified candidates, ..   | 7288-4                             |
| Practical experience in teaching, should be required, but not necessary that every post should be filled from ranks of National teachers, .. | 7267-74, 7425-4                    |
| Routine work heavy, ..   | 7287-9                             |
| Secret and arbitrary instructions from Board should be avoided, ..   | 7328-34, 7346                      |
| Surprise visits, and question as to fairness, ..   | 7398-404, 7415                     |
| Task set, one of great difficulty, ..  | 7213-5                             |
| Tone adopted, faultfinding, ..   | 7236-9, 7246-6                     |

**MANAGERS :**

|  |                         |
|--|-------------------------|
| Holding of periodical examinations by, question, ..  | 7378-82                 |
| Notice of Inspectors' visits, shortness objected to, ..  | 7229-30, 7397-8, 7415   |
| Retrospective rule re condition of school buildings, question re, but no personal experience, .. | 7475-6                  |
| <b>MERIT MARKS :</b>   |                         |
| Personal mark of teacher should not be kept secret, ..   | 7254-5                  |
| Want of uniformity, ..   | 7240-4, 7250-4, 7408-14 |

**PROMOTIONS :**

|  |                   |
|--|-------------------|
| Slow rate a serious discouragement, and suggested remedy, ..   | 7393, 7450-7      |
| Undergraded teachers, plea for, ..   | 7308              |
| Salaries, greater initial advocated, ..  | 7305, 7454        |
| School programme, result of enlargement depriving teaching of concentration on more essential subjects, question, .. | 7291-302, 7353-63 |

**TEACHERS :**

|   |                        |
|---|------------------------|
| Civil rights, restrictions on, and abolition recommended, ..        | 7320-2, 7383-9, 7413-9 |
| Maternity rule, question as to fairness of retrospective action, .. | 7247-40                |

## Board of National Education:

- ACCOUNTANTS:  
 Duties, *Fraser*, .. 13924-32, p. 517, II.  
 see also *Fraser*, David, 13916-14131  
 Action taken by, question as to what is to be  
 understood by "Board," *Starke*, 11498-508  
 Administration product of long growth, and it is  
 owing to method of construction that it is able  
 to exist in country, *Lemass*, 14141, 14398-807  
 Administration, system of, *Starke*,  
 11555-609, 11627-31  
 Annual reports, Government refuse to publish,  
*Starke*, .. 12581  
 Always assembled from time of foundation in 1831,  
 and resolution passed in 1845 that they would not  
 correspond with certain people in the country,  
*Lemass*, .. 10907-9  
 Appeals to, see that title.  
 Appendices supplied by, p. 134-150, I., p. 167-222,  
 I., p. 489-511, p. 516, p. 517-26, II.  
 Authorized report of matters of public importance  
 dealt with by, should be communicated regularly  
 to press, *Diaghov*, .. 7323, 7471-4  
 Candidates for Junior Inspectorate introduced  
 before, resulting in final selection, *McNeill*,  
 1254-69  
 Changes should not be made in code without longer  
 and more careful consideration, *Furner*, p. 464, II.  
 CHIEFS OF INSPECTION:  
 Action taken in case of falsification of accounts  
 and inefficiency, indefensibly lax, *Starke*,  
 11735  
 Alteration in duties, statement, *Furner*, p. 471, II.  
 Appeal against and change of name and consequent  
 suspension of Messrs. Downing and  
*Furner*, particulars re, and re previous record  
*Starke*, 11266-90  
 Appointed Chief Inspectors, and no degradation  
 intended by change of name, *Lemass*,  
 11667-64, 11683-127  
 Change in duties, *Starke*, .. 11260-1  
 Comparison of system of reports being examined  
 by, or by examiners, and question, *Ward*,  
 9732-9  
 Complaints of inspectors of severity of orders,  
*Lemass*, .. 10907, 14414  
 Consulted as to estimates, *Downing*, .. 4773  
 Consulted on one point only in new programme,  
*Furner*, .. 4295-6  
 not Consulted on new scheme and programme  
 in 1910, *Furner*, 3791-2, 4286-95, p. 493, II.;  
*Downing*, 4787-8  
 Examination of reports by, considered waste of  
 power and expensiveness, *Dale*, .. 10457-65  
 History of appointment, *Lemass*, 10911-13, 11127  
 no immediate supervision exercised over inspec-  
 tors, *Starke*, .. 11233  
 not informed of proposed changes because of  
 need for absolute secrecy, *Lemass*,  
 11065, 14337-45  
 Initiation for change came from Commissioners  
 themselves, *Lemass*, .. 14537-43  
 Kind of reports noted by, for consideration of  
 Board, *Downing*, .. 4776-82  
 Little or no assistance given to new scheme,  
*Lemass*, .. 10993-6, 13543-5  
 Matters referred for advice of, by examiners,  
 question, *Furner*, .. 4550-1  
 Merely attached initials to reports in perfunctory  
 manner, and admonition of, *Lemass*, 10623-5  
 Order given that one should be present at each  
 meeting of Board, *Downing*, 4793-7, p. 475, II.  
 Powers at present performed by whole Board,  
*Starke*, .. 12425-5  
 Responsibility over notings on reports limited,  
*Lemass*, .. 14332-6  
 Restoration of office suggested as only way to  
 remedy present evil, *Downing*,  
 4744-51, p. 475, II.  
 Routine work done by clerks and no visits paid  
 to schools, *Starke*, 11215, 11224-33  
 Salaries included in estimates for office, and  
 not with outdoor inspectional staff, *Downing*,  
 4745  
 no Scrutiny of reports by, and question, *Lemass*,  
 14483-93  
 Statement that examiners were in position of,  
 incorrect, *Lemass* .. 11192-4

## Board of National Education—continued.

- CURSES OF INSTRUCTION—continued.  
 Statement that they used to be in attendance at  
 Board meetings incorrect, *Lemass*, 11193  
 Work done by clerks under, now done by exami-  
 ners, *Lemass*, .. 14614-9  
 Chronology, .. p. 134-50, I.; p. 516, II.  
 CIRCULARS:  
 Chief idea of method of inspection developed in,  
 and passages quoted, *Starke*,  
 11643-9, 11633-8  
 Collection in book form, *Diaghov*, 215-18;  
*Starke*, .. 12739-44  
 Directions not always carried out, *Starke*,  
 11639-41  
 Effectiveness of government by, question, *Dale*,  
 10993-5  
 Leaving impression on inspectors' minds that  
 bribes were taken by managers for appoint-  
 ments to schools, *Starke*, 13252-3, 13512-21  
 no Objection to communication to teachers,  
*Starke*, .. 12739-44  
 Question as to teachers seeing, *Diaghov*,  
 212-15, 1210-2  
 Submission to Commissioners, question re, *Clarke*,  
 3688-97, 3806-72; *Ward*, 3604-8; *Starke*,  
 12772-3.  
 Tone, *Diaghov*, 39-42, 319-47, 459-68, 769-809;  
*McNeill*, 1353-5, 1375-82, 1406-13, 1491-  
 770, 1730-9, 1742-0, 1925-41, 2000-19,  
 2045; *Wyer*, 2160, 2169-76, 2207-13;  
*O'Connor*, 2565-79, 3210-17, 3293-322;  
*Furner*, 4246-56; *Downing*, 4845-6, 5488-91,  
*Peeler*, 5589-95, 5656-41; *Greenwood*, 5914-0,  
 5950; *Beeson*, 6043-59, 5071-5; *Collis*,  
 6340-3; *Woodward*, 6483-9; *Hayes*, 6602-4;  
*Diaghov*, 7285-90, 7335-49, 7364-77, 7425-  
 32; *Guinness*, 7497-613, 7578-9, 7595-602,  
 7626-35; *Mahaffy*, 8407-14, 8530; *Clarke*,  
 9231-6; *Ward*, 9303-18; *Tristram*, 10346,  
 10335-8; *Starke*, 11325-69, 11973-9, 13816-  
 20, 13842-58, 12977-95.  
 COMMISSIONERS:  
 Accessibility by public generally, *Diaghov*, 245  
 Appeals should be heard before three, *Guinness*,  
 7396-7  
 Attendances for each, for year, should be re-  
 corded in annual reports, *Beeson*, .. 7323  
 Attitude with regard to Belfast and Channel  
 cases, *Clarke*, .. 3967-9043, 9072-3  
 Charge of knowing nothing or next to nothing  
 of what is going on in office, *Starke*, 13262-81  
 Check inspections cannot be held except by  
 order of, *Starke*, .. 12637-41  
 Circulars issued without reference to, *Starke*,  
 12772-3  
 no Definite rules as to practice of office laid be-  
 fore, *Ward*, .. 9369-72  
 Duties and responsibilities, and question, *Clarke*,  
 8774-846, 9329-55, 9358-5; 9089-101, 9114-6  
 9177-88; *Starke*, 12912-18;  
 Exceptions to rule under which correspondence  
 is not carried on with teachers,  
*Diaghov*, p. 133, I.  
 Imbued with one idea and actuated by one  
 motive, of administration in most effectual  
 manner system of primary education, *Ward*,  
 9285  
 Initiative for change in Chiefs of Inspection came  
 from, *Lemass*, .. 14537-43  
 Intercourse with members of staff, question,  
*Clarke*, .. 8939-43  
 Number of letters received from teachers, *Ward*,  
 9693-4, 9293-6, 9703-5, 9815-8, 9849-54.  
 Official communication regarding discontent and  
 dissatisfaction, question, re, *Clarke*, 8847-69  
 Open to, to bring any question connected with  
 administration specially before Board, *Di-*  
*aghov*, .. 245  
 Powers and duties, but in practice power largely  
 directed, and passed on to Resident Com-  
 missioner, *Ward*, 9325-6, 9337-8, 9361-7,  
 9373-82, 9622-53, 9669-78, 9682-8.  
 Qualifications, question of, *Hobson*, .. 14219  
 Relations with Teachers, *Diaghov*, p. 132-3, I.  
 Resident, see that title below.  
 Resignation and question, *Starke*,  
 11262, 11298-6, 12332-41

## Board of National Education—continued.

## COMMISSIONERS—continued.

Right to discuss matters with officials question, *Journing*, 8513-21; *Starkie*, 12996-89, 12992-13093, 13016-224, 13688-92.  
 Sending of appeals to individual, question, *Starkie*, 12774-83.  
 Surprises expressed by, at relations of Belfast teachers with inspectors and question, *Dalworth*, 759-68, 839-95.  
*see also* Clarke, Rev. J. C., D.D., 8670-9292, and Ward, Philip, 12663-822.

## COMMITTEES:

Conference of managers and teachers with, should be held, *Bingham*, 7323.  
 to deal with appeals suggested, *Purser*, 3936-41, 4446-57, 4234-6; *Ward*, 9329-30.  
 Number, and subjects, *Clarke*, 9143-8, 9240-2.  
 Small permanent desirable, *Purser*, 4568, p. 464, II., *Clarke*, 8927-8.  
 Comparison of system of Department of Agriculture and Technical Instruction with, difficult, *Gill*, 7939, 7947.  
 Conference with teachers on important questions, *Dilworth*, 246.  
 Conferences held with teachers on proposed modifications on system of education, *Starkie*, 11610.  
 Correspondence carried on with managers and not with teachers, *Dalworth*, 205.  
 Cost of administration *Prinzel*, 14076-8.  
 Criticism of policy by inspectors not allowed in Blue Book presented to Parliament, but at liberty to approach Board with any suggestions *McNeill*, 1673-84, 1356-86; *Ward*, 3179-86; *Hynes*, 6801-2; *Starkie*, 12843-62.  
 Debates on whole question of present system of awarding grants, question, *Clarke*, 9160-4.

## DEPUTATIONS:

Belfast Teachers' Association, and subsequent correspondence, p. 167-206, I.  
 One of facilities for approaching Board, *Dilworth*, 245-51, p. 134; *Starkie*, 11610.  
 should be received by Board or by Committee of Board and question of admission of press, *Bingham* 7327, 7350-6, 7350-6, 7469-74.  
 Desirable that important circulars, letters of instruction or anything issued during year should be inserted in appendix to Report, *Clarke*, 8902-21; *Ward*, 9460-2.  
 should be made directly responsible to Parliament, *MacLaughlin*, 7347-8.  
 Document dealing with re-organisation scheme, authorship question, *Lemass*, 14443-54; *Starkie*, 12877-95, 13745.  
 Estimate of amount of Parliamentary vote, manner of preparation, and circumstances in which it becomes necessary to surrender balances to Treasury, *Dalworth*, 178-90, 296-74; *Cumerton*, 7536-54, 7642-9, *Clarke*, 3770-3, 8958; *Starkie*, 11858-81; *Prinzel*, 13913-37, 14642-64, 14670-8, 14126-8; *Hebron*, 14268-73.

## EXAMINERS OF REPORTS:

Accept inspectors' statement as to merit mark, except when marked discrepancy seen between proficiency table and, *Powell*, 3480-9.  
 Arrangement to call attention of higher authorities to any great variation in standard suggested, *Starkie*, 11486-8.  
 Average number of reports dealt with daily, and percentage of adverse reports, *Powell*, 3683-5, 3704.  
 not bound to bring papers for consultation with Inspector, *Hynes*, 6663, 6676-8.  
 Comparison of system of reports being examined by, or by chief inspectors, and question, *Ward*, 9732-9; *Starkie*, 13873-7.  
 Complaint as to no practical knowledge of school matters on part of, *Purser*, 4241-5.  
 Complaints against managers come before, *Powell*, 3428-30.  
 Date of appointment, *Powell*, 3372, 3614.  
 Delay in dealing with appeals due to, *Powell*, 3440-6.

## Board of National Education—continued.

## EXAMINERS OF REPORTS—continued.

*Dutton*, *Dilworth*, 110-1, 862-84, 743-52, 1622, 1675-132; *Hynes*, 2636-61, 2680; *Powell*, 3337-512, 3574-426, p. 163-6; 3447-8, 3429, 3662-73, 3686-711, *Clarke*, 9162-25, 9266-7; *Lemass*, 11128-34, 14346-62; *Starkie*, 11807, 11585.  
 Duties of chiefs of inspection divided between new chief inspectors and, *Starkie*, 11260-1.  
 no indication as to percentage of change in specific case of abrupt falling of standard of marks, *Powell*, 3600-13.  
 Matters referred to Chief Inspectors for advice, question, *Purser*, 4550-1.  
 Nature of special matters which would be submitted to Secretary, *Powell*, 3607-8.  
 Nothing does not become a reprimand until secretary who signs letters has considered it, *Lemass*, 14263-3, 14260-3.  
 Promotion and increment not dealt with at all, *Powell*, 3431-4.  
 Question as to access to Board by teachers being limited by appointment of, *Powell*, 3627-55.  
 Reprimands sent out by, without reference to any higher authority, and question, *Powell*, 3513-23; *Ward*, 9435-45, 9425, 9749-1; *Dale*, 10569-12, 10622-5, 10810-22.  
 Routine work performed in conveying, and not responsible at all, but secretaries, *Starkie*, 12440-53, 12425-30, 13869-71.  
 Routine work in office admirably carried out, *Starkie*, 11264-6.  
 Statement they were chiefs of inspection incorrect, 11192-4.  
 Training, question of, *Powell*, 3547-64, 3615-26.  
*see also* *Purcell*, *Walter J.*, 3359-3713.  
 Experts consulted on introduction of new system, but not people directly interested, *Holton*, 14238-41.  
 Feeling that system would be very largely remedied by circulars issued in June, 1911, and August, 1912, *Ward*, 9203-18.  
 Formal resolutions of Teachers' Associations printed in agenda and laid before, at regular intervals, *Starkie*, 11616.  
 Fundamental rules not to be changed without consent of Lord Lieutenant, and question, *Bingham*, 7477-8; *Starkie*, 12405-11.  
 Higher officials not consulted re changes in system until Board or prominent members were prepared to consider question formally, and instance, *Lemass*, 10926-9, 11005.  
 History of, and of committees as affecting possibility of committees in future, *Starkie*, 12323-43.  
 Improvements introduced or attempted to be introduced since 1900 summarised, *Starkie*, 11463-79.  
 Information as to striking reduction in value of merit marks, question, *Starkie*, 12472-87.  
 Inspectors, *see this title*.  
 Investigation into complaint of teachers that July examinations were too severe, and particulars, *Lemass*, 16920-41.  
 In Looking for best educational results not desire or intention of, that any injustice should be inflicted on any teacher, *Ward*, 9283.  
 Magnitude and complexity of system, *Dilworth*, 245, p. 134, I.  
 Manner in which differences in opinion, between senior and junior inspectors come before, *Dalworth*, 164-10.  
 Means of access to, *Dilworth*, 236-38, 654, p. 123-4, I.; *Clarke*, 8758-68, 8873-7; *Starkie*, 11610-2, 12412-23, 12454-60, 12594-99.  
 MEETINGS:  
 Attendance, *Starkie*, 11569-79.  
 Frequency and day of, *Dilworth*, 895-6; *Purser*, 4568; *Clarke*, 9142.  
 Often prolonged after 6 p.m. to deal with cases placed on agenda, *Starkie*, 11598, 11873-4.  
 Order given that one of chiefs of inspection should be present, *Dewdney*, 3653-4, 4793-7.  
 Statement that Chiefs of Inspection used to be in attendance at, incorrect, *Lemass*, 11195.  
 Twice fortnightly suggested, *Purser*, 4553, p. 464, II.

## Board of National Education—continued.

## MEETINGS—continued.

- Member formerly a teacher in a National school, *Dillworth*, . . . . . 251-3  
Monthly payment of salaries would involve increase in staff, *Prinzel*, . . . . . 14079-82

## OFFICE COMMITTEE:

- History and functions, *Starkie*, 11581, 11630-2  
Revival advocated, and functions, *Dewdney*, 4768-75, 4783-6, p. 476, II.  
Office organisation, decline in, under new system, *Dewdney*, . . . . . 4731-3  
Office work, question as to employment of ex-inspectors, *Ward*, . . . . . 9471-5  
Power of dismissal of teacher irrespective of manager, *Parcell*, . . . . . 3391  
Power of managers in dismissal of teachers irrespective of, *Parcell*, . . . . . 3589-90  
Powers in matters of finance, question, *Starkie*, 11853  
Preparatory section of evening division of Technical Institute, Belfast, under, and difficulty of working scheme, *Ford*, . . . . . 9920-6  
Principle of appointment of officials most undesirable, *Tristram*, . . . . . 10364-5  
Programmes and Notes to Teachers submitted to, *Clerke*, . . . . . 9149-59  
Proposal to sever connection between office and inspection staff, *Starkie*, . . . . . 12751-3, 11521-64  
Question as to abrupt raising of standard in Tipperary not being noted or checked in office, *Wyse*, . . . . . 2367-87, 2302-27  
Recommendations of Potts Commission not followed and question, re, *Clerke*, . . . . . 8932-6  
Relations with teachers, *Starkie*, . . . . . 11770-95  
Re-organisation of system in 1900, history, *Leamas*, . . . . . 10668-11019, 11066-71, 14415-23  
Report made in reference to recommendations of Commission on Manual and Practical Instruction, p. 490-5, II.  
Reports to, from inspectors, see first title.

## RESIDENT COMMISSIONER:

- Accusation of giving secret instructions to inspectors repudiated, *Starkie*, 11727, 13369-70  
Appeals brought before, *Starkie*, 12030-42, 12854-99, 12412-22, 12454-60,  
Appeals have to be controverted by, before being sent to Chief Inspector, *Starkie*, 12461  
Award of diploma, process followed, *Wyse*, 2069  
Chief inspectors subordinate to, and not to secretaries, *Starkie*, . . . . . 11261-4  
Claim that National Board service is a department of civil service and that he is chief of department, and therefore claims supreme power, question as to documentary evidence, *Dewdney*, 4919-26, 5336-54, 5404-11, 5492-597, p. 477, II.  
and *Clelland* case, *Starkie*, 11509-32, 11845-52, 11882-6, 12043-51, 12032,  
and *Ginnel* case, *Starkie*, 11480, 11455-97, 11509-30, 11532-45, 11707, 11731-4, 12096-104, 12281-328, 13138-48, 13479-512, 13531-90, 13609-41, 13809-15, 13889-99.  
Communication of Chief Inspectors with, *Parcell*, 4569-75  
Deputations from Teachers' Organisation to, *Starkie*, 11610; and cessation of, *Dillworth*, 911-5.  
Every case of promotion submitted to, *Dillworth*, 158-9  
Favourable reception of speech outlining new proposals, *Starkie*, . . . . . 11291-2  
Hampered in carrying out policy by incompetence or disloyalty of four or five higher officials, *Starkie*, . . . . . 11266-60  
Inefficiency allowed to go on because of danger of being compelled to resign, and question, *Starkie*, . . . . . 13219-31  
Kind of reports referred to Board before 1900, *Dewdney*, . . . . . 4776-82  
List of candidates for junior inspectorate revised by, *McNeill*, . . . . . 1252  
Memorandum re new scheme referred to Chief of Inspection for criticism, and letters involving their suspension, *Leamas* 11083-127, 11061, 11106, 14449, p. 489-90 II.

## Board of National Education—continued.

## RESIDENT COMMISSIONER—continued.

- Nothing whatever to say to introduction of new system except to provide over administrative machinery, *Starkie*, . . . . . 12697-76  
Meetings in Observation Book conveying disapproval of subordinates making questions, *Starkie*, . . . . . 13116-37, 13391-7  
Order re prohibition of supplying information to Commissioners, unless otherwise specially provided for in routine of department, without express authority of, question, *Dewdney*, 5513-21, p. 477, II.  
Personal interference with work of inspection undesirable, *Parcell*, p. 464, II.  
re Power on part of Chief Inspectors to hold re inspection unless specially instructed by, *Wyse*, . . . . . 6549-2, 6546-50, 4785A, 6512-16  
Powers, *Starkie*, 11584-609, 11627-30, 11631-2, 13764-18, 12958-91, 13004-13, 13023-31, 12994-26, 12984-65.  
Primary functions, question, *Starkie*, 12602-4  
Private Secretary:  
Award of diploma, process followed, *Wyse*, 2039  
Powers re reports, *Parcell*, . . . . . 4273-82  
Procedure re claims for increment, *Wyse*, 2062  
Procedure re cases of inefficiency of teachers in school work, *Wyse*, . . . . . 2080  
Visits paid to schools in company with Resident Commissioner, *Wyse*, . . . . . 2102-4  
see also *Wyse*, A. N. Bonaparte, M.A., . . . . . 2046-2619  
Public speeches, question of, *Dale*, . . . . . 10497-502, 10795-8  
Reprimands not brought before as a rule, *Starkie*, . . . . . 12423, 12453  
Reprimands countermanded by, in cases of doubt, *Leamas*, . . . . . 14363-6  
Salary borne on Civil Service vote, and pensionable, *Prinzel*, . . . . . 14108-9  
Sketch of introduction of new system to show difficulties in way of, *Starkie*, . . . . . 11399-369, 12016-17  
Speeches suppressed by Government, *Starkie*, 12581-5  
Strained relations with elder officials, question, *Ward*, . . . . . 9492-3  
Superior authority to chief inspectors in everything, *Starkie*, . . . . . 13597-608  
Suspension of Chief Inspectors, and question as to powers, *Ward*, . . . . . 9609-11  
Powers of Board vested in, *Wyse*, 2080, 2065-6; *Parcell*, 3389, 3396; *Dillworth*, 1075-132; *Parcell*, 3418-30; *Parcell*, 4649-7; *Wyse*, 6808-4; *Stegmans*, 7327, 7350-6, 7390-6, 7417-8, 7469-74; *Cummins*, 7596-7; *Clerke*, 6774-846, 5928-55, 9177-88; *Ward*, 9325-6, 9337-8, 7350-6, 9361-7, 9378-82, 9518-17, 9622-63, 9668-73, 9682-9; *Dillworth*, 119-20, 652, p. 131, I.; *McNeill*, 1356-65, 1650-2; *Wyse*, 6805-11; *Ward*, 9318-22, 9494-503; *Dale*, 10484-95, 10665-8, 10822A-8; *Starkie*, 11480-5, 12080, 12130-5, 13129-30, 13145-76;  
no more voice as far as voting is concerned, in promotion of inspectors, than any other member of Board, *Starkie*, . . . . . 12812-8  
see also *Starkie*, W. J. M., M.A., . . . . . 11200-13915  
Resolutions in 1899 relative to new system, p. 519, II.  
not Responsible to Parliament, *Clerke*, . . . . . 8224-6  
Routine business, suggestion for conducting, *Ward*, 9454-9

## RULES AND REGULATIONS:

- no Alteration of rules without majority of Commissioners being present, question, *Ward*, 9463-6  
should be known to public for reasonable time before coming into operation, *Stegmans*, 7323, 7324-6, 7419-21, 7433; *Cummins*, 7626-8; *MacLoughlin*, 7844-56; *McNeill*, 8428-8, 8547-56; *Dale*, 10506-8; *Clerke*, 8747-57, 8922; *Ward*, 9467-70; *Tristram*, 10193-202, 10233-47, 10390-2; *Starkie*, 12560-73, 12598-603, p. 481, II.

## Board of National Education—continued.

## RULES AND REGULATIONS—continued.

- Marks necessary to get increment and promotion should appear in published. *Word*, 1972-73  
 Proposal to give notice of publication of new rules would lead to an agitation which might compel rescinding of, *Starke*, 11511-26  
 Retrospective in action not fair, *Slaphane*, 7434-42, 7470-6; *McKuff*, 8023, p. 48, 111.

## SECRETARIES:

- Appointments should be filled from inspectors, *Downing*, 4759-97, p. 476, 11.  
 Award of diplomas, process followed, *Wynn*, 3089  
 Chief inspectors made subordinate to Resident Commissioner, and not to, *Starke*, 11251-4  
 Chief inspectors meet highly paid officials with intention of breaking ambition of being appointed, *Starke*, 11204  
 Dispute with Chief Inspector about a modified programme, and as a result Board decided that two offices were quite independent, *Starke*, 12439-703  
 Duties, *Dilworth*, 112-18; *Starke*, 11585.  
 may Exercise check on examiner but rarely done, *Parcell*, 3384-7, 3436, 3439-79, 3396  
 General duties applicable to both, *Lemass*, p. 457, 11.  
 List of candidates for junior inspectors revised by, *McNeill*, 1252  
 Nature of special matters which would be referred to, by examiners, *Parcell*, 3597-9  
 Noting of examinees does not become a reprimand until letter is signed by, *Lemass*, 14363-6, 14020-3; *Starke*, 11501-7, 12439-30, 12440-53, 13839-71.  
 Objection to exclusion of inspectors from post of, *Starke*, 12753-4  
 Position and emoluments existing previous to 1900, ordered by Board to be restored, *Parcell*, p. 820, 11.  
 Power of, *Lemass*, 11183-4  
 Powers of suspension claimed in absence of Resident Commissioner, *Starke*, 12292  
 Procedure re appeals, *Dilworth*, 1075-132; *Parcell*, 3418-20.  
 Procedure re claims for increment, *Wynn*, 3065-6  
 Restored to original position, and have now actual authority over chief inspectors, *Starke*, 12751-5  
 Routine work in office admirably carried out, *Starke*, 11264-6  
 Visiting of schools by higher officials such as, important factor in securing uniformity, *McNeill*, 1356-65, 1060-2  
 Written orders and directions shall be assumed to be made by authority of Board or Resident Commissioner, p. 518-50, 11.  
 See also *Dilworth*, W.J., M.A., 1-1217, App. I. V. II. and IV. (parts), and *Lemass*, P. E., 10892-11199, 14327-14623  
 Spoken rather than written word believed in in communicating with, *Feeler*, 5329-31  
 Subjected to unreasonable criticism, *Clarke*, 8769-73, 8936-8.  
 Success of new scheme endangered by high officials, *Starke*, 11266-80, 11295-7, 11298, 13219-31  
 Trade Preparatory Schools a grade of education which should be provided by, *Forde*, 8070, 9482-3, 8992-9  
 Unpopularity and continual attacks on, question as to explanation, *Clarke*, 9214-23; *Starke*, 11992-12010, 12018-22.

## C.

- Chemistry, see under School Programme.  
 Children's Act, 1908, Working of, *McKuff*, 8432-4  
 Church of Ireland Managers of National Schools, Memorial, p. 478 11.  
 Church of Ireland Education Board of General Synod, heads of evidence forwarded by, App. 481.  
 Circulars, see under Board of National Education.

CLARKE, Reverend J. Courtenay, D.D., Commissioner of National Education: 8670-9232

## APPEALS:

- no information withheld from Board as a whole, 8702-9, 8873-7  
 Number coming before Board as a whole, question, 8759-61  
 Official transaction of business, method, 8875-901, 8929-38  
 Resolution of Board divesting themselves of authority, question re, 8774-846, 8939-55, 9063-125, 9114-6, 9177-83, 9242-50, 9296-7  
 Right of Resident Commissioner to refuse to bring before Board, question, 8944-56  
 Belfast case, 8724-32, 8847-53, 8734-40, 8978-7, 8982-94, 9032-4, 9042-3, 9072-3, 9175

## BOARD OF EDUCATION:

- Appointment of small permanent standing committee would get through some of the difficulties, 8927-8  
 Commissioners:  
 Attitude with regard to Belfast and Cleonard cases, 8957-9043  
 Duties and responsibilities and question, 8774-840, 8862-5, 8939-55, 9092-101, 9114-5, 9177-88.  
 Intercourse with members of staff, question, 8939-43  
 Official communication regarding discontent and dissatisfaction, question re, 8847-59  
 Submission of circulars to, question re, 8688-97, 8806-72  
 Committees, number, and subjects, 9142-8, 9240-2  
 Desirable that important circulars, letters of instruction, or anything issued during year, should be inserted in appendix to Report, 8903-21  
 Debates on whole question of present system of awarding grants, question, 9160-4  
 Meetings, frequency, 9142  
 New rules and amendment of rules, question as to allowing certain period of time to elapse for public criticism, 8747-57, 8922  
 Programmes and notes to teachers submitted to, 9149-69  
 Recommendations of Powlis commission not followed, and question re, 9322-0  
 Resident Commissioner, duties and responsibilities, and question as to how far those of lay commissioners differ from, 8774-846, 8939-55, 9177-88  
 not Responsible to Parliament, 9224-6  
 Subjected to unreasonable criticism, 8760-73, 8960-8  
 Unpopularity, and discontent of teachers, 9214-23  
 Cleonard case, 8907-81, 8995-31, 9175-6  
 Grades, standard numbers, commissioners have no power to fix, apart from consent of Treasury, 8938-48, 9223-52  
 Increments, annual and retrospective scheme would be approved, 9133-7  
 INSPECTION SYSTEM:  
 Intelligence cultivated under, 9138-41  
 Working of, question, re, 8680-716  
 INSPECTORS:  
 Circulars issued after Belfast and Cleonard cases, question as to distrust of, shown in, 9165-74  
 Individual examination not unnecessary, nor examination in whole programme, 9073-83, 9190-205  
 Relations with teachers satisfactory on whole, 8717, 8846, 9233-8  
 MERIT MARKS:  
 Difficult to deal with, 9126-8  
 Debates by Board on whole system of awarding, question, 9160-4  
 Lowering without asking single question, question re, 9074-7  
 Tense circular, 9251-6  
 Uniformity question, 8721-46, 9189-88, 9035-41, 9232-42  
 Pensions, question of. urged again by Commissioners, 9044-6, 9008-9  
 Promotion, slowness of, question, 9129-32  
 State aid, earmarked, and statement in accounts re surrender of balance, misleading, 8770-831, 9318

CLARE, Reverend J. Courtenay, D.D.—continued.

## TEACHERS:

- Discontent not so general as represented, but confined to certain districts, . . . 3713-20  
Dismissals of old teachers on ground of inefficiency, . . . 9047-73

## Clemens case,

- Districts*, 933-71, 1002-8, p. 206-16 *l.*; *MacNeill*, 1228-34, 1808-10; *Wyle*, 2267-67, 2302-27, 2378-80; *Parrell*, 3600-13; *Purser*, 3997-4097; *Hynes*, 4713-52, 6817-20, 8906-48, 4970, 7008-30, 7086, 7083-7, 7073-83, 7125-55, 7161-37, 7191-4; *Clarke*, 8967-81, 8995-1031, 9175-6, *Ford*, 9303-18, 9385-6, 9717-25, 9729-30, 9774-85, 9787-92; *Storrie*, 11430, 11485-97, 11509-30, 11532-45, 11707, 11731-4, 12096-104, 12231-223, 12138-50, 13479-512, 13531-60, 13699-41, 13809-15, 13838, 13889-69, 13458-75, 13522-30; *Lemass*, 14398, 14408-3, 14453-95, 14567-95, p. 520 *ll.*

## Closaduff case,

- Delaware*, 1151-6; *Purser*, 4576-722, p. 465-6 *ll.*; *Ward*, 9446-52, 9793-806; *Storrie*, 11809-32, 11842-52, 11882-6, 12042-51, 13032-120.

COLLIS, Rev. Maurice H. P., Vicar of Antrim:

6189-6410

## INSPECTORS:

- Curry and superficial inspection, examinations advocated, 6223-32, 6251-61, 6269-76, 6316-23, 6334-9, 6353-68, 6379-2, 6390-4.  
Discourtesy to teachers . . . 6233-43, 6311-5  
Lack of uniformity, . . . 6285-8, 6288-94, 6373-4  
Spirit of inspection, 6231-5, 6259-80, 6280-7  
Surprise visits, question as to disadvantage, . . . 6385-9

## MANAGERS:

- Full reports should be sent to and not only extracts, . . . 6223-32, 6292-5, 6298-308  
Recommendation re holding by, of periodic examinations, question, . . . 6346-52  
Responsibility for school buildings, etc., question, . . . 6299-18  
Short notice of inspector's visits, . . . 6221-2, 6277-9, 6345-6

## MERIT MARK:

- Impressionist or tone system, and impossibility of arriving at correct judgment by . . . 6340-3  
School premises, effect, . . . 6219-20, 6393-10, 6385-7, 6408-10

## SCHOOL PROGRAMME:

- Desire on part of children to become clerks as against mechanical work or farming as outcome of, not known of, . . . 6324-33, 6375-9  
Standard of education as compared with Results system, . . . 6344-6  
Schools, half-time system, number of days spent in school, . . . 6329-1

Commissioners, see under Board of National Education.

Composition, see Writing and Composition, under School Programme.

Conferences: see under Inspectors.

Cookery, see under School Programme.

## Corporal Punishment:

- no case known of children not attending school by fear of, for not knowing lessons, *Dawson*, 5005-7  
Rules and regulations, *Lemass*, 14499-307  
Statement that there was little or none under old system incorrect, *Lemass*, . . . 11199

## Corporal Punishment Book:

- Object, *Parrell*, 3683-92; *Lemass*, 14496-8  
Regulations, and question, *Storrie*, . . . 13900-3

CUMMINS, Rev. David, M.A., Minister of Glenwherry

Ca. Antrim, . . . 7479-7662

Appeals, should be heard before three Commissioners, . . . 7586-7

## BOARD OF EDUCATION:

- Important changes in rules and regulations should be made public, . . . 7635-8  
Resident Commissioner, too much power, 7594-7

CUMMINS, Rev. David, M.A.—continued.

## INSPECTORS:

- Frequent changes not experience, . . . 7495-6  
Impressionist and tone inspection insufficient, and individual examination by, partly on results system, strongly favoured, . . . 7497-513, 7578-9, 7595-602, 7626-35  
Larger proportion might be drawn from teachers, and some experience of teaching should be required of all, . . . 7514-6  
Review of work by head inspectors useful, 7655  
Tone of fault-finding criticism not encountered personally, . . . 7487-3, 7494, 7603-8  
Junior assistant mistresses should have status of teachers, . . . 7658-62  
MERIT MARK:  
Uniformity, want of, . . . 7517-25  
Workable system but sometimes not fair to teacher, . . . 7623-5, 7689-3  
Promotion, "Paper," grievance of teachers, . . . 7490, 7535-56, 7642-9  
Fragile, promotion at regular intervals, question as to care taken under system, . . . 7614-6

## SALARIES:

- Higher initial necessary to get promising teachers, . . . 7649-55  
Payment direct to teacher and not through manager desirable, . . . 7662  
School Programme, comparison with Results system, . . . 7508-12, 7569-77, 7591-3, 7617-35  
SCHOOLS:  
Children leaving, to go to Intermediate schools, question, . . . 7638-41  
Improvement under present system, 7609-13  
State grant, over estimate, money not drawn from Treasury at all and therefore not returned, . . . 7539-56  
Teachers, grievance of restrictions on civil rights, . . . 7491-3, 7527-35

## D.

DALE, F. H., Chief Inspector of elementary schools, Board of Education, England: 16499-491

Appeals, procedure, and difficulty of suggesting alternative, . . . 16518-7, 16627-9, 16632-7, 16735-49

16832-7

## BOARD OF NATIONAL EDUCATION:

- Changes in rules and regulations, question of making public, . . . 16506-8  
Chiefs of inspection, examination of reports by, considered waste of power and experience, . . . 16437-65

## Resident Commissioner:

- Public speeches, question of, 16497-502, 16796-8  
Visits to schools considered valuable, . . . 16484-95, 16665-8, 16822-3  
Circulars, effectiveness of government by, question, . . . 16303-5

Education, lack of local interest in, . . . 16447-56, 16616-17, 16620-9

Examiners, issuing of reprimands to teachers, inadvisable, . . . 16509-12, 16622-3, 16619-22

## ENGLAND:

- Examinations, abolition, question as to effect on efficiency of children, . . . 16530-9  
Grades, time taken for teacher to get from bottom to top, . . . 16414-50  
Inspection, attitude of teachers and inspectors towards, . . . 16420-6, 16717-27  
Increments, practice, . . . 16630-42  
Promotion, practice, . . . 16630-42  
Scholarships, from primary to secondary schools, in, . . . 16788-91  
School Programme, comparison of liberty granted in Ireland and question, . . . 16583-76  
Teachers, political liberties, . . . 16792-5  
Increments, smaller automatic, and larger initial salary desirable, . . . 16440

## INSPECTORS:

- Arrangement of staff, opinion, . . . 16466-78  
Appointment:  
Examination not considered necessary; and personal qualifications important, . . . 16481-3, 16741



DALE, F. H.—continued.

## INSPECTORS.—continued.

- Teaching experience desirable, but absolute preference should not be given to teachers, 10748-8
- Changes in districts too frequent, 10470-2
- Chief, number too small to secure uniformity, 10473, 10411-6
- Divisional, suggested appointment, opinion, 10474-3, 10809
- Inadvisable to place direct responsibility on, for scheduling or grading or promotion of teachers, 10430-40
- Informal examination by, necessary to test result of teaching, 10562-7, 10669-706, 10762-87, 10877-86
- Initial salary, question as to possibility of attracting sufficiently good men, 10479-80, 10734
- Visits, notice of:  
to Manager, shortness, and result, 10568-70, 10576-7  
to Teacher, inadvisable, 10371-5, 10448-51, 10658-61, 10820-81
- Managers, appointment of teachers of unsuitable educational ability, 10426
- MERRY MARKS:  
Sudden alterations of standard should be stopped, 10805-15
- Uniformity impossible and general report advocated, 10442-3, 10603-4
- Promotion:  
Plan suggested, 10720-33
- Reports, annual, system of grading only thing that really compels, 10578-9
- Report on primary education in Ireland, 10410-23, 10643-7, 10887-91
- Report referred to, Dilworth, 138-42; Power, 5843-50; Deering, 5384-8; Starkie, 11303-9
- Evidence: 10409-10891
- SALARIES:  
Considerations which have to be taken into account in fixing, 10543-7, 10707-16
- Payment directed to teachers suggested, 10441
- SCHOOL ATTENDANCE:  
Hours and question, 10758-61
- Low, and suggestion for improvement, 10543-5, 10606-13, 10749-55
- School Equipment, inadequate, 10634-42
- School Premises, wrongly planned, and overcrowding, 10518-33, 10614-5
- School Programme, suitability of, question, 10438-43
- SCHOOLS:  
Raising of leaving age advocated, 10757
- Rule for admission of babies, question, and effect of instruction of other children, 10549-54
- Small, multiplication of, and question, 10590-605
- School Year:  
Promotion of children should not be restricted to beginning of, 10555-61
- Uniformity, and question as to effect on inspection, 10365-7
- Teachers, matter of great importance to, to have just and uniform system of inspection than in England, 10709-804
- Dental Treatment:  
Scheme, particulars, Frizell, 14129-31
- Vote provided, but with stipulation that equal amount was provided locally and therefore ineffective, Frizell, 14127-8
- Development grant: Diverted from proper purposes, Starkie, 13224-6
- DILL, SIR SAMUEL, M.A., LITT.D., LL.D.,  
Chairman of Committee, appendix handed in, p. 482-4.
- DILWORTH, W. J., M.A., Secretary to the Board of National Education, Ireland:  
1-1217, App. I. and V., II, IV. (parts).
- APPEALS:  
Facilities for, and means of access to Board, 236-52, 694, p. 133-4 I.
- Number of cases obtaining redress, question, 1019-23
- Probably many not made, and reason suggested, 1021
- Procedure, 245, 264-8, 434-6, 560-7, 728-32, 972-80, 996-7, 1075-1132.
- Belfast case, 90-2, 759-68, 980-95, p. 147-200 I.

DILWORTH, W. J., M.A.—continued.

## BOARD OF NATIONAL EDUCATION:

## Commissioners:

- Open to, to bring any question connected with administration specially before Board, 245
- Relations with teachers, 206-12, p. 132-3 I.
- Resident:  
Deputation of Teachers' Organisation received by successive, 911-15
- Every case of promotion submitted to, 159-9
- Schools visited by, 119-20, 452, p. 131 I.
- Correspondence carried on with managers and not with teachers and exceptions to rule, 203, p. 133-4 I.
- Examiners of reports:  
Appointed in 1900, and question as to experience, 541-51
- Duties, 110-1, 532-34, 748-52, 1022
- Magnitude and complexity of system, 245, p. 134
- Manner in which differences of opinion between senior and junior inspectors come before, 104-10
- Member formerly a teacher in a national school, 251-3
- Meetings, frequency and day, 886-6
- Schools not under, 294-303
- Secretary, outline of duties, 712-13
- Clothes case, 903-71, 1002-8, p. 200-16 I.
- Clothes case, 1151-6
- Conferences:  
Held annually, and question re, 484-6, 608-10
- Importance of periodical enjoyed in several branches, 87
- GRADERS:  
First:  
Deferred payment on promotion owing to maximum number having been reached, 163-9, 175-8, 658-63, 1158 60, p. 132 I., p. 164 I.
- Maximum numbers, 161, p. 132 I.
- Special promotion to, regulations, 192, p. 132 I.
- Standard numbers, question re introduction of wording "under arrangement with Treasury" into rules, 937-62
- Table showing number of teachers in receipt of salary of, 164
- Gross total, and standard numbers fixed, 103, 470
- Proposal for rearrangement of available places in different, so as to increase numbers in higher, and removal, 471-4
- Second:  
Men, maximum numbers, 161
- Special promotion to, regulations, 191-2, p. 132 I.
- Standard numbers, question re introduction of wording "under arrangement with Treasury" into rules, 937-62
- Table showing number of teachers in receipt of salary of, 164
- Women, maximum numbers, 161, p. 132 I.
- Third:  
Regulations re special promotion of assistants to second grade, 193-5
- Table showing number of teachers in receipt of salary of, 164 I.
- INCREMENTS:  
Circumstances under which teachers have not to wait another triennial period on failure to obtain, 428-33
- Claims dealt with by experienced inspector brought into office especially for purpose, 149, 187-8
- Conditions as to size of school, 132 I.
- Procedure, 76, 123, 556, p. 132 I.
- Scheme, reasons for adoption not known, and question of injustice in certain cases, 452-66
- Table, 1907-13, App. V., p. 164 I.
- INSPECTION:  
Mode of very efficient schools, 33, p. 139 I.
- no Suggestions can be offered for more satisfactory scheme, 482
- System replaced Results system in 1900, 487-92, p. 130 I.

## DILWORTH, W. J., M.A.—continued.

DILWORTH, W. J., M.A.—continued.  
MERE MARKS—continued.

## INSPECTORS :

|  |   |
|--|---|
| Appointments :   |   |
| Age limit .. .. .  | 16-17                                       |
| Procedure .. .. .  | 1177-96                                     |
| Chief :  |   |
| Control of variations in merit marks, question, ..   | 879-6                                       |
| Eleven circuits under control of, ..   | 23  |
| Means of testing uniformity of inspection through, ..  | 481-6                                       |
| Number, .. .. .  | 15  |
| Circuits, division into and arrangements of work in each, ..   | 22-4, 37, 377-9, p. 125-31 I.               |
| Criticism of action of, by teachers' Organisation thought to be doing harm to education of district, question, ..                      | 917-8                                       |
| District and Junior :  |   |
| Appointed before 1900 by limited competitive examination and different scale of salary from those appointed since, but duties same, .. | 15  |
| Number .. .. .   | 15  |
| Divisional, suggested appointment and functions, ..  | 120-2, 476-80, p. 131 I.                    |
| Duties .. .. .   | p. 129-30 I.                                |
| Periodic visits :  |   |
| Held only in case of schools which are not doing satisfactory work, ..   | 37  |
| as inspection and examination in each subject of each standard, ..   | 37, 329-33                                  |
| Methods not prescribed, ..   | 334-8                                       |
| Only visits of which notice is given beforehand to teacher, ..   | 36-7  |
| not to give orders in schools, other than model schools, ..  | 43, p. 128                                  |
| Instructions to, and steps taken to ensure uniformity of standard, ..  | 82-123, 520-37, 608-65, p. 130-1 I.         |
| on Probation for a year, and training, ..  | 25-31                                       |
| Proportion having been National teachers, ..   | 18-9  |
| Relations with teachers, ..  | 296-312, 759-68, 983-95, 1908-10, p. 132 I. |
| Residence at a common centre gradually fell into disuse, ..  | 87  |
| Retirement, age, and question as to anticipation by National Board, ..   | 319-23, 324-7                               |
| Senior :   |   |
| Arrangement of work, ..  | 602-6                                       |
| Number .. .. .   | 15  |
| Relations with two juniors under, ..   | 34-5, 607                                   |
| Whole circuit covered in five years, ..  | 23-4  |
| Staff, and number of schools to each, ..   | 14, 116-8, p. 129 I.                        |
| Summing up work of school, rules for, ..   | p. 130 I.                                   |
| Visits, number, and notice given, ..   | 32-7, p. 129 I.                             |
| Junior Assistant Mistresses, number, ..  | 163   |
| LOCAL AID :  |   |
| Provision a condition for securing State grant, ..   | 8-9, 304-12, 562-5                          |
| Total amount, 1911, ..   | 11, p. 129 I.                               |
| MANAGERS :   |   |
| Functions, .. .. .   | p. 129 I.                                   |
| Letters written to, re points in reports in connection with equipment of schools, ..   | 1047  |
| Must be apprised of inspection presence when a visit of considerable length is intended, ..  | 37  |
| Removal by Board rate, .. .. .   | 457-8                                       |
| MERE MARKS :   |   |
| Abolition, question of, .. .. .  | 690-3                                       |
| Controlling influence at head quarters, question as to desirability, ..  | 670, 842-76                                 |
| Decision as to, often referred back to Inspector, ..   | 423-7                                       |
| Due allowance for time of school year and time of day enjoyed, ..  | 447-51                                      |
| Effect on, of not teaching certain subjects, question, ..  | 810-30                                      |
| Elasticity of, and question whether fixed figure would not be better, ..   | 351-7                                       |
| Endorsement of mark of circuit inspector, by chief inspector as being responsible for uniformity, question, ..                         | 1014-8                                      |
| no Expression of opinion of inspectors seen, ..  | 420-2, 717-9                                |
| Factors determining, .. .. .   | 50-74                                       |

## Lowering of standard :

|   |   |
|---|---|
| should not follow accidental lowering of proficiency unless tone is lowered and question, ..  | 1789-909  |
| by Junior inspector without concurrence of senior inspector not allowed, ..   | 320-41, 862-8, 1063-5                                     |
| Steps taken to see whether justified, question, ..  | 660-73  |
| "Making due allowance for adverse circumstances," question as to impression conveyed by phrase, ..  | 1033-44   |
| Origin of, question of, ..  | 700-4, 801-2  |
| Penalising teachers for state of school buildings, question, ..   | 71, 280-1, 374-7, 378, 1157-44                            |
| Period of time after inspection before teacher is notified, question, ..  | 443, 674-89, 1022-3, 1213-7                               |
| Personal mark of teacher and question re date of circular, ..   | 371-5, 877-84, 988  |
| Precise conditions for promotion and increment not published to teachers, ..  | 1202-9  |
| Procedure in case of alteration, ..   | 161, p. 131 I.  |
| Prominence given to English and Arithmetic, and question as to information of teachers that special stress should be laid on, ..                  | 1065-62   |
| Promotion dependent on, and question re, ..   | 58-74, 195, 202   |
| Reduced by weak members of the staff, ..  | 61-3  |
| Reference to, in Rules and Regulations, question, ..  | 481-8   |
| Regulation of promotion facilitated, question re statement, ..  | 1173-5  |
| Return, 1906-11, submitted, ..  | 74-81, p. 130, p. 164 I.                                  |
| Rules for inspection, ..  | p. 130 I.   |
| School re-inspected on complaints of teachers, and marks may be cancelled and higher one recorded, ..   | 444-6   |
| Senior inspectors summoned to a conference in 1903 to arrive at an exact understanding of terms, ..   | 87  |
| Standard required for promotion and increments, ..  | 149-56, 203-4, 1153-6, 1187, 1198-1205, p. 131, p. 132 I. |
| Stress laid on importance of not altering without grave reason, in re-terms of instructions, ..   | 83, p. 131 I.   |
| Tone an important factor in assessing, and question of, ..  | 39-42, 319-47, 423-66, 720-8                              |
| Uniformity question, ..   | 414-9, 603-58, 635-9, 753-8, 897-910                      |
| National Education, introduction and growth of system, ..   | p. 129 I.   |
| OBSEKVATION BOOK :  |   |
| Difficultly of inspector making full report in, question, ..  | 1024-7  |
| Inspector, manager and teacher only, have access to and not open to inspection of public, ..  | 439, 10131-2  |
| Inspectors told to call attention to 2 or 3 important points at a time and not to burden teacher with great number of suggestions all at once, .. | 1028  |
| Necessary in order that inspector on returning may see what points have been neglected, ..  | 1028-30   |
| Use of and question whether friction is caused by, ..   | 557-70  |
| ORGANISERS :  |   |
| Brought in chiefly since great change of 1900, ..   | 21  |
| Domestic economy, particulars, ..   | 20, 21, 314   |
| Duties, .. .. .   | 313-18  |
| Irish Language, particulars, ..   | 20, 314   |
| Kindergarten, particulars, ..   | 20, 21  |
| Music, particulars, ..  | 20, 21  |
| National teachers among, ..   | 21, 314   |
| Numbers, .. .. .  | 20-4, 314   |
| School, particulars, ..   | 20, 21  |
| Science, particulars, ..  | 20, 21  |
| Progress Record, system followed, ..  | 1068-74   |
| PROMOTIONS :  |   |
| Awarding of, procedure, ..  | 146-60, 563, p. 132 I.                                    |
| Circumstances under which teachers have not to wait another triennial period on failure to obtain, ..   | 428-33, 1201  |
| Claim dealt with by experienced inspector brought into office specially for purpose of, ..  | 146, 157-8  |

## PROMOTION—continued.

|  |                     |
|--|---------------------|
| Conditions as to sizes of schools, ..  | 146, 143, p. 132 I. |
| "Paper Promotion" meaning of, ..   | 467-9               |
| Period which would elapse before teacher got from bottom to top, ..              | 666-7               |
| Provisions for rapid or especially meritorious teachers, ..                      | 191-2               |
| Special:   |                     |
| of Assistants, ..  | 193-5, p. 132 I.    |
| of Principals, standard of reports, ..   | p. 132 I.           |
| Table, 1897-12, ..   | p. 104 I.           |
| Teachers remain three years at maximum of grade before promotion to a higher, .. | 132-3, 146, 147     |

## RELIGIOUS INSTRUCTION CERTIFICATE BOOK:

|   |       |
|---|-------|
| Complaints sometimes received about people coming in and giving annoyance, ..                     | 441-2 |
| Visitors of all denominations have full liberty to examine but not permitted to make extracts, .. | 441   |
| Report book, open to inspection of public, ..   | 440   |

## REMARKS:

|   |                   |
|---|-------------------|
| Chief heads under which information is to be supplied, regulations re, 44-5, 343, p. 139 I. |                   |
| Formal inspection, details, question re, 330-3  |                   |
| General:  |                   |
| Form for, ..  | p. 151-3 I.       |
| Importance of, and visit made for purpose of furnishing, ..                                 | 32-4              |
| Great importance attached to particular marks given for each subject, ..                    | 351               |
| Incidental:   |                   |
| Forms for, ..   | p. 154 I.         |
| Relative numbers, question, ..  | 1068-7            |
| Occasional visits, unless very short generally entail a short, ..                           | 347               |
| Office routine with regard to, ..   | 338-40            |
| Sending back to inspectors for elimination of passages, question, ..                        | 714-6             |
| Senior inspector, form for, ..  | p. 153 I.         |
| Sent in duplicates to manager and teacher, ..   | 236, 343, 1045-61 |
| Space given to general remarks very small, ..   | 369               |
| Special instruction as to the most important factor in determining inspector's opinion, ..  | p. 130 I.         |

## RESULTS SYSTEM:

|  |  |
|--|--|
| Abolished in 1900 and place taken by present system, ..                                  | 487-61, p. 139 I.                            |
| Observations on, by Commission on Manual and Practical Instruction, 490, 42-3, p. 130 I. |  |
| Went improvement of present system as compared with, ..                                  | 44-3, 493-5, 649-60, 733-44, 1146-60, p. 130 |
| Returns, of teachers, forms for, ..  | 157-9  |
| Roll book, open to inspection of public, ..  | 440  |

## SALARIES:

|  |                        |
|--|------------------------|
| Stipend grant, ..  | 503-6                  |
| Bonus for assistants, ..   | 144, p. 131 I.         |
| Capitation payments:   |                        |
| Convent schools mainly paid by, altogether, ..   | 502-3                  |
| Nature of, ..  | 144, p. 131 I.         |
| Residual grant, ..   | 123-8                  |
| Comparison with England, ..  | 128-42                 |
| Fees for special and extra subjects, 144, p. 131 I.  |                        |
| Fixed, new system of, ..   | 123, p. 131 I.         |
| Made out to teachers but sent to managers and question re practice, 12, 589-601, p. 129 I. |                        |
| Monthly payments:  |                        |
| Agitation for, ..  | 12-4                   |
| Increase in expenditure would not be very great, ..  | 1216-7                 |
| Taking of men from ordinary work would be obstructed, ..                                   | 1216                   |
| Scale, ..  | 128-31, 187, p. 131 I. |
| Sources, ..  | 8, p. 129 I.           |
| System of payment, delay caused by, ..   | 12, 478, 1214          |
| School programme, arithmetic, criticism of and question, ..                                | 245-58, 707-8, 1173-3  |

## SCHOOLS:

|   |                        |
|---|------------------------|
| Cleaning and heating, rule re, and question as to defects of system, ..   | 379-413, 507-10, 507-8 |
| Fees charged in few only, ..  | 10, 596                |
| Government, ..  | p. 129 I.              |
| Number and number of pupils, ..   | 9, p. 129 I.           |
| non-National:   |                        |
| Number of, and of pupils attending, 4-5, 299  |                        |
| Term, meaning of, ..  | 294                    |
| STATE GRANT:  |                        |
| Estimate of vote for national education, deficiencies under certain sub-heads may be met by savings under other, provided that it be sanctioned by Treasury, .. | 178-80, 261-74         |
| Practically whole of salaries of national school teachers paid from, ..   | 269-1                  |
| Total amount, 1911, ..  | 11, p. 129 I.          |

## TEACHERS:

|   |                   |
|---|-------------------|
| Allowed to attend meetings for educational purposes, but not for party politics except for voting, ..                                   | 626-33, p. 133 I. |
| not Allowed to become members of county, district or urban councils or poor law guardians, unless by co-option, 228-4, 233-5, p. 133 I. |                   |
| Appointed for first time placed in third or lowest grade, ..  | 123               |

## Assistant:

|   |                      |
|---|----------------------|
| Appointed on or after April 1st, 1900, ineligible for promotion beyond third grade unless in exceptional circumstances and by special order of Commissioners, 123 |                      |
| Total number, ..  | 162-3                |
| Character query omitted, ..   | p. 133 I.            |
| Communication of circulars to, question as to publication in book form, ..  | 215-8, 1210-2        |
| Diploma, granting of, and question as to conditions, ..   | 585-91               |
| Discussion of programme and course of instruction, question as to restriction, ..   | 228-8, 230-2, 934-44 |

## Dismissals:

|  |                       |
|--|-----------------------|
| Board cannot reinstate teachers, but may either remove manager or not allow manager to appoint successor, .. | 240                   |
| Formal statement of grounds furnished to teacher, ..   | 236                   |
| Last resource, ..  | 1161-70               |
| Procedure, ..  | 648                   |
| Forbidden to keep public house or to be the husband or wife of a person keeping a public house, ..           | 222, 262, p. 133 I.   |
| Grievances, and question of, ..  | 496-501, 605, 1019-20 |
| Migration of candidates, question, ..  | 136-7                 |
| Practical rules for guidance of, ..  | p. 133 I.             |

## Principals:

|   |         |
|---|---------|
| Nothing to do with appointments of assistants, except by advising manager, .. | 197-200 |
| Total number, ..  | 182     |
| not Prohibited from farming, ..   | 221     |
| Supply fluctuating, ..  | 745-7   |
| Work measures, number, ..   | 163     |
| Tipperary Teachers' Association, memorial from and Mr. Walsby's reply, ..     | 883-71  |
| Domestic Economy, see under School Programme.                                 |         |
| Domestic Economy Organism, see under Organisms.                               |         |

## DOWNING, Edmund, Chief Inspector:

|   |                          |
|---|--------------------------|
| Disloyal to Board from beginning, and success of new scheme endangered by, Starkie, ..  | 11266-60, 11295-7, 11299 |
| Evidence referred to, as being conscious of duties in regard to annual conferences, Starkie, ..   | 11463                    |
| Evidence re production of inspectors from expressing opinions adverse to policy of Board, Starkie, ..   | 12643-45                 |
| Instructions to, to give opinion with regard to certain facts, based upon evidence supplied from reports of inspectors, and not followed, Starkie, .. | 12553-46                 |
| Letter of instruction re new circuits, and memorandum thereon, ..   | p. 507-9 II.             |

## DOWNING, Edmund—continued.

- Letters to Secretary re new scheme, involving suspension of, *Lemass*,  
11061, 11063-8, 11106, 14448, p. 488-90 II.  
Little assistance given to new scheme, *Lemass*,  
11003-6  
Memorandum on measure urgently needed with  
view to more efficient inspection of schools,  
p. 495-6 II.  
Memorandum on efficient inspection of schools  
quoted, *Lemass*, . . . 10907-11009  
Misconception of duties, *Starkie*, . . . 11707  
Statement that chiefs of inspection used to be in  
attendance at Board meetings incorrect, *Lemass*,  
11198  
Statement that reprimands were submitted to  
Board incorrect, *Lemass*, . . . 11198  
Statement that there was little or no corporal  
punishment under old system incorrect, *Lemass*,  
11189  
Statement that system of promotion always went  
by seniority incorrect, *Lemass*, . . . 11198  
Suspension for criticism of anonymous document,  
particulars re,  
4927-48, 5404-II, 5336-54, 5492-507  
Suspension, particulars re, and re previous record,  
*Starkie*, 11288-90, 11299, 12223-6, 12888-908  
Variation in evidence before Manual Instruction  
Committee and present opinion, *Dale*, 10979

## Evidence, 4723-5521, App. XIX.

- Accounts, not simplified by new scheme as claimed,  
4972-3  
Appeals, procedure under old system, 4896-13

## BOARD OF NATIONAL EDUCATION:

- Chiefs of Inspection:  
Consulted as to estimates, . . . 4773  
not Consulted in new scheme and programme  
in 1900, . . . 4787-8  
Kind of reports noted by, for consideration  
of Board, . . . 4776-82  
Restoration of office suggested as only way to  
rectify present evil, . . . 4744-51, p. 476 II.  
Salaries included in estimates for office and  
not with outdoor inspection staff, 4745  
Meetings, order given that one of chiefs of  
inspection should be present,  
4793-7, 5003-4, p. 476 II.  
Office Committee, revival advocated and func-  
tions, . . . 4768-75, 4783-6, p. 476 II.  
Office organisation, decline in, under new system,  
4751-3  
Secretariats should be filled from inspectors to,  
4788-97, p. 476 II.  
Corporal punishment, no case known of children  
not attending school for fear of, for not knowing  
lessons, . . . 5006-7  
Examination, no drawback in proper system and  
only way of testing merits of schools,  
5478-87, p. 476 II.

## GRADES:

- Comparison of old classes with, . . . 5301-18  
Grading in respect of schools on institution of  
new scheme in 1900,  
4950-70, 5118-24, 5248-72, 5319-36, 5424-30  
Home Lessons, value of, and importance attached  
to, . . . 5001-4

## INCREMENTS:

- Forfeit in third year by failure in one of three  
merit marks, system should be got rid of,  
4867-73  
Many teachers having qualified cannot get, for  
want of funds . . . p. 476, II.  
Original proposal for award on satisfactory  
report, . . . 4987-9

## INSPECTION:

- Cost of new scheme, . . . 4949-51, 4971  
Meds and spirit, decline under, . . . 4731-3

## INSPECTORS:

- Appointment under old system, . . . 4861-84  
Changed too frequently and not allowed to  
remain long enough in districts,  
4829-32, 5045-52, 5124-31, p. 476 II.

## DOWNING, Edmund—continued.

## INSTRUCTIONS—continued.

## Chief:

- Duties and comparison of old and new systems,  
4768-7, 5027-41  
no Opportunity of knowing reports, 4752-6  
Conferences, held regularly and object of,  
4758-65  
Examinations, of highest grade only, advocated,  
4837-7, 4979-84, 5093-8, 5237-47, 5412-7, 5433  
p. 476 II.  
should be Free to express honest opinions,  
p. 477, II.

## Head:

- Means taken under old system to secure  
uniformity, . . . 4796-807  
Reduced to rank of Senior Inspectors, 5042-4  
could not Judge of proficiency of school by  
looking at Progress and Syllabus books, &c.,  
5090-1  
Instructions calculated to lead to error, to want of  
uniformity, and consequently to injustice and  
hardship to teachers, . . . p. 474-5, II.  
Junior, no systematic training under old system,  
4847-50  
Objection to tone of dictation adopted towards,  
4877-918, 5110-17, 5148-8  
Order re prohibition of supplying information to  
Commissioners, unless otherwise specially pro-  
vided for in routine of department without  
express authority of Resident Commissioner,  
question, . . . 5013-21, p. 477 II.  
Promotion should be made on just lines, 4813-6,  
p. 476 II.

- Recent outcry against examinations natural  
outcome of employment of, not being educa-  
tionists, . . . 5153  
Recruitment largely from National teachers  
recommended and question as to number  
formerly appointed, . . . 5056-75  
Staff, revision suggested, . . . 4798, p. 476 II.  
Uniformity, means taken to secure, under old  
system, . . . 4799-807, 4820-3  
Junior assistant mistresses, objection to, as being  
of very little use, . . . 4895-99, p. 476 II.  
Lavatories, and baths, grants from State, question  
re, . . . 5021-2

## MANAGERS:

- Absence during inspections exceptional, p. 476 II.  
Directed to use influence to get prizes subscribed  
by locality, and question, . . . 4898, 4916-8  
Honorary and thankless position, a few suitable  
laymen can be got to accept, . . . p. 475 II.  
Rules applicable to, should not be changed  
except with consent of, 5148-52, p. 476 II.

## MERIT MARKS:

- Assignment accurately and uniformly among  
60 men impossible, 4854-62, 5100-9, 5488-91  
Substitute suggested, . . . 4863-6  
Too circular, objection to, and reasons,  
4845-6, 5185-91

## PRIMARY EDUCATION:

- Character, decline under new system and question  
as to grounds for opinion,  
4731-3, 5393-403, 5311-2  
Steering of memory and training of intellect,  
importance of, . . . 5163-237, 5273-300  
System affecting whole country of more im-  
portance than stored-up knowledge,  
5224-37, 5458-60

## PROMOTIONS:

- Limited by numbers in school, system assailed  
and change suggested, . . . 4874-84  
Procedure under old system, but reversion to,  
undesirable, . . . 4814-24  
Paps, promotions regular as a general rule,  
5434-42

## REPORTS:

- Inspectors subjected to coercion . . . p. 475 II.  
Kind of, referred to whole Board before 1900,  
4778-82  
Procedure, . . . 5055-84

## RESULTS SYSTEM:

- Mechanical teaching under, and questions arising  
from, . . . 5163-237, 5273-300, 5443-57  
Superior to present system, but defects of, and  
return to not desired,  
4734-43, 5138-44, 5159-62

**DOWNING, Edmund—continued.****SALARIES :**

- Scale, under new scheme, . . . . . 4962  
 Teachers did not suffer any immediate loss by  
 change in, . . . . . 5132-5

**SCHOOL PROGRAMME :**

- Definite, with certain amount of freedom to  
 teachers and managers to add other subjects  
 suited to locality, advocated, . . . . .  
 4859-60, 4993, 5081-2, 5418-25  
 Extra subjects, estimates, question, . . . . . 4955-6  
 Grouping, objection to, on grounds of one end  
 or other suffering while teaching is going on,  
 4891-4, 5014-20, 5083-4, 5383-3a  
 Present, unsuitable to National Schools, and  
 detrimental to interests of both pupils and  
 teachers, . . . . . p. 474, II.  
 Subjects which should be emphasized,  
 5076-30, 5308-53a  
 Teachers should be left free to devise own  
 methods and no suggestions should be mixed  
 up with, . . . . . 5085-8, 5384-82, 5470-7  
 Teaching of essential subjects, question as to  
 whether arrangements are as good as formerly,  
 4891-4, 5059

**SCHOOLS :**

- Primary, Intermediate Board pressing Treasury  
 for Grants, . . . . . p. 476 II.  
 Number of hours of obligatory attendance,  
 5431-2  
 Swimming baths, provision in connection with  
 larger schools, question as to source of money,  
 5021-2

**TEACHERS**

- Examination after having left training college,  
 question as to desirability, 5023-4, 5153-5  
 Exception taken to not being at liberty to pro-  
 mote pupil except at beginning of school  
 year, . . . . . 5156-8, p. 477 II.  
 Freedom with regard to methods and classifica-  
 tion of pupils not attained under new system,  
 4874-7, 4897-5000  
 Increased facilities under new scheme for en-  
 couraging earnest teachers and controlling  
 negligent teachers, . . . . . 4978  
 Maternity rule objectionable and unaltered for  
 p. 477 II.  
 Necessity of preparation for lessons, question,  
 5092-4  
 One-teacher schools meet difficult to teach, but  
 debarred from promotion above third grade,  
 p. 476 II.  
 Rules and regulations with regard to conduct,  
 p. 477 II.  
 Start on career better equipped than formerly,  
 4821-5  
 Time-Table, bipartite and tripartite describing  
 arrangements made to suit, to construction of  
 school, . . . . . 5008-13  
 Drawing, see under School Programme.  
 Drawing Organisers, see under Organisers.  
 Dressmaking, see under School Programme.  
 Drill, see Physical drill, under School Programme.  
 Dublin, Archbishop of, interview with, on coming  
 revolution in system of National Education in  
 Ireland, extract from "Freeman's Journal,"  
 p. 510-11, II.  
 Dublin Conference, DeGuerth, St. p. 131; McNeill,  
 1244, 1312; Wynn, 2133-42; Purser, 3793-5,  
 3801-5; Wynne, 6949.  
 Dublin Conference report, Storrie, p. 511-16 II.

**E.****England, Public Elementary Schools :**

- Examinations, question as to effect abolition  
 would have on efficiency of children, Dale,  
 10680-9.  
 Grants, particulars, . . . . . p. 482 II.

**England, Public Elementary Schools—continued.**

- Chief Inspector, see Dale, F. F. 10409-691.  
 Code of regulations re supplementary teachers,  
 p. 483 II.  
 Increments and promotion, practice, Dale,  
 10630-42.  
 Manchester, payments to teachers, p. 463-4 II.

**LONDON COUNTY COUNCIL :**

- Award of annual increments under scale,  
 p. 485, II.  
 Extracts from handbook containing general  
 information, p. 486 II.  
 System of examination and inspection, p. 492 II.  
 Scholarships to secondary schools, Dale, 10788-91  
 School Programme, comparison of liberty granted  
 in Ireland and question, Dale, . . . . . 10683-76  
 Teachers, political liberty, Dale, . . . . . 10792-3  
 English, see under School Programme.

**Evening continuation schools :**

- not Adequate enrolment of young people in,  
 Forth, 9926-32, 9962  
 Average attendances, and effort on fees, Fitchell,  
 14108-7  
 Circular, . . . . . p. 141 I.  
 Estimates, and amount stated to have been re-  
 turned to Treasury, question, Forth, 9933-43;  
 Fitchell, 14070-3.  
 Increase in number, Storrie, . . . . . 11406  
 Memorandum and suggestions, . . . . . p. 594-5, II.  
 Prizes for teaching of Irish in, Storrie, . . . . . 11443  
 Scheme of payments to teacher, Forth, 9934-49  
 Scheme, and reasons for non-success, and alterna-  
 tive suggested, Forth, 9936-49, 9959-62  
 Examinations, see under Inspectors.  
 Examiners, see under Board of National Education.

**F.**

- FORTH, Francis C., Associate Royal College of  
 Science, Ireland; Principal of Municipal  
 Technical Institute, and Director of Technical  
 Instruction, Belfast: 8823-10101, App. XXIII.  
 Education, indifference of parents and children,  
 10018-24

**EVENING CONTINUATION SCHOOLS :**

- not Adequate enrolment of young people in,  
 9926-32, 9962  
 Estimates, and amount stated to have been  
 returned to Treasury, question, 9933-43  
 Inspection, attitude towards work needs radical  
 information, . . . . . 10067-86  
 Payments to teacher, . . . . . 9938-49  
 Scheme, and reasons for non-success, and  
 alternative suggested, 9936-49, 9959-62  
 Juvenile Advisory Committee of the Labour  
 Exchange, scheme of employment of children  
 having left National schools, 9902 10011

**SCHOOL ATTENDANCE :**

- Evils of present system of "single school day,"  
 10031-41  
 Low average, and remedy needed, 10012-3

**SCHOOL BUILDINGS :**

- Improvement greatly needed, . . . . . 10025  
 Increase in number urgently needed,  
 10025-30, 10042-64

**SCHOOLS :**

- Children employed to large extent out of school  
 hours in work which militates against proper  
 pursuit of daily studies, . . . . . 9995-7  
 Children insufficiently educated for vacancies  
 notified to Juvenile Advisory Committee,  
 10003-8  
 no Co-ordination between, and efficiency will  
 not be secured without close connection  
 between schools in same area, 10014-8  
 Half-time system, and tendency to lower stan-  
 dard of education, . . . . . 9998-10002  
 no Provision for mentally defective and un-  
 healthy children, and scheme advocated,  
 10080-2  
 Raising of leaving age advocated, . . . . . 10012

**FORTH, Francis C.—continued.****SCHOOLS—continued.**

Smallness of number of pupils passing to secondary schools, and provision of scholarships, advocated, . . . 9874-82, 10018  
Standard of efficiency not reached which should be, . . . 10086-90

**SCHOOL PROGRAMME:**

Elementary subjects, thorough teaching of, advocated, . . . 10093-5  
Free hand to teachers in theory but not in practice, . . . 10057-86  
Teachers, difficulty of doing work, 10057-66

**MUNICIPAL TECHNICAL INSTITUTES, BELFAST:**

Age, diagrams, . . . p. 431, II.  
Day Apprentice Classes, apprentices product of National schools and standard of education low, . . . 9904-10  
Day division, grades and classes included in, 9847  
Day Trade Preparatory School;  
Best work Corporation of Belfast is doing, 9853, 9871

**Entrance Examination:**

Candidates sometimes have not passed through sixth standard, 9857-9  
Failures, cause, and proportion, 9883-4,  
9857 9859-61, 9885  
Great bulk of applicants from National Schools, . . . 9857-8  
Number presenting themselves annually, 9857, 9881, 9859-70  
Percentage of marks required to pass, 9862  
Scope, . . . 9648-50, 9885  
Great demand for boys, . . . 9871-4  
Interval between boys leaving National Schools and joining, . . . 10095-101  
Length of course, . . . 9853  
Programme, . . . 9853-6  
Regulations for admission, . . . 9847-9, 9881-2  
Scholarships offered by Corporation, 9870-1  
Evening Classes, children enrolled in National Schools discouraged from attending, 9839-44  
Evening Division, Preparatory section:  
Entrance examination, scope and purpose, 9914-20  
Ex-National School pupils, low standard of education, . . . 9869, 9884-89  
Inspection, . . . 9923-9  
Under National Board, and difficulty of working scheme, 9920-6, 9931-3  
Scope, . . . 9914-26  
Started in 1902, . . . 9922, 9903  
Number of students enrolled, and ages, 9837-9  
Time table of classes handed in, . . . 9990

**TECHNICAL INSTITUTES AND SCHOOLS:**

Boys coming from National Schools found very insufficiently prepared to take advantage of, 9824-32

**TRADE PREPARATORY SCHOOLS:**

Boys eligible for, and having exhausted programme of Elementary Schools, and kept marking time, suggested remedy, 9896-7, 9900-4  
Funds, source, . . . 9886-9  
Grade of education which should be provided by National Board, 9870, 9882-3, 9882-9  
Increased number desirable, 9882, 9884-5, 10018

**France:**

Payment of teachers in, *Wage*, . . . p. 135  
System of inspection, etc., *Parer*, 4333-93, 472-3, II.  
"Freeman's Journal," extracts re interview with Archbishop of Dublin, . . . p. 510-11

**FRIZZELL, David, Accountant, National Education Office:**

Office: . . . 12916-14121 App. XXXVI.  
**BOARD OF NATIONAL EDUCATION:**  
Accountant, duties, 13624-32, p. 517, II.  
Cost of administration, 14078-8  
Estimate of amount of parliamentary vote, manner of preparation, and circumstances in which it becomes necessary to surrender balances, . . . 13933-67  
Resident Commissioner, salary home on Civil Service vote, and pensionable, 14108-9

**FRIZZELL, David—continued.****DENTAL TREATMENT:**

Schools, particulars, . . . 14129-31  
Vote provided, but with stipulation that equal amount was provided locally and therefore ineffective, . . . 14127-8  
Evening schools, average attendances, and effect on fees, . . . 14102-7

**GRADES:**

First, first and second sections, standard numbers, and insufficiency, . . . 13942-3  
Second, standard numbers, . . . 13963-8  
Standard numbers fixed by Commissioners after consultation with Treasury, 13982-3, 14085-7

**INCREMENTS:**

Awarding upon certificate of manager instead of obtaining certain marks, question, 13971-84, 14101  
Percentage of teachers obtaining, question, 14093-4  
Revised scale, criticism, 13985-14041, 14116-21  
Pensions, percentage of teachers running through all grades up to maximum, question, 14095-9

**SALARIES:**

Any new scheme must present difficulties and lead to increased expenditure, 14089-92  
Monthly payment, difficulties, 14083-8  
Quarterly payment, routine, . . . 13968-70  
Revised scale, criticism, 13983-14041, 14116-21  
Rule bearing on average attendance sanctioned by Treasury, . . . 14058-9  
Teachers, fines, procedure, 14110-5, 14121-4

**G.**

Gardening, see under School Programme.

Geography, see under School Programme.

Geometry, see under School Programme.

Germany, comparison of way in dealing with reading lessons with England, *Furner*, 6140-4

GILL, T. P., Secretary of the Department of Agriculture and Technical Instruction for Ireland: 7929-8030

**AGRICULTURE AND TECHNICAL INSTRUCTION,****DEPARTMENT OF:**

Agricultural branch, types of colleges and schools under, . . . 7940

Capitation grant assessed on work done, and explanation, 7981-90, 7985-8084, 8014-29

Comparison of system with that of National Board, difficult, . . . 7939, 7947

**INSTRUCTIONS:**

Complaints against method of dealing with, 8006-10

Conferences, . . . 7962-8

Interchange of districts, . . . 7056-63

Number and powers, . . . 7941-8

Question whether official visits would override verdict of, . . . 8003-5

Recommendations not invariably carried out, 8010-11

Reports:

Classification of schools in, 7956-8

Unsatisfactory, procedure, 7969-75

Trouble taken to keep up to developments which may arise, . . . 8030

Series of inspections throughout year and final inspection before grants are assessed, 7964, 7991-94

System, and steps taken to secure tolerably uniform judgment of schools, 7946-8030

Teachers, trouble taken to keep up to developments which may arise, . . . 8030

Technical Instruction Branch, types of schools under, . . . 7939-40

Work classified in two main divisions, 7939

**Grades:**

1st. Sections 1 and 2:

Block in promotion owing to standard numbers having been reached, *Dilworth*, 181, 153-78, 164, 437-9, 1188-9, p. 132 I; *Comerford*, 7836-86, 7842-9; *Clarke*, 9281-3; *Starkie*, 11335-40, 11459-60, 11921-4, 12549-63;

*Frizzell*, 13963-3; *Hobson*, 14274-7, 14317-28.

## Grades—continued.

## 1st—continued.

- Increments, standards of reports required for, *Dillworth*, 204, 1197, p. 132 I.; *McNeill*, 1726.  
 Number of teachers in receipt of salary of, *Table*, *Dillworth*, ... p. 164 I.  
 Promotion to, standards of reports required for, *Dillworth*, 143, 1133-6, 1198-1200, p. 132 I.  
 Provision for rapid promotion of specially meritorious teachers, *Dillworth*, 192, p. 132 I.  
 Scale of salaries proposed for men and women, and question, *Storkie*, ... 13654-73  
 Standard numbers fixed after consultation with Treasury, and refusal to make any alteration, *Storkie*, ... 11335-49  
 Standard numbers, question re introduction of wording "under arrangement with Treasury" into Rules, *Dillworth*, 967-62.  
 Women, standard numbers and will be filled before end of next year, *Dillworth*, 161, p. 132 I.; *Storkie*, 12532-3.

## 2nd:

- Increment, standard of reports required for, *Dillworth*, ... 204, 1197, p. 132 I.  
 maximum numbers, *Dillworth*, 161, p. 132 I.  
 Number of teachers in receipt of salary of, *Table*, *Dillworth*, ... p. 164 I.  
 Numbers eligible for promotion on vacancies, question, *Dillworth*, ... 1189-93, 458-63  
 Promotion to, standards of reports required for, *Dillworth*, 143, 1133-6, 1198-1200, p. 132 I.  
 Scale of salaries proposed for men and women, and question, *Storkie*, ... 13654-73  
 Special Promotion to, regulations, *Dillworth*, 191-2, p. 132 I.  
 Standard numbers, *Frissell*, ... 13962-8  
 Standard numbers not nearly reached, *Storkie*, ... 12530  
 Standard numbers, question re introduction of wording "under arrangement with Treasury" into Rules, *Dillworth*, ... 967-62

## 3rd:

- Increment, standard of reports required for, *Dillworth*, ... 203-4, 1197, p. 132 I.  
 Number of teachers in receipt of salary of, *Table*, *Dillworth*, ... p. 164 I.  
 One-teacher schools most difficult to teach, but debarred from promotion above, *Downing*, p. 476 II.  
 Regulations re special promotion of assistants, to second grade, *Dillworth*, ... 193-6  
 Scale of salaries proposed for men and women, and question, *Storkie*, ... 13654-73  
 Comparison of old classes with, *Downing*, ... 5301-18  
 Final result of promotions, and summary, p. 626 II.  
 Grading in respect of schools on institution of new scheme in 1905, *Downing*, ... 4950-70, 5118-24, 5248-72, 5318-25, 5424-30  
 Gross total, *Dillworth*, ... .. 163  
 Memorandum, re ... .. p. 522 II.  
 Proposal for rearrangement of available places in different, so as to increase numbers in higher, and refusal, *Dillworth*, ... 471-4  
 Report of Financial Assistant Secretary, showing how rules have been carried out for first triennial period under new system, p. 522-6, II.  
 Standard numbers fixed by Commissioners in consultation with Treasury, *Clarke*, 9358-66, 9226-33; *Dillworth*, 470; *Leeson*, 11020-1, 14370-92, 14424-47; *Frissell*, 13962-8, 14056-7.  
 System of, only thing that really compels annual report, *Dale*, ... .. 10578-9  
 Time taken to get from bottom to top, *Dillworth*, 655-7; *Bingham*, 7303, 7460-7; *Curran*, 7490; *McNulty*, 338-94; *Storkie*, 11459-64; *Clarke*, 9129-32; *Dale*, 10844-50.

see also Increment, and Promotion.

Grammar, see under School Programme.

GRIERSON, Very Reverend Charles, R.D., Dean of Belfast: .. .. 5851-5985

## INSPECTORS:

- Examinations, 5892-7, 5934-7, 5961-72, 5976-8  
 Tone and manner towards teachers, and change in, desirable, ... 5365, 5917-33, 5942-55, 5973-6, 5981-5  
 Want of uniformity and illustration, ... 5902-9, 5956-9  
 Local aid, amount in certain case, ... 5979-81

## MANAGERS:

- Only get notice of inspector's visit on morning, ... 5864-6  
 Rule re holding periodic examinations, question re, ... .. 5884-8

## MERIT MARKS:

- Tone of school taken into account rather than knowledge and proficiency of pupils, ... 5914-6, 5960  
 Uniformity, desirable, but difficulty in attaining, ... 5910-13  
 School cleaning, no obligation put on teacher, or known of personally, ... 5881-3, 5933-9  
 School year, uniform bearing on inspection, ... 5979-80  
 Schools, improvement on whole as to efficiency under present system, ... 5889-907, 5940-1

## H.

Hand-and-eye training, see under School Programme.

History, see under School Programme.

HOBSON, REV. E. W., Rector of Portadown: 14132-14226

## BOARD OF NATIONAL EDUCATION:

- Commissioners, qualifications, question of, 14219  
 Experts consulted on introduction of new system, but not people directly interested, ... 14239-41  
 Surrender of balances to Treasury, question of, ... 14268-73  
 Increments, annual, through efficiency of work, not through lapse of time, advocated, ... 14206-11, 14253-64  
 INSPECTORS:  
 Attitude to teachers considered absolutely wrong, and want of co-operation, ... 14295-309, 14314-5, 14175-82, 14218  
 Examination by, favoured and question as to time of, ... 14168-74, 14220-47  
 Interference with teachers' methods, ... 14265  
 Notice of visits of general examination, question, ... 14183-5, 14238-47  
 Observations on appeals from teachers and unfairness, ... 14185-93, 14248-52  
 Irish, unfairness of extra fees being given for, and not for any other language, ... 14316-7

## MANAGERS:

- Notice of inspectors' visits, shortness, ... 14165-6  
 Responsibility of, question, ... 14301-13

## MERIT MARKS:

- Abolition, question as to how stimulus is to be provided, ... 14151-2  
 Condition of school and school equipment as affecting, ... 14157-62, 14194-7  
 Individual suggested and explanation, 14212-7  
 Uniformity, question and instances, ... 14143-51, 14290-4  
 Promotion, "paper," as result of fixing of standard number in higher grades, 14274-7, 14317-26  
 Results system, comparison, ... 14153-74

## SALARIES:

- should go Direct to Teachers, ... 14196-202  
 Higher, advocated, ... 14202-5, 14281-3  
 Monthly payment, would increase work of managers enormously, ... 14198-202  
 Teachers, no stampage on letters sent to inspectors, ... 14277-89  
 Hyde, Dr. Douglas, statement that under tone circular inspector who did not like teaching of Irish language could put down school as bad, unjustified, *McNeill*, ... 2045, 1730-9  
 Hydraulics, see under School Programme.

HYNEN, James Joseph, M.A., ex-Chief Inspector:  
6827-7203

Appeals, procedure, and suggestion, .. 6985-90, 7092-6

Belfast case, .. 6943-4, 6779-84, 6961-70, 7069-72, 7031-62,  
7144-66, 7182-3, 7195-9

Council case, .. 6713-52, 6817-29, 6906-45, 6970, 7008-39, 7056,  
7093-7, 7072-83, 7125-55, 7161-87, 7191-4  
Increment, automatic and annual unless deburred  
by grave irregularity or inefficiency, advocated,  
7188-90, 7200-3

#### INCREMENTS:

Appointments, made objectionable and interview  
first and competitive examination afterwards  
advocated, .. 6590-8  
Certain amount of examination desirable, and  
should vary according to school and inspector,  
6836-46, 6971-3

#### Chief:

Appeals sent for investigation by, .. 6785-89, 7084-91  
Examiners not bound to bring papers for  
consideration with, .. 6653, 6976-8  
Functions, and change in, and question as to  
desirability of restoring work of revising  
reports and recommending action, .. 6939-4551, 6935-64, 6956-68  
Nothing to do with reports except when  
referred to, as a special case, .. 6536-40  
no Power to hold re-inspection unless specially  
instructed, .. 6540-2, 6546-50, 6785A, 6812-16  
Right to visit any school at any time, .. 6543-5, 6657-63  
Unjustifiable and irritating exercise of power  
over, question, .. 6908-4  
Conferences:  
of all school inspectors not called, and not  
known of, and not much importance attached  
to, .. 6559-64  
Regular holding, question, .. 6552-6  
Districts changed too frequently, and good deal  
of present discontent attributed to, and  
cause, and old system preferred, .. 6577-84, 6604-82, 6869-75  
Disturbing influence of Resident Commissioner  
on free discharge of duties by, .. 6906-11  
Training, system should be sufficient, .. 6597-9  
Visits, notice of, longer to managers and teachers,  
question of desirability, .. 6891-7007

#### MERIT MARKS:

Abrupt changes in, no part of business of any  
officer to direct attention to, .. 6553-9  
Change, as result of re-inspection, .. 6795-6  
Inspectors inclined to be indulgent in third  
year, .. 6573-6  
Inspectors very easily dissuaded on short visits  
without examining, .. 7120-4  
Lowering, without examination, indefensible,  
6840-6  
State of school promises as factor of, .. 6950-50  
Tone, emphasis laid on, and not agreeing with,  
not understood, .. 6662-4  
Uniformity:  
Discussed at conferences, .. 6565-6, 6552, 6557  
Impossible, and undesirable, and system of  
awarding increments on, abominable, and  
should be abolished, .. 6571, 6567-70, 6786, 6830-5

Monitors and monitoresses, desire to get into service  
as teachers through doorway of, question, .. 6923-34

Reports, no criticism of policy of Board, .. 6801-3

#### SCHOOL PROGRAMME:

more Educational than Results system, and  
more efficient in cultivating intelligence, .. 6600-22, 6753-78  
Overloaded, and modified programmes not pro-  
posed to extent they might be, .. 6683-38, 6753-68, 6847-53, 6889-905, 7097-  
119

School year, separate, for each school desirable,  
but many objections, .. 6974-84  
Teachers, dearth in supply of candidates for  
training colleges, and causes, .. 6577-98

Time table, hours allotted to reading, writing  
and arithmetic question, .. 6700-12

## I.

#### Increments:

Annual and automatic on satisfactory reports,  
scheme, McNeill, 1456-60, 1503-4, 1853-7; Wynn,  
2547-8, 2383-9; O'Connor, 3016-22a, 3030-7,  
3337-47; Purser, 3897-916, 6099-105, 4463-65,  
4516-35 p. 454, II; Posner, 5890; Barnes, 5064-  
70, 6065-100, 6118-28; Wynn, 7183-30, 7200-3  
Affiler, 8077-9; Makoff, 8403-7, 8435-8, 8557-  
63; Clark, 9133-7; Ward, 9320-4, 9382-407,  
9707-14; Trustum, 10149-61, 10204, 10219;  
Starke, 11357-60, 11863-7, 11908-21, 11923-7,  
12065-70; Hobson, 14206-11, 14253-64  
Annual, originally proposed but abandoned and  
rescued, Starke, .. 11803, 12389, 12052-6  
to Assistants summing up of work of teachers  
necessary for, Dilworth, .. 75  
Awarding of, Dilworth, .. 123, p. 132, I  
Awarding upon certificate of manager instead of  
obtaining certain marks, question, Friswell,  
13971-84, 14101  
Certificate, form of, Lemass .. p. 485-9, II  
Circumstances, .. p. 143, 144, I  
Circumstances under which teachers have not to  
wait another triennial period on failure to  
obtain, Dilworth, 423-33; Wynn, 2072-5; Starke,  
12461-3  
Claims dealt with by experienced inspector brought  
into office specially for purpose, Dilworth,  
146, 157-8  
Conditions as to size of school, Dilworth, p. 132, I  
Date of commencement of scheme, McNeill,  
1816-17  
Depending on average attendance, and grievance  
of boys under 7 being ineligible, Wynn, 2547-54  
Diminishing, and raising fixed salaries suggested,  
McNeill, 1451-62, 1500-5, 1512-29, 1623-7,  
1831-57, 1908, 2024-42  
Docket, form for, .. p. 163-3, I  
Given as regularly as clockwork in 80 per cent. of  
cases, Lemass, 14389; Starke, 12815-19, 12386-  
8  
not increments of ordinary salary but of special  
good service salary, Lemass, .. 11073-3  
Inspectors have no official information as to when  
teachers are in third year, Starke, 12921-4  
Many teachers having qualified cannot get, for  
want of funds, Downing .. p. 476, II  
Merit Marks, see that title  
Necessity in interests of teachers of system of,  
and administration with all fairness that can  
reasonably be expected, possible, Wynn, 2109-48,  
2243-61, 2262-301, 2269-72; O'Connor, 3024-15  
Origin of system, question, Dilworth, 452-64;  
McNeill, 1636-90  
Original proposal for award on satisfactory report,  
Downing, .. 4957-9  
Paid triennially from certain fixed date, and each  
teacher dealt with as his year arrives, McNeill,  
1811-14  
Percentage of teachers obtaining, question, Fris-  
well, .. 14093-4  
Practice in England, Dale, .. 10930-42  
Principal might be damaged by bad assistant,  
Dilworth, 61-3, 185-202, 375-7; Purser, 3576-7;  
Makoff, 8394-9, 8517-22; Ward, 9388-9  
Procedure, Dilworth, 556, p. 132; Wynn, 2056-70  
Return of numbers of teachers deburred from  
obtaining, in years 1903-1912, .. p. 518, II  
Report of Financial Assistant Secretary showing  
how rules have been carried out for first triennial  
period under new system, .. p. 522-8, II  
Revised scale, and criticism, Starke, 13054-73;  
Friswell, 13985-14041, 14116-21  
Scheme, Starke, .. 12676-700, 12796-7  
Schemes proposed not considered an improvement  
on, Wynn, 2106-48, 2243-61, 2269-301, 2242  
Severe responsibility on inspectors in third year  
owing to increments and promotion depending  
on, McNeill,  
1835-4, 1444-62, 1500-3, 1512-29, 1623-7,  
1727-9, 2043-4, 1900-17  
Slow rate a serious discouragement, and suggested  
remedy, Dingwall, .. 7303, 7450-7  
Standard of reports required for, Dilworth, 203-4,  
1197, p. 132, I; McNeill, 1725-1726  
Statement as to number of teachers who received,  
each year since introduction of new system,  
p. 517, II



## Increments—continued.

|   |                 |
|---|-----------------|
| Suggestion that effect of reform of, should not extend beyond year in which it is refused, and question, <i>Starke</i> , .. | 12701-15        |
| System had, <i>Starke</i> , ..  | 11901, 12037-84 |
| System elaborated by Board, <i>Starke</i> , ..  | 12400-4         |
| System largely copied from local Service and mistaken idea of teachers <i>vs. Lomas</i> , ..                                | 11039-55        |
| Table, 1907-12, <i>Dilworth</i> , ..  | p. 154, 1.      |
| Teachers having joined since 1899 at a low initial salary have stronger claim to than other teachers, <i>Starke</i> , ..    | 12716-8         |
| Undergraded teachers, plan for, <i>Bingham</i> , ..   | 7203            |
| <i>see also Grades, and Promotion.</i>  |                 |

## Inspectors :

## AGREEMENTS :

|  |                |
|--|----------------|
| Advertisement of vacancies put in papers, <i>McNeill</i> , ..  | 1247-8         |
| Age limit, <i>Dilworth</i> , ..  | 16-17          |
| Alphabetical list of candidates and qualifications drawn up, <i>McNeill</i> , ..   | 1247-8         |
| Candidates interviewed by committee of whole Board, who make nomination to Board, <i>Starke</i> , ..   | 11031          |
| Candidates introduced one by one before Board resulting in final selection, <i>McNeill</i> , ..  | 1254-60        |
| Canvassing, <i>Bingham</i> , ..  | 7271-80        |
| Demand of teachers for all positions as, under Results system, <i>Lomas</i> , ..   | 10938-9        |
| Examination not considered necessary; and personal qualifications important, <i>Dale</i> , ..  | 10481-3 10741. |
| First selection of candidates made by Chief Inspector, <i>McNeill</i> , ..   | 1247-51        |
| by limited competition suggested, but objected to, <i>Starke</i> , ..  | 12744-7        |
| List revised by Resident Commissioner and Secretaries, <i>McNeill</i> , ..   | 1252           |
| on merit, and better men, <i>Starke</i> , ..   | 12707          |
| Made objectionable and interview first and competitive examination afterwards advocated, <i>Hynes</i> , ..   | 6509-6         |
| Made suggested, <i>Bingham</i> , ..  | 7275-84        |
| Number of applications received, <i>McNeill</i> , ..   | 1246, 1247-8   |
| Old system, <i>Downing</i> , ..  | 4851-3a        |
| Procedure, <i>Dilworth</i> , 1177-96; <i>McNeill</i> , 1246-68; <i>Bingham</i> , 7303-19, 7357; <i>Starke</i> , 12748-50.  |                |
| Recruitment from ranks of national teachers, question, <i>Dilworth</i> , 18-19; <i>McNeill</i> , 1460-71; <i>Downing</i> , 5063-75; <i>Poser</i> , 5823-4; <i>Bingham</i> , 7397-74; <i>Cassius</i> , 7314-6; <i>Tristram</i> , 10133-5; <i>Dale</i> , 10742-8; <i>Lomas</i> , 11054-5; <i>Starke</i> , 12748, 12746-76. |                |
| Selected candidates summoned for qualifying examination, <i>McNeill</i> , ..   | 1252-4, 1261-3 |
| Arrangements for instruction in new system of hand-and-eye training and elementary science and opposition to, <i>Lomas</i> , ..  | 11138-40       |
| no Charge against as inspectors, <i>Woodward</i> , ..  | 6496-501       |

## CHIEF :

|   |   |
|---|---|
| Abolition of office of chief of inspection and appointment of, and no degradation intended by change in name, <i>Lomas</i> , .. | 11056-64, 11063-127                         |
| Actual authority, question of, <i>Starke</i> , ..   | 12138-53, 12165-6                           |
| Additional, proposed, and position to be occupied by, <i>Starke</i> , ..  | 12000-8                                     |
| have ample means of knowing variation in standard, <i>Starke</i> , ..   | 11489-96                                    |
| Appeals have to be countersigned by Resident Commissioner before being sent to, <i>Starke</i> , ..                              | 12441                                       |
| Appeals sent for investigation by, <i>McNeill</i> , ..  | 1803-1907; <i>Hynes</i> , 6785-90, 7034-91. |
| Authority over award of merit mark, and question, <i>Poser</i> , ..   | 4410-6                                      |
| Control of variations in merit marks, question, <i>Dilworth</i> , ..  | 870-6                                       |
| Communication with Resident Commissioner, <i>Poser</i> , ..   | 4569-75                                     |
| Differences of opinion between Senior District Inspectors <i>vs.</i> marking referred to, <i>Starke</i> , ..                    | 12806-10                                    |

## Inspectors—continued.

## CHIEF—continued.

|  |  |
|--|--|
| Disloyal to Board from beginning and success of new scheme endangered by, <i>Starke</i> , ..   | 11266-90, 11295-7, 11299   |
| Dispute with secretary about modified programme, and as a result Board decided that two offices were quite independent, <i>Starke</i> , .. | 13089-703; <i>Lomas</i> , 14460-82.                                  |
| Duties of chiefs of inspection divided between examiners and, <i>Starke</i> , ..   | 11290-1  |
| Duties under old and new systems compared, <i>Downing</i> , ..   | 5027-41  |
| Eleven circuits under control of, <i>Dilworth</i> , ..   | 23   |
| Examiners not bound to bring papers for consultation with, <i>Hynes</i> , ..   | 6053, 6476-8   |
| in fairly constant communication with senior inspectors, <i>O'Connor</i> , ..  | 2929-3001  |
| First selection made by, of candidates for appointment of Junior Inspector, <i>McNeill</i> , ..  | 1247-61  |
| Free to move about from school to school within own circuit, <i>McNeill</i> , ..   | 1303a-6  |
| Functions, p. 150, 1.; <i>O'Connor</i> , 2625-9; <i>Starke</i> , 11683-767.  |  |
| Functions, and change in, and question as to desirability of restoring work of revising reports and recommending action, <i>Hynes</i> , .. | 6536-6551, 6835-54, 6856-68  |
| General correction of inspection, <i>McNeill</i> , ..  | 1230-7   |
| Incidental visits considered one of principal duties, <i>McNeill</i> , ..  | 1256, 1255   |
| should have informed Board of striking reduction in value of merit marks, <i>Starke</i> , ..   | 12472-80   |
| no investigation by, into marking of inspectors can be taken without express order of Resident Commissioner, <i>Starke</i> , ..            | 11609  |
| Letter sent to, asking for consideration and report of new arrangements of circuits and their memorandum thereon, <i>Lomas</i> , ..        | 11174-8.   |
| 11162-4, p. 507-9, 11.   |  |
| Means of testing uniformity of inspection through, <i>Dilworth</i> , ..  | 481-6  |
| Most highly paid officials, with intention of breeding ambition to be appointed secretaries, <i>Starke</i> , ..                            | 11264  |
| New programme sent to, in rough state for criticism, <i>Lomas</i> , ..   | 11166  |
| Nothing to do with reports except when referred to, as a special case, <i>Hynes</i> , ..   | 6636-40  |
| Number on staff and circuits under, <i>Dilworth</i> , ..   | 15, p. 129, 1.; <i>McNeill</i> , 1231; <i>Dale</i> , 10473, 10411-5. |
| no Official information of trouble which had arisen in <i>Clonard, Poser</i> , ..  | 4297   |
| One-fifth of schools taken in each year, and question as to sufficiency to know district, <i>Starke</i> , ..                               | 12134-62   |
| no Opportunity of knowing reports, <i>Downing</i> , ..   | 4752-6   |
| Part of duties to visit my school chosen, <i>Downing</i> , ..  | 4756-7   |
| no Power to hold re-inspection unless specially instructed, <i>Hynes</i> , ..  | 6540-2, 6540-30, 6785a, 6812-16                                      |
| Power limited to reporting facts, <i>O'Connor</i> , ..   | 2930-3   |
| Power over reports, and duties in office, <i>Poser</i> , ..  | 4290-85  |
| Reports should be sent in through, <i>Poser</i> , ..   | 4149-52  |
| Resident Commissioner superior authority to, in everything, <i>Starke</i> , ..   | 13597-600  |
| no Responsibility for preparation of "Notes to Teachers" as a whole, and not forced on teachers, <i>Poser</i> , ..                         | 4307-13  |
| Right of appeal to Board in case of variance with Resident Commissioner, question, <i>Ward</i> , ..  | 5012-7   |
| Right to visit any schools at any time, <i>Downing</i> , ..  | 4765-7; <i>Hynes</i> , 6543-5, 6637-83.                              |
| Secretaries restored to original position, and have now actual authority over, <i>Starke</i> , ..  | 12751-5  |
| Subordinate to Resident Commissioner and not to Secretaries, <i>Starke</i> , ..  | 11261-4  |
| Suspension by Resident Commissioner, and question as to powers, <i>Ward</i> , ..   | 5009-11  |

## Inspectors—continued.

## Cause—continued.

- Unjustifiable and irritating exercise of power over, question, *Hynes*, . . . 6808-4  
*see also* Downing, Edmund, 4723-5531; *Hynes*, James Joseph, M.A., 6827-7203; *McNeill*, John, B.A., 1218-2045; *O'Connor*, T. P., B.A., 2620-3538; *Purser*, Alfred, 3714-4722.  
 Circuit records, circular, . . . p. 141, I.  
 Credits, division of work into, and arrangements, *Dilworth*, 25-4, 87, 277-9, p. 120-31; *McNeill*, 1222; *Purser*, 4917-23, p. 463, II.; *Ward*, 9478-88; *Dole*, 10466-78; *Starke*, 11650-7.  
 Credits, new, letter of inspection to Chief Inspectors and their memorandum thereon, . . . p. 567-8, II.  
 Circulars to merit marks assigned to schools after general inspections, . . . p. 516, II.  
 Circulars to, . . . p. 137-43, 145, 147-8, 149-50, I.

Circulars issued after Belfast and Clonmel cases, question as to distrust of, shown in, *Clarke*, 9165-74

- Class of men inferior to that under old system, *Beeson*, . . . 6021-31, 6183  
 Competency, question, *Starke*, . . . 12811-25  
 should confer with teacher after every inspection or examination, *Purser*, . . . 3921-4

## CONFERENCES:

- Dublin, 1904, *Dilworth*, 87, p. 131, I.; *McNeill*, 1244, 1312; *Wye*, 2333-42; *Purser*, 3793-5, 5800-15; *Hynes*, 6049; *Starke*, p. 511-16, II.  
 Duty of chief inspectors to preside at, and official notice sent to, *Starke*, 12265-81  
 Eleven, held by Chief Inspector during year, one for each senior inspector's circuit, *Dilworth* 484-6, 1311, *McNeill*, 1237-42.  
 Frequency of, question, *Dilworth*, 508-10; *O'Connor*, 2981-8; *Purser*, 4029-32; *Downing*, 4758-65; *Hynes*, 6582-8.

General of all circuits:  
 no importance attached to, *Hynes*, 6553-64

- Suggested as remedy to want of uniformity, *Biagham*, 7256-66; *Tristram*, 10176-81;  
*McNeill*, 1245-6; *O'Connor*, 2640-4.

Holding under old system, and change in procedure in recent years, *Downing*, 4803-7, 4826-8; *Lemass*, 14494-5.

Importance of periodical, conjoined in several circuits, instructions, *re*, *Dilworth*, 87, p. 130-1, I.; *Starke*, 11654, 11657.

Intention to hold, with object of securing greater uniformity, *O'Connor*, . . . 2634-9

Procedure, *McNeill*, 1315-32, 1391; *O'Connor*, 2989-98, 3248-53.

of Senior inspectors, extract from report, *Purser*, . . . p. 223, I.

Uniform standard specially considered at, and agreement arrived at regarding value to be allotted to different merit marks, *Starke*, 11657-66

Uniformity question seldom discussed, and not considered efficient means of securing uniformity, *Purser*, . . . 4053-9

Criticism of action of, thought to be doing harm to education of district by Teachers' Organisation, question, *Dilworth*, . . . 917-8

Criticism of policy of Board not allowed, in Blue Book to be presented to Parliament, but at liberty to approach Board with any suggestions, *McNeill*, 1673-84, 1956-66; *Wye*, 2179-80; *Hynes*, 6801-3; *Starke*, 12843-52.

Distribution of staff under old system, and comparison with new, *Purser*, . . . 4014-16

Distribution of work, circular, . . . p. 146-7, I.

## DUTIES:

- Appointed before 1809 by limited competitive examination, and different scale of salary from those appointed since, but duties same, *Dilworth*, . . . 15  
 Circular to, . . . p. 144, I.  
 Differences of opinion with Senior Inspectors referred to Chief Inspector, *Starke*, 12806-10  
 Number, *Dilworth*, . . . 15, p. 129  
 New programme sent to, in rough state for criticism, *Lemass*, . . . 11106  
 District system, restoration, with 6 or 8 head inspectors advocated, *Purser*, 3796, p. 463, I.

## Inspectors—continued.

## Districts:

- Changed too frequently, *Downing*, 4820-32, 5045-52, 5124-31, p. 476, II.; *Purser*, 5825-7;  
*Beeson*, 6060-4; *Collis*, 5236-8, 6373-4;  
*Hynes*, 6377-84, 6664-82, 6869-75; *Biagham*, 7240-41; *Cummins*, 7493-6; *MacLaughlin*, 7777-80; *Tristram*, 10157-75; *Dole*, 10470-2;  
*Starke*, 12609-31.

Divisional, scheme for appointment of, *Dilworth*, 120-2, 478-80, p. 131, I.; *Wye*, 2342-619; *Ward*, 9504-701, 9715-6; *Dole*, 10474-8, 10869;  
*Starke*, 12153-6, 12606, 12759-60.

Duties, *Dilworth*, . . . p. 129-30, I.

- Examination question, *Wye*, 2182-3, 2573-7;  
*O'Connor*, 2670-8, 3119-22, 3218-34; *Purser*, 3863-96, 4040-5, 4120-30, 4155-63, p. 464, II.;  
*Downing*, 4837-64, 4979-84, 60929, 5237-47,  
 5412-7, 5423, 5478-87, p. 475-6, II.; *Purser*,  
 6543-51, 5660-5, 5643-54, 5611-6, 5674-69,  
 5734-45, 5777-84, 5701-6, 5635, 57844-67,  
 5833-7, 5848-50; *O'Brien*, 5892-7, 5934-7,  
 5961-72, 5975-8; *Beeson*, 6155-6; *O'Sullivan*,  
 6251-61, 6234-9, 6370-2, 6380-4; *Woodward*,  
 6602-12; *Hynes*, 6830-46, 6971-3; *Biagham*,  
 7285-90, 7333-49, 7364-77, 7425-32; *Cummins*,  
 7497-613, 7575-8, 7598-602, 7625-35;  
*MacLaughlin*, 7781-6, 7801-6, 7820, 7857-79,  
 7918-34; *McCarthy*, 8331, 8338-7, 8357-78,  
 8434-47, 8509-10, 8537-40, 8585-607, 8627-31;  
*Clarke*, 9078-88, 9199-205; *Ward*, 9298, 9338-50, 9339-44, 9570-9, 9615-21, 9679-81, 9704-73;  
*Dole*, 10362-7, 10380-9, 10608-706, 10762-87,  
 10877-85; *Tristram*, 10138-48, 10220-1, 10250-76, 10282-307, 10350-5, 10374-82, 10398-401,  
*Starke*, 11355-6, 11370, 11363-73, 11378-9,  
 12183-90; *Beeson*, 14164-74, 14220-47.

Extravagant structural requirements, question, *McCarthy*, . . . 8249-51

Forbidden to give orders in schools, other than model schools, *Dilworth*, 43, p. 129, I.; *McNeill*, 1570-1

should be free to express honest opinions, *Downing*, p. 477, II.

Hampered by Results system, *Lemass*, 10967-14414

## HEAD:

Absorbed in senior inspectors with higher salaries and no degradation intended by change in name, *Lemass*, 11057-64, 11083-127, 11135-7, 11147; *Starke*, 11267-69.

Abolished in 1909 and made senior inspectors, and objections to change overruled, *Purser*, 4008-13, 4508-10; *Downing*, 5042-4.

Appeal against change of name and consequent suspension of Messrs. Downing and Purser, particulars *re* and *re* previous record, *Starke*, 11260-90

Dismissal for insubordination, history, *Lemass*, 10811-3

Duties, *re*, *Starke*, 11233-43, 11247-57

Means taken under old system to secure uniformity, *Downing*, . . . 4759-807

Number and duties, *Purser*, . . . 3928-8

Re-examination by, proceedings, *Purser*, 3768-70

Salaries not affected by change, only functions, *Purser*, . . . 4202-6

Immediately in charge of school directed to hold enquiry in cases of complaints against teachers, and procedure, *Purser*, . . . 5403-25

Inspection and investigation, question *re* difference, *Starke*, . . . 13910-5

Improvement in status as compared with men of 35 years ago, and attributed largely to present system of selection, *Lemass*, . . . 14327-31

Inadvisable to place direct responsibility on, for scheduling or grading or promotion of teacher, *Dole*, . . . 10436-40, 10616, 10726

Initial salaries should be raised in order to secure better qualified candidate, *Biagham*, 7282-4; *Dole*, 10479-80, 10734; *Starke*, 12797-800.

no instance known of speaking against system of grading Merit Marks, *Dilworth*, . . . 420-2

Instructions to, calculated to lead to error, to want of uniformity, and consequently to injustice and hardship to teachers, *Downing*, p. 474-5, II.

## Inspectors—continued.

- Interference with teachers' methods, question, *McNeill*, 1493-7; *O'Connor*, 3191-201; *Downing*, 5055-8, 5384-92, 5470-7; *Poser*, 5714-4, 5855, 8617; *Hobson*, 14285; *Ford*, 10067-66; *Tristram*, 10132-93; *Starkie*, 13777-80.
- Joint inspection, and discussion to see whether estimates correspond, *McNeill*, 1592-4
- could not judge of proficiency of school by looking at Progress and Syllabus books, &c., *Downing*, 5030-1
- Judgment of character of schools not possible by mere system of inspection, *Poser*, 4069-80, 4153-5

## JUNIOR :

- Allotment of work and number of schools, *McNeill*, 1224-5
- Inspections made by, after training would be accepted as sufficient, *McNeill*, 1292-4
- Interchange of schools between senior and junior as tending to produce uniformity, *McNeill*, 1238, 1302-3
- Merit Mark may not be altered by, without concurrence of senior inspector, *Dilworth*, 161, 820-4, 802-9, 1093-5, p. 131; *McNeill*, 1351-2; *Starkie*, 11853, 12435-61.
- Permanent appointment from Commissioners obtained at end of second 6 months, but charge of action or district not guaranteed, *McNeill*, 1300-1
- should have Power to raise merit mark, but not to lower, *Ford*, 9209
- Senior inspector should join with, to see whether merit mark could not be raised, *Starkie*, 12452
- Sufficiency of initial salary to secure as good men as desired, question, *Ford*, 9439-51
- Time which would elapse before getting charge of a district, question, *McNeill*, 1281, 1287, 1290-1

## Training :

- Chief Inspector responsible for, *McNeill*, 1264
- Confidential reports from Senior Inspectors at end of six months, *McNeill*, 1275-4
- Definite instructions about manner of awarding merit marks and drawing up reports, question, *McNeill*, 1282-4
- Examination in method required to be passed at end of 6 months, *Starkie*, 11449-73
- Method, before and after Results system, and comparison with present day, *Poser*, 3750-65; *Downing*, 4467-50.
- Opportunity of getting knowledge of good methods by observation of work of good teacher, *McNeill*, 1287-9
- in Practical teaching in primary schools advocated, *Tristram*, 10118-37
- Present method satisfactory on whole, but might be more thorough, *Wyes*, 26223
- a Probationary period, *Dilworth*, 25-31; *McNeill*, 1259-70
- Proper means of promoting uniformity of marking, *McNeill*, 1234, 1246
- Question of, *McNeill*, 83445
- Required at end of 6 months to inspect a school under eyes of, and to satisfaction of two senior inspectors, *McNeill*, 1278-80, 1282, 1285-6
- Required to pass further examination in professional subjects, *McNeill*, 1274-5
- by Senior Inspector, particulars, *McNeill*, 1285-1301
- Sent out for fortnight with each Senior Inspector, passing from one circuit to another, *McNeill*, 1266-8
- Supposed to study method for themselves in certain specified text-books, *McNeill*, 1275-8
- System should be sufficient, *Wyes*, 6597-9
- Work on probation for another 6 months if all tests passed, and allowed to inspect and do independent work, *McNeill*, 1259-1, 1297-9
- Knowledge of Irish a condition for every alternate appointment, *Starkie*, 11443
- Matters requiring attention of managers, question as to whether information is regularly given by, *Poser*, 5053-7
- Memorandum on measures urgently needed with view to more efficient inspection of schools, p. 495-6, II.
- Merit Marks, see that title.

## Inspectors—continued.

- Methods to not conduce to sound education, *Woodward*, p. 478, II.
- Number, and number of schools to each, *Dilworth*, 15, 116-18, p. 129, I.; *Starkie*, 12805
- Objection to exclusion of, from post of secretary, *Starkie*, 12753-4
- Objection to tone of dictation adopted towards, *Downing*, 4877-918, 5110-17, 5146-8
- Observations book, see that title.
- Observations on appeals from teachers not sent to teachers and managers, *Hobson*, 14186-93, 14243-52
- not One in fifty fit to inspect infants, *Poser*, 5838-41
- Order re prohibition of supplying information to Commissioners, unless otherwise specially provided for in routine at department, without express authority of Resident Commissioner, question, *Downing*, 5513-21, p. 477, II.
- so Organised system, each man allowed own little facts, *Poser*, 3817
- Particulars of trouble created by, *MacLoughlin*, 7325-43
- Plan of judging proficiency of children and discipline and control of, *McNeill*, 1265, 1619, 1824-30
- of Poor class under old system and appointed by pure patronage, *Lennox*, 10914-7, 14327-31
- Practical teaching experience, question, *Starkie*, 7297-74, 7422-4; *Starkie*, 11453-9; *McNeill*, 8330-41, 8340-8, 8429-33, 8511-4, 8563-76, 8582-4
- Promotion of child to higher grade should depend on, *Poser*, 5634-59
- Promotions :
- should be made on just lines, *Downing*, 4833-6
- Method, *Starkie*, 12532-8
- Reply to charge of promotion because of being hard markers, *Starkie*, 12326-31
- Statement that system always went by seniority incorrect, *Lennox*, 11198
- Protestants and Roman Catholics very nearly equal in numbers, *Poser*, 4307-11
- Provincial appointment proposed, but not carried out, *Starkie*, 11665-9
- Recent outcry against examinations natural outcome of employment of, not being educational, *Wyes*, 26223
- Redistribution suggested, *Wyes*, 2595-6129; *Downing*, 4798, p. 476 II.
- Reorganisation of staff, memorandum, p. 505-7, II.
- Reports, see that title.
- Residence at a common centre gradually fell into disuse, *Dilworth*, 87
- Results of new organisation in main satisfactory, but disaffection and incompetence of some of heads of staff and instances, *Starkie*, 11266-90
- Retirement age, and anticipation by action of National Board, question, *Dilworth*, 319-27
- Review of work by head inspectors useful, *Curran*, 7635
- Routine work heavy, *Starkie*, 7287-9
- Secret and arbitrary instructions from Board should be avoided, *Starkie*, 7328-34, 7240
- Secretaryships of Board should be filled from, *Downing*, 4789-97, p. 476, II.
- SENIOR :
- Allotment of work, *Dilworth*, 403-6, 1224-9
- Authority over award of merit mark, and question, *Poser*, 4410-6
- Confidential reports on work of Juniors on probation, at end of 6 months, *McNeill*, 1272-4
- Differences of opinion with district inspector referred to Chief Inspector, *Starkie*, 12806-10
- Duty of, to notify Board of changes in standard of merit marks, *Starkie*, 12481-6
- Had not in all cases advantages of seniority, and reasons, and question as to power over junior inspectors, *Poser*, 4207-11, 4024-8
- Head Inspectors appointed, and no degradation intended by change of name, *Lennox*, 11057-64, 11083-127, 11135-7, 11147; *Starkie*, 11257-60.

## Inspectors—continued.

## SENIO—continued.

- Interchange of schools between junior and, useful as tending to produce uniformity, *McNeill*, 1285, 1302-3 should join with Junior to see whether merit mark could not be raised, *Starke*, 12492
- Junior inspectors may not alter merit mark without concurrence of, *Dilworth*, 101, 820-4, 823-9, 1063-5, p. 131; *McNeill*, 1351-2; *Starke*, 11663, 12488-91.
- Junior Inspectors sent out for fortnight with each, passing from one circuit to another, *McNeill*, 1286-8
- New programme sent to, in rough state for criticism, *Lemass*, 11188
- Number, *Dilworth*, 16, p. 29, 1.
- Objection to system because of difficulty of getting number of men to fill position if to be given any real supervising powers of control, *Purser*, 3773-88
- no Official below rank of, may change merit mark, *McNeill*, 1351-2
- Relations to two juniors under, *Dilworth*, 407
- Reports of junior inspectors embodied in, in published blue book, *Dilworth*, 34-5
- Whole circuit covered in five years, *Dilworth*, 23-4
- Severe responsibility on, in third year owing to increments and promotion dependent on marking, *McNeill*, 1335-9, 1444-62, 1509-5, 1512-29, 1522-7, 1727-9, 1909-17, 2045-4
- Staff in 1871, and supervision exercised by, *Purser*, 3722, 3724, p. 463, II.
- Standard element, *Starke*, 11485
- not Subjected to indiscriminate revision at mere request of teachers and procedure adopted, *Starke*, 11608, 11609, 11831-32, 12123-9, 12461
- Submission of programme and notes to Teachers to, before being issued for criticism, question, *Ward*, 9531-8
- Sch. circular to, 144
- Suggestions by Education Board of General Synod of Church of Ireland, p. 481, II.
- Summing up work of school, rules for, *Dilworth*, p. 130
- Supernumerary, in process of training, *McNeill*, 1232
- should Talk matters over with Managers rather than make statements in Observation Book, which is permanent record, *Woodward*, 6614
- Task set, one of great difficulty, *Bingham*, 7233-5
- to Teacher dismissed on report of, below rank of senior or chief inspector, *Starke*, 11736, 11745-3, 12236-64
- Tone and manner adopted towards teachers, *Dilworth*, 205-12, 809-10, p. 132; *Purser*, 4058-63, 4179-201, 4548-9; *Posler*, 5552-62, 5617-24, 5856-9, 5973, 5708-13, 5746-7, 5748-50, 5748-75; *Grierson*, 5869-70, 5877-8, 5917-33, 5945-55, 5973-5, 5981-5; *Benbow*, 6014-33, 6160-7; *Collis*, 6231-43, 6239-50, 6280-7, 6311-6; *Woodward*, 6513, p. 478, II.; *Bingham*, 7236-9, 7245-9; *Cummins*, 7457-8, 7494, 7498-8; *MacLoughlin*, 7787-93; *Moheffy*, 8338, 8342; *Clarke*, 8717, 8846, 9253-5; *Ward*, 9290-8; *Fork*, 10057-86; *Starke*, 11055-62, 12167-87, 12552-48; *Hobson*, 14175-82, 14218, 14296-300, 14314-5
- Uniformity question, *Dilworth*, 82-123, 351-7, 414-9, 320-37, 606-55, 695-9, 753-8, 762-800, 897-910, 1014-8, p. 130-1, I.; *McNeill*, 1288, 1302-3, 1304-10, 1332-4, 1359-66, 1463-4, 1570-99, 1660-2; *Wynn*, 2102-4, 2370-31, 2697-72, 2681; *O'Connor*, 2635-8, 2650-2, 2700-16, 2805-95, 2915-62, 2961-3003; *Purcell*, 3490-2; *Purser*, 3789-91, 3797-9, 3849-50, 3962-5, 3988-96, 4029-39, 4257-85, 4392-499; *Devering*, 4799-807, 4828-8, 4854-62, 5100-9, 5488-91; *Posler*, 5585-6, 5696-10, 5627-35, 5818-9; *Grierson*, 5902-13, 5956-9; *Benbow*, 6055, 6059; *Collis*, 6288-94; *Woodward*, 6428-79a, 6515-9 p. 478, II.; *Hynes*, 6582, 6587, 6595-6, 6571, 6587-70, 6780, 6785-8, 8830-5, 7120-4; *Bingham*, 7240-4, 7250-4, 7468-14; *Cummins*, 7517-25, 7521-5, 7589-3; *MacLoughlin*, 7518-22; *Müller*, 8002-77, 8208-74, 8280-2, 8313-9; *Moheffy*, 8416-21, 8479-82, 8470-3,

## Inspectors—continued.

- 8497-518, 8536, 8545-6, 8584-7, 8605-10, 8635-7; *Clarke*, 8721-48, 9035-41, 9126-8, 9182-98, 9252-82; *Ward*, 9298-302, 9445-8; *Tristram*, 10149-54, 10162-31, 10202-14, 10219, 10339-45; *Dale*, 10442-6, 10473, 10633-4, 10855-15; *Lemass*, 10930-7, 14393-413; *Starke*, 11480, 11485, 11650-734, 11898-909, 12105, 12767-71; *Hobson*, 14143-51, 14290-4

## Vices:

- Change from Results system has not increased number, *Tristram*, 10385-8
- Changes in methods as result of introduction of subjects of manual and practical instruction, p. 492-3, II.

## Formal:

- Circular, p. 141-2, I.
- Held only in case of schools which are not doing satisfactory work, *Dilworth*, 37; *Starke*, 11496
- an Inspection and examination of each standard in each subject, *Dilworth*, 37
- Methods not prescribed, *Dilworth*, 334-3
- Much the same as results examination, except that individuals were not taken, *Dilworth*, 329-33

- Incidental, circular, p. 140-1, I.
- Mode, of very efficient schools, *Dilworth*, 38, p. 129, I.
- Nature of, *Collis*, 6235-32

## Notices:

- to Managers, and absence of, *Posler*, 5638-42; *Grierson*, 5864-5; *Benbow*, 6010-13, 8175-82; *Collis*, 6221-2, 6277-9, 6355-8; *Woodward*, 6514; *Hynes*, 6691-7007; *Bingham*, 7220-30, 7391-5, 7415; *MacLoughlin*, 7774-6; *Moheffy*, 8351-4; *Tristram*, 10110-7; *Dale*, 10568-70, 10576-7; *Hobson*, 14165-6; *Starke*, 11960-2, 12197-203

- to Teachers, question, *Hynes*, 6691-7007; *Ward*, 9355-80, 9743-50; *Tristram*, 10377-81; *Dale*, 10571-5, 10648-51, 10653-61, 10829-31; *Starke*, 11960-2, 12464-75, 13904-9; *Hobson*, 14183-5, 14238-47

- Number of, *Dilworth*, 32-3, p. 129
- Shortness of, *Collis*, 6288-76, 8318-25, 6353-63
- Surprise visits, *Collis*, 6365-9; *Hynes*, 8082-4, 6991-7007; *Bingham*, 7298-404, 7415

- Want of uniformity very marked under old system, *Starke*, 11244-9

- Women, number, *McNeill*, 1232

- Work formerly split up better, *Purser*, 4490-6

- Work of teachers not tested by anyone but, *O'Connor*, 3289-6

- Irish Language, see under School Programme.

- Irish Language Organisers, see under Organisers.

- Irish Technical Instruction Association, report of Annual Congress handed in, *Fork*, 9991-2

## J.

## Junior Assistant Mistresses:

- Abolition of appointment favoured, and reasons, *Purser*, 4212-29
- no Improvement made in education equal to that of, *Starke*, 11291-5, 11459

- Number, *Dilworth*, 163

- Objection to, as being of very little use, *Downing*, 4885-90, p. 476, II.

- Provided for average of 35, *Starke*, 11423

- Status of teachers should be given to, *Cummins*, 7858-62

- Value of, *O'Connor*, 2810-23, 3166-8; *Moheffy*, 8381-2, 8532-5.

- Juvenile Advisory Committee of the Labour Exchange: scheme of employment of children having left national schools, *Fork*, 9992-10011

## K.

- Kindergarten, see under School Programme.

- Kindergarten Organisers, see under Organisers.

## L.

LEMASS, P. E., L.B.C.S.I., L.S.C.—continued.

Laundry work, *see* Cookery.Laundry work and Domestic Science, *see* under School Programme.Lavatories and baths, grants from State, question *re*, Decree, . . . . . 5021-2

LEMASS, P. E., L.B.C.S.I., L.S.C., Secretary of Board of National Education.

10892-11198, 14397-14623, App. XXVI.  
Appeals, procedure under Results system, and comparison with present, 10942-6, 14346-62

## BOARD OF NATIONAL EDUCATION:

Administration product of long growth, and owing to method of construction that it is able to exist in country, 14114, 14586-607  
Always resulted from time of foundation in 1831, and resolution passed in 1845 that they would not correspond with certain people in the country, . . . . . 10907-9

## Chiefs of Inspection:

Appointed chief inspectors and no degradation intended by change of name, . . . . . 11-57-64, 11083-127

Complaints of inspectors of severity of orders, 10967, 14614

History of appointment, 10911-12, 11127

Initiative for change came from Commissioners themselves, . . . . . 14357-43

Little or no assistance given to new scheme, 15543-5, 10993-6

Memorandum re new scheme referred to, criticism, and letters involving their suspension, 11083-127, 11061, 11105-14469

Merely attached initials to reports in perfunctory manner, and advertisement of, . . . . . 10923-6

Responsibility over notings on reports, limited, 14352-6, 14493-93, 14567-93, 11129-4

Statement that they used to be in attendance at Board meetings, incorrect, . . . . . 11198

Work done by clerks under, now done by examiners, . . . . . 14614-9

Document dealing with re-organisation scheme, question of authorship, . . . . . 10981, 10988-90, 11016-9, 11020-1, 14418-20, 14448-54

Examiners, functions, etc., 11129-43, 14346-62

Fines and dismissals brought before, 14397-9

Higher officials not consulted re changes in system until Board or prominent members were prepared to consider question formally, 10925-9

Investigation into complaint of teachers that July examinations were too severe, and particulars, . . . . . 10630-41

Necessity for absolute secrecy with regard to proposals, . . . . . 11066

Re-organisation of system in 1906, history, 10968-11019, 11066-71, 14418-23

Secretaries:

Dispute with Chief Inspector about a modified programme, and as a result Board decided that two offices were quite independent, . . . . . 14456-62

General duties applicable to both, p. 487, II.

Noting of examiners does not become a reprimand until letter is signed by, . . . . . 14363-6, 14620-3

Power of, . . . . . 11133-4

Clemency case, . . . . . 14398, 14426-8, 14483-93, 14567-95

Conferences, change in procedure of recent years, . . . . . 14494-5

## CORPORAL PUNISHMENT:

Rules and regulations, question, 14499-507

Statement that there was little or none under old system, incorrect, . . . . . 11199

Corporal punishment book, object, 14495-8

## INCREMENTS:

Certificate, form of, . . . . . p. 488-9, II.

Given as regularly as clockwork in 80 per cent. of cases, . . . . . 14399

not increments of ordinary salary, but of special good service salary, . . . . . 11072-3

System largely copied from Civil service, and mistaken idea of teachers re, 11039-53

## INSPECTORS:

Arrangements for instruction in new system of hand-and-eye training, and elementary training and opposition to, . . . . . 11138-46

Demand of teachers for all positions as, under Results system, . . . . . 10958-9

Circulars, letter sent to chief inspectors, asking for consideration and report of new arrangement, . . . . . 11174-8, 11192-4

Hampered by Results system, . . . . . 10967, 14414

Head:

Dismissal for insubordination, history, . . . . . 10911-3

Made Senior inspectors, and no degradation intended by change of name, . . . . . 11057-64, 11083-127, 11135-7, 11147

Improvement in status as compared with men of 25 years ago, and attributed largely to present system of selection, . . . . . 14527-31

of Poor class under old system and appointed by pure patronage, . . . . . 10914-7, 14527-31

Recruiting from ranks of National teachers provided for, . . . . . 11054-6

Statement that system of promotion always went by seniority, incorrect, . . . . . 11116

Variation in standard wider under old system than present, . . . . . 10958-7, 14393-7

MANAGERS:

Annual report form, . . . . . p. 487-8, II.

Confidential annual reports on school and teacher, scheme, but withdrawal, 11083-11039, 14458-65

Memorandum prepared on financial aspect of new scheme, . . . . . 10981, 10988-90, 11016-19, 11020-1, 14418-29

Merit marks, uniformity of standard approached very closely, . . . . . 14397-413

Promotions, prospects as compared with old system, question, . . . . . 10945-9, 14376-92

Results system, history of introduction, and effect, . . . . . 10918-22

SALARIES:

Capitation grant, scheme had to be re-cast owing to, . . . . . 11159

Cases of financial hardship not recalled, 14553-6

Difficulty of settling with teachers whose Results year did not coincide with 31st March and complaints, . . . . . 11141-6

Re-organisation of system, scheme for, . . . . . 11020-1, 14424-47, 14553-96

Rights of teachers preserved by new scheme, . . . . . 11194-7

Scheme had to be kept within limits of expenditure, . . . . . 11074-82

Scheme of payments designed *inter alia* to promote advancement of high class teachers to best schools, . . . . . 11074-82

Treasury reserved to itself complete liberty, . . . . . 11071-2

SCHOOL PROGRAMME:

In Advance of times, and motives not understood, . . . . . 11166, 14456

Criticism of, and question as to attention paid to, . . . . . 11166-73

Modified, invited to be submitted by managers, and case of Father Loughrey, . . . . . 14462-81

Preparation, history, . . . . . 11158-63

Received by teachers with acclamation, and question as to evidence for statement, . . . . . 14531-5

Scheme of revision, . . . . . 11021-2

Sent to chief and senior inspectors and some of the district in rough state for criticism, 11166

Submitted to teachers, . . . . . 14454-7

TEACHERS:

Dismissals, in no case are teachers dismissed for inefficiency on report of single inspector, and instance and question, . . . . . 14508-32

Fines and severe punishment for falsification of school record under Results system, . . . . . 10964-7

Insecure tenure under Results system, question, . . . . . 10960-3

Trained in Model schools in new subjects, 11166

Light and heat, *see* under School Programme.

## Local Aid:

- Amount, in certain case, *Grierson*, . . . 5879-81  
 Provision a condition for securing State Grant,  
*Dewar*, . . . 8, 9, 304-11, 592-5  
 Total amount, 1911, *Dinwiddie*, . . . 11, p. 129  
*Longhrey*, Father, case of, in connection with  
 school programme, *Sterkie*, 13689-703; *Lemane*  
 14405-32.

## M.

- MACLOUGHLIN, Reverend David, B.D., Ph.D.,  
 Minister of Drumminis: . . . 7943-7926  
 BOARD OF NATIONAL EDUCATION:  
 Change in rules, notice should be given,  
 . . . 7844-55  
 should be made directly responsible to Parlia-  
 ment, . . . 7847-8  
 INSPECTORS:  
 Defects of inspection, and class examination  
 desirable, . . . 7781-5, 7801-6, 7820, 7837-79, 7916-24  
 Frequent changes, . . . 7771-80  
 Manner towards teachers and managers, satis-  
 factory, . . . 7792-3  
 Notice of visits no complaint on ground of  
 shortness, . . . 7774-6  
 Particulars of troubles created by, . . . 7825-43  
 Test, . . . 7787-91  
 Managers, advised to institute examinations under  
 their own control, . . . 7823-4  
 Merit marks, want of uniformity, and unsuitable  
 system, . . . 7818-22  
 Primary education, suggestions for more efficient  
 system, . . . 7794-804, 7803-915  
 Pupils, proportion taking up business or clerkships  
 and agricultural pursuits, . . . 7925-3  
 School programme, additional subjects not suitable  
 to schools, and educational status lowered by,  
 . . . 7807-17, 7889-92

McNEILL, John, B.A., Chief Inspector: . . . 1218-2045

- APPEALS:  
 Number, question, . . . 1935-8  
 Procedure, . . . 1858-1907, 1967-95  
 Channel case, . . . 1628-54, 1803-10

- INCREMENTS:  
 Date of commencement of scheme, . . . 1815-17  
 should be given automatically in Third grade,  
 if not censured, . . . 1450-60, 1502-4, 1833-7  
 Origin of system, question, . . . 1685-99  
 Paid triennially from certain fixed date, and  
 each teacher dealt with as his year arrives,  
 . . . 1811-14

- INSPECTORS:  
 Chief:  
 Free to move about from school to school  
 within own circuit, . . . 1564-6  
 General correction of inspection, . . . 1236-7  
 Incidental visits considered one of principal  
 duties, . . . 1236, 1235  
 Number, and number of circuits under, . . . 1231

- Circuits:  
 Interchange of schools between senior and  
 junior inspectors useful as tending to  
 produce uniformity, . . . 1288, 1302-3  
 Number, and number of inspectors allotted  
 to, . . . 1232

- Conferences:  
 General, of all eleven circuits suggested,  
 . . . 1243-5  
 Method of conducting and matters discussed  
 at, . . . 1315-32, 1691  
 One for each senior inspector's circuit held  
 during year, . . . 1237-42, 1811  
 Criticism of policy not allowed, in Blue Book  
 to be presented to Parliament, but at liberty  
 to approach Board with any suggestions,  
 . . . 1673-84, 1846-66  
 Forbidden to give orders in schools, . . . 1670-1  
 Joint inspection, and judgment to see whether  
 estimates correspond, . . . 1892-4

McNEILL, John, B.A.—continued.

## INSPECTORS—continued.

- Junior:  
 Inspections made by, after training would be  
 accepted as sufficient, . . . 1292-4  
 Permanent appointment from Commissioners  
 obtained at end of second six months,  
 but charge of section of district not  
 guaranteed, . . . 1290-1  
 Time which would elapse before getting  
 charge of a district, question, . . . 1281, 1287, 1290-1
- Training:  
 Chief Inspector responsible for, . . . 1294  
 Confidential reports from Senior Inspectors  
 at end of six months, . . . 1272-4  
 Define instructions about manner of  
 awarding merit marks and drawing up  
 reports, question, . . . 1283-4  
 Opportunity of getting knowledge of good  
 methods by observation of work of good  
 teacher, . . . 1297-9  
 Probationary period, . . . 1269-70  
 Proper means of promoting uniformity of  
 marking, . . . 1294, 1246  
 Required at end of six months to inspect a  
 school under the eyes of, and to satisfac-  
 tion of two senior inspectors, . . . 1278-80  
 Required to pass further examination in  
 professional subjects, . . . 1274-8  
 by Senior Inspector, and particulars,  
 . . . 1265-1301
- Sent out for fortnight with each Senior  
 Inspector, passing from one circuit to  
 another, . . . 1266-8  
 Supposed to study method for themselves  
 in certain specified text books, . . . 1275-8  
 Transfer from one circuit to another, useful  
 as tending to produce uniformity, . . . 1294-10
- VACANCIES:  
 Advertisement put in papers, . . . 1247-8  
 Alphabetical list of candidates and quali-  
 fications drawn up, . . . 1247-8  
 Candidates introduced one by one before  
 Board resulting in final selection, . . . 1254-60  
 First selection of candidates made by  
 Chief Inspector, . . . 1247-51  
 List revised by Resident Commissioner and  
 Secretaries, . . . 1252  
 Method of filing, . . . 1246-63  
 Number of applications received, . . . 1246, 1247-8  
 Selected candidates summoned for qualifi-  
 cation examination, . . . 1252-4, 1261-3  
 Teachers simply take place in ranks of  
 other applicants for, . . . 1606-71  
 Work on probation for another six months  
 if all tests passed and allowed to inspect  
 and do independent work, . . . 1289-1, 1297-9
- Plan of judging proficiency of children and  
 discipline and control of, . . . 1396-1619, 1824-26  
 Senior, allotment of work, . . . 1224-9  
 Supernumerary, in process of training, . . . 1232  
 Women, number, . . . 1232
- MERIT MARKS:  
 Definite standard value in minds of number of  
 different men, question, . . . 1436-4  
 no Difficulty found in awarding, personally,  
 . . . 1833-4  
 Factors in arriving at, . . . 1366-1443, 1567-63, 1966  
 General lowering, question as to control over,  
 by Chief Inspector, . . . 1679-90  
 Inspector at liberty to assign, without asking  
 single question, . . . 1618-25  
 no Official below rank of Senior Inspector may  
 change, . . . 1361-2  
 Phrase "making due allowance for any adverse  
 circumstances" question as to exact intention,  
 . . . 1360-69  
 Prepared to consider any scheme of replacing  
 with any proper substitute, . . . 1506-1, 1506-11  
 of Principal teacher will correspond with that of  
 school as a rule; that of assistant might  
 differ, . . . 1653-6, 1663-5, 2008-19  
 Severe responsibility on inspectors in third year  
 owing to increments and promotion dependent  
 on, and suggested alternative,  
 . . . 1335-9, 1444-63, 1500-6, 1512-23, 1622-7,  
 . . . 1727-9, 1900-17, 2043-4

McNEILL, John, B.A.—continued.

## MERTY MARKS—continued.

|  |                                    |
|--|------------------------------------|
| Standards required for increments, ..  | 1726                               |
| Statement that under tone circular inspector who did not like teaching of Irish could put down school as bad conducted, .. | 1730-9, 1742-6, 2045               |
| Tone circular, 1353-5, 1691-1770, 1936-41, 2050-19   |                                    |
| Uniformity question, and instances given, ..   | 1258-83, 1628-54, 1808-16, 1913-17 |
| Variation in intelligence of pupils taken into account, ..   | 1695-9                             |

## OBSERVATION BOOK:

|  |         |
|--|---------|
| Object of, ..  | 1483-91 |
| Suggestions in, question as to what happens when they are not followed, .. | 1573-9  |

## ORGANISERS:

|                            |        |
|----------------------------|--------|
| Cookery, duties, ..        | 2020-3 |
| Drawing, duties, ..        | 2020-3 |
| Irish language, duties, .. | 2020-3 |
| Kindergarten, duties, ..   | 2020-3 |
| Music, duties, ..          | 2020-3 |
| Science, duties, ..        | 2020-3 |

Primary education, no proposals for improvement as affecting fundamental principles, ..

|  |  |
|--|--|
| 1771-2, 1781-4   |  |
| Reports, control over, by Chief Inspector, 1578-80           |  |
| Results system, comparison with present system, question, .. | 1498-9, 1942-55, 1967-84   |
| Salaries, raising, and diminishing increments suggested, ..  | 1451-62, 1500-5, 1512-29, 1622-7, 1785a-1807, 1831-67, 1908, 2024-42 |

School accounts, no separate cash book and published accounts for each school, ..

|        |  |
|--------|--|
| 1405-9 |  |
|--------|--|

School programme, liberty of teachers, ..

|        |  |
|--------|--|
| 1493-7 |  |
|--------|--|

## TEACHERS:

|   |                                  |
|---|----------------------------------|
| Candidates for training colleges, better and larger supply would be obtained were initial salary raised, .. | 1785a-1807, 2026-42              |
| Course of study for students after leaving training colleges important, ..                                  | 1630-44, 1629-1                  |
| Financial demands made upon, ..   | 1465-82, 1632-6, 1773-80, 1785-6 |
| Provision for watching work of students from training colleges for first five years, 1545-51                |                                  |

MAHAFFY, Reverend Gilbert, M.A., Canon of Christchurch, and Member of Board of Education of the Synod of the Church of Ireland: ..

|           |  |
|-----------|--|
| 8320-8809 |  |
|-----------|--|

Board of National Education, change in rules should be published before being carried out, and should not be retrospective, ..

|                       |  |
|-----------------------|--|
| 8422-8, 8567-52, 8623 |  |
|-----------------------|--|

Increments, automatic, should follow satisfactory general report, ..

|                      |  |
|----------------------|--|
| 8403-7, 8435-3, 8542 |  |
|----------------------|--|

## INSPECTION:

|  |   |
|--|---|
| Impressionist system, ..   | 8407-14, 8536   |
| System not so thorough, or promotive of as thorough an education as former one, and combination of examination with, advocated, .. | 8331, 8335-7, 8357-78, 8434-47, 8503-10, 8537-40, 8586-807, 8627-31 |

## INSPECTORS:

|  |   |
|--|---|
| Extravagant structural requirements, question, ..  | 8349-51   |
| Intercourse with, favourable, ..   | 8328, 8342  |
| Notice of visits, received on morning of inspection, ..  | 8331-4  |
| should have Practical experience in teaching, but wholesale promotion of teachers not favoured, .. | 8338-43, 8346-8, 8429-32, 8511-8, 8568-76, 8632-4 |
| Training, question of, ..  | 8244-5  |
| Junior assistant mistresses, value of, ..  | 8331-2, 8532-5                                    |

MAHAFFY, Rev. Gilbert, M.A.—continued.

## Merit Marks:

|   |   |
|---|---|
| Absence of uniformity, and plans for securing, .. | 8415-21, 8470-3, 8479-82, 8487-510, 8536, 8543-6, 8564-7, 8606-16, 8638-7 |
|---|---|

Principal may be damaged by bad assistant, ..

|                 |  |
|-----------------|--|
| 8394-9, 8517-22 |  |
|-----------------|--|

Unter to teacher and inspector, ..

|        |  |
|--------|--|
| 8450-2 |  |
|--------|--|

Monitors, practical abolition of system deprecated, and question of advantages and disadvantages, ..

|                                 |  |
|---------------------------------|--|
| 8382-5, 8448-68, 8604-6, 8663-9 |  |
|---------------------------------|--|

Pensions, improved scale proposed, ..

|        |  |
|--------|--|
| 8342-3 |  |
|--------|--|

## PROMOTION:

Examination for, should be restored, ..

|                      |  |
|----------------------|--|
| 8624-0, 8642-7, 8347 |  |
|----------------------|--|

Slowness of, ..

|         |  |
|---------|--|
| 8338-94 |  |
|---------|--|

Pupils, future of, ..

|                  |  |
|------------------|--|
| 8369-72, 8648-53 |  |
|------------------|--|

## SALARIES:

Monthly payments advocated, ..

|      |  |
|------|--|
| 8343 |  |
|------|--|

Rule as to boys under seven being ineligible for enrolment, and grievance of, ..

|          |  |
|----------|--|
| 8480-02a |  |
|----------|--|

Two-fold, one personal to teacher and one attached to school, scheme, ..

|                             |  |
|-----------------------------|--|
| 8387-89, 8533-5, 8341, 8557 |  |
|-----------------------------|--|

School programme, teachers should be left to own discretion, ..

|      |  |
|------|--|
| 8617 |  |
|------|--|

## SCHOOLS:

Present brought upon inspection, to try and close small, and objection to, and question as to efficiency, ..

|                           |  |
|---------------------------|--|
| 8474a-3, 8526-31, 8577-85 |  |
|---------------------------|--|

Understanding not complained of, ..

|         |  |
|---------|--|
| 8379-81 |  |
|---------|--|

School year, effect on inspection, ..

|                  |  |
|------------------|--|
| 8638-41, 8597-10 |  |
|------------------|--|

## TEACHERS:

Financial demands, etc., re clothing, question, ..

|        |  |
|--------|--|
| 8526-6 |  |
|--------|--|

not Students out of school hours, ..

|      |  |
|------|--|
| 8388 |  |
|------|--|

## Managers:

Absence during inspections exceptional, Drawing, ..

|             |  |
|-------------|--|
| p. 475, 11. |  |
|-------------|--|

Action which would be taken on ascertaining that teacher was providing out of own pocket things which should be provided by, *O'Connor*, ..

|         |  |
|---------|--|
| 8228-35 |  |
|---------|--|

Annual report, *how*, *Lemass*, ..

|               |  |
|---------------|--|
| p. 487-8, 11. |  |
|---------------|--|

Appeal to Board as to desirability of removing teacher, question, *Storkie*, ..

|         |  |
|---------|--|
| 11791-6 |  |
|---------|--|

Appointment of Teachers:

Board cannot renege to teachers, but may either remove, or not allow appointment of successor by, *Dilworth*, ..

|     |  |
|-----|--|
| 340 |  |
|-----|--|

Circular issued to inspectors leaving impression that bribes were being taken by, for appointments to schools, *Storkie*, ..

|                   |  |
|-------------------|--|
| 13282-3, 13512-21 |  |
|-------------------|--|

Principal teachers have nothing to do with appointment of assistants, except by advising, ..

|         |  |
|---------|--|
| 197-200 |  |
|---------|--|

of Unsuitable educational capacity, question, ..

|       |  |
|-------|--|
| 10626 |  |
|-------|--|

Associations of, suggested for increasing public interest in schools, *Dale*, ..

|                 |  |
|-----------------|--|
| 10447-50, 10615 |  |
|-----------------|--|

*Storkie*, 11373-80, ..

no Complaint to make on head of discourtesy of inspectors to, *Grierson*, ..

|        |  |
|--------|--|
| 5877-8 |  |
|--------|--|

Complaints against, for neglect of duties come before examiners, *Parcell*, ..

|         |  |
|---------|--|
| 3428-30 |  |
|---------|--|

Complaints against, by Teachers, Privilege granted of making direct to Board, *Storkie*, ..

|       |  |
|-------|--|
| 11787 |  |
|-------|--|

Complaints against Teachers:

Inequality, procedure, *Parcell*, ..

|         |  |
|---------|--|
| 3403-25 |  |
|---------|--|

nature of, *Parcell*, ..

|        |  |
|--------|--|
| 3424-7 |  |
|--------|--|

Confidential annual reports on school and teacher, scheme, but withdrawal, *Lemass*, ..

|                       |  |
|-----------------------|--|
| 11023-11029, 14458-65 |  |
|-----------------------|--|

Contribution towards upkeep of schools, question as to ascertaining amount, *O'Connor*, ..

|            |  |
|------------|--|
| 2811, 2835 |  |
|------------|--|

Correspondence with, by Board, and not with teachers, *Dilworth*, ..

|     |  |
|-----|--|
| 206 |  |
|-----|--|

Directed to use influence to get prizes submitted locally, and question, *Drawing*, ..

|              |  |
|--------------|--|
| 4916-8, 4939 |  |
|--------------|--|

Dismissals, grounds for, *Storkie*, ..

|          |  |
|----------|--|
| 11944-53 |  |
|----------|--|

Dismissal of Teachers, action now taken by Board, *Storkie*, ..

|          |  |
|----------|--|
| 11787-90 |  |
|----------|--|

Full reports should be sent to and not only extracts, *Dilworth*, ..

|  |  |
|--|--|
| 238, 348, 1045-61; <i>Poser</i> , 8768-78; <i>Reasen</i> , 5129-34; <i>Collis</i> , 6232-32, 8262-5, 0298-203; <i>Woodward</i> , p. 478. 11. |  |
|--|--|

*Storkie*, 11787

## Managers—continued.

Functions, *Dilsforth*, . . . . . p. 120, I.  
Holding of periodic examinations by, question,  
*Peeler*, 3678-84; *Grinson*, 5994-8; *Collis*, 6348-  
52; *MacLoughlin*, 7823-4; *Stephens*, 7378-92.  
Honorary and thankless position, and few laymen  
can be got to accept, *Dewdney*, . . . . . p. 473, II.  
Inspectors' reports sent to, *Dilsforth*, . . . . . 236  
Inspectors should talk matters over with, rather  
than make statements in Observation Book,  
which is a permanent record, *Woodward*, 6814

## Letters from:

Containing complaints against teachers, duties  
of examiners, *Parcell*, . . . . . 3490, 3492-7  
Knocking appeals from teachers, duties of  
examiners, *Parcell*, . . . . . 3490-1, 3537-64  
Procedure, *Starke*, . . . . . 11583  
Letters written to, re points in reports in connection  
with equipment of schools, *Dilsforth*, 1047  
Manner of inspectors towards, satisfactory,  
*MacLoughlin*, . . . . . 7792-3  
Matters requiring attention, question as to whether  
inspectors regularly inform, *Peeler*, 5563-7  
Modified programmes invited to be submitted by,  
and case of *Father Loughrey, Starke*, 13895-  
703; *Lennox*, 14486-82.  
Must be apprised of inspector's presence when a  
visit of considerable length of time is intended,  
*Dilsforth*, . . . . . 37

## New:

Must enter into agreement with each member  
of existing staff, and cannot dispense with  
services of any teacher except under terms of  
agreement, *Starke*, . . . . . 11792-9  
Rule that order in which assistants stand is to  
remain unaltered, *Starke*, . . . . . 11302  
Notice of Inspectors' visits, *Sherrin*, *Peeler*,  
5839-42; *Grinson*, 5994-6; *Beeson*, 6910-13.  
6178-92, *Collis*, 8221-2, 8277-9, 8365-6,  
*Woodward*, 6814; *Hyne*, 6991-7007; *Stephens*,  
7229-30, 7297-8, 7415; *MacLoughlin*, 7774-8;  
*McLaff*, 9331-4; *Tristram*, 10110-7; *Dale*,  
10368-70, 10576-7; *Starke*, 11980-2, 12197-  
203; *Robson*, 14165-6.  
Observation book open to, *Dilsforth*, . . . . . 1032  
Power of Board of National Education to dismiss  
teachers irrespective of, *Parcell*, . . . . . 3591  
Power of dismissal of teachers, irrespective of  
National Board, *Parcell*, . . . . . 3589-90  
Removal by Board rare, *Dilsforth*, . . . . . 437-8  
Required to enter into formal agreements with  
teachers, *Starke*, . . . . . 11776  
Responsibility, question, *Robson*, . . . . . 14301-13  
Responsibility for school building, etc., question,  
*O'Connor*, 3979-80; *Peeler*, 5269-70; *Beeson*,  
5995-6006, 6076-80, 6130-43; *Collis*, 8209-19;  
*Stephens*, 7475-6.  
Rule enabling furnishing of confidential reports  
on school abolished, *Starke*, . . . . . 11302  
Rules applicable to, should not be changed except  
with consent of, *Dewdney*, 5146-52, p. 475, II.  
Spoken word rather than written believed in,  
in communicating with Board, *Peeler*, . . . . . 5829-31  
Statement of whole career of teacher prepared  
and sent to, and directed to teacher with request  
to furnish explanation or observation in cases of  
inefficiency in school work, *Wynn*, . . . . . 2081  
Maxfield, Mr., late teacher of *Calton National*  
*School, County Tipperary*, case of dismissal of  
and correspondence, *Dilsforth*, 819-24, p. 217-22, I.  
*Parcell*, p. 469-70, II.  
Manual and Practical Instruction Commission,  
report of Board made in reference to recom-  
mendations, . . . . . p. 496-5  
Manual work, see under School Programme.  
Mathematics, see under School Programme.  
Mental Arithmetic, see under School Programme.  
Mentally defective and epileptic children, no  
organised education for, and scheme advocated,  
*Fitch*, . . . . . 10090-2

## Merit Marks:

Abolition, and adoption of alternative schemes  
suggested, *Dilsforth*, 690-3, *McNeill*, 1335-9,  
1441-62, 1500-23, 1622-7, 1727-8, 1908-17,  
3961-4; *O'Connor*, 3038-41; *Parcell*, 3949-90,

## Merit Marks—continued.

3997-910, 4098-105, 4164-5, 4483-85, 4518-25,  
4537-40, p. 464, II.; *Dewdney*, 4963-73; *Peeler*,  
5951-5; *Woodward*, 6490-9; *Hyne*, 6967-70,  
6971, 6780, 8830-5; *Miller*, 9279; *Ward*,  
9298-302, 9545-9; *Tristram*, 10149-54, 10203-  
14, 10219, 10339-45; *Dale*, 10442-5, 10663-4;  
*Starke*, 12502-49, 12719-38, 13786-97.  
Absence of specific and clear preference to, in  
rules, and should be remedied, *Dilsforth*, 981-9;  
*Ward*, 9373-9; *Starke*, 13302-29.  
Advantage in facilitating regulation of promotion,  
and question, *Dilsforth*, . . . . . 1173-6  
Appeals, see that title.  
Assignment without asking single question, question  
of, *McNeill*, 1918-25; *Wynn*, 2190-92; *O'Connor*,  
3202-9; *Hyne*, 6840-6; *Clark*, 9076-7.  
Authority of chief inspector, and question, *McNeill*,  
1578-80; *Parcell*, 4410-6.  
Authenticity of senior inspector, and question,  
*Parcell*, . . . . . 4410-6  
Ballast case, *Dilsforth*, 90-2, 759-68, 889-95, p. 107-  
200, I.; *Hyne*, 6643-4, 6770-94, 6963-70, 7031-  
62, 7068-72, 7144-50, 7192-3, 7195-9; *Stephens*,  
7240, 7329-34; *Clark*, 9724-32, 9784-86, 9847-  
53, 9876-7, 9992-94, 9992-4, 9942-9; *Ward*,  
9203-19, 9408-34, 9476-503, 9519-30, 9557-65,  
9729-31, 9788-92; *Starke*, 11530-3, 11706-24,  
12794-5, 13229-52, 13360-74, 13642-53, 13924-  
41.

## Check inspection:

Change as result of, question, *Hyne*, . . . . . 6795-9  
Cannot be held except by order of the Com-  
missioners, *Starke*, . . . . . 13037-41  
Inspector ought not to be over critical or  
censorious, *Ward*, . . . . . 9384  
Teacher should be informed of object of visit,  
*Ward*, . . . . . 9381-2  
Circular to Inspectors re, assigned to schools after  
general inspections . . . . . p. 516, II.  
Circulars, . . . . . p. 149-150, I.  
Circumstances under which teachers have not to  
wait 3 more years to obtain increment or pro-  
motion, *Dilsforth*, 428-38, 1201; *Wynn*, 2072-5;  
*Starke*, 12401-3.  
Coppel case, *Dilsforth*, 913-71, 1002-9, p. 209-16,  
I.; *McNeill*, 1623-54, 1908-10; *Wynn*, 2267-97,  
2302-27, 2578-89; *Parcell*, 3600-13; *Parcell*,  
3997-4007; *Hyne*, 6713-52, 6917-29, 6960-48,  
6970, 7009-30, 7056, 7063-7, 7073-83, 7129-36,  
7161-97, 7191-4; *Clark*, 9067-91, 9096-31,  
9173-8; *Ward*, 9203-18, 9265-6, 9717-28, 9729-  
30, 9774-85, 9788-92; *Starke*, 11490, 11485-97,  
11509-30, 11832-48, 11707, 11731-4, 12096-  
104, 12291-328, 13138-50, 13408-79, 13479-612,  
13522-30, 13531-60, 13809-41, 13809-16, 13839,  
13889-90; *Lennox*, 14398, 14496-8, 14493-61,  
14567-95, p. 620, II.  
Coodall case, *Dilsforth*, 1151-6; *Parcell*, 4078-  
722, p. 465, II.; *Ward*, 9448-52, 9793-806;  
*Starke*, 11890-32, 11842-52, 11982-6, 12043-51,  
13032-180,  
not Condemned if inspection were a reality, *Wood-*  
*ward*, 6847-9, p. 478, II.  
Considered satisfactory way of classifying school,  
and reasons, *Wynn*, . . . . . 2149-53, 2328-32  
Controlling influence at headquarters, question  
as to desirability, *Dilsforth*, . . . . . 686-73, 942-76  
Debates by Board on whole system of awarding,  
question, *Clark*, . . . . . 9140-4  
Difficulty in grading schools mainly responsible  
for present agitation, *Starke*, . . . . . 12116-22  
"Due allowance for any adverse circumstances,"  
question, *Dilsforth*, 50-7, 80, 93-74, 447-51,  
1033-44; *McNeill*, 1340-50, 1998-9; *Wynn*,  
2525-9; *O'Connor*, 2990-900; *Beeson*, 6051-9,  
6168-75.  
Everything in power of Board done to lessen  
friction, *Starke*, . . . . . 11384  
Examiners accept inspectors' statement except  
when marked discrepancy seen between pro-  
ficiency table and, *Parcell*, . . . . . 3490-9  
no Expression of opinion of inspectors seen, *Dil-*  
*sforth*, . . . . . 420-2, 717-19  
Factors determining, *Dilsforth*, 50-74, 310-20,  
1055-62; *McNeill*, 1366-1443, 1387-63, 1998;  
*Wynn*, 3392-9; *O'Connor*, 2660-0; *Parcell*, 4552-  
61.



## Merit Marks—continued.

Form a ready means by which Board can distribute awards of increments and promotions, and if abolished would be necessary for Board to answer Inspector's reports under some such similar heads, *Storkie*, 11546-8

Grading of schools, memorandum p. 521-2, II.

Importance of not altering, without grave reason, stress laid on, and steps taken when lowered, *Storkie*, 11669-82, 11683; *Dilworth*, 88, p. 131.

Individual, suggested, and explanation, *Hobson*, 14313-7

Information of Board, when there is a striking reduction, question, *Storkie*, 12472-87

no Inspector below rank of Senior Inspector allowed to alter, without conference with the latter, and question, *Dilworth*, 101, 820-41, 863-9, 1043-3, p. 131, I.; *McNeill*, 1351-2; *Storkie*, 11683, 12488-91.

Junior Inspector should have power to raise, but not to lower, *Ward*, 9250

Laid down as a principle that it is not to be altered, and question, *Storkie*, 11731-26, 11801-8

Leniency of Inspector in third year, *McNeill*, 1913-17; *Wynn*, 2109-17; *O'Connor*, 2565-9, 3023-6; *Hynes*, 6373-8.

Lowered, in case of, senior Inspector should join with junior to see whether it could not be raised, *Storkie*, 12492

Lowering in third year and effect on increments, *Ward*, 9286-9, 9690-2.

Number increased by inspectors, *Storkie*, 11549-65

Objection to, as a general system not well founded if fair and exhaustive examination were held, *Poser*, 5609-5, 5661-73; *Woodward*, 6437-9.

Origin of, question, *Dilworth*, 700-4, 801-2

Period of time after inspection before teacher is notified, question, *Dilworth*, 443, 674-89, 1022-3, 1213-17

## PERSONAL:

Date of issue of circular, *Dilworth*, 938

Mark not always same for school, *Dilworth*, 371-8, 377-94; *McNeill*, 1656-9, 1663-5, 2099-10; *O'Connor*, 2910-12, 3054-7; *Parrell*, 3565-8, 3674, 3875; *Purser*, 4466-87; *Storkie*, 11887-82, 11886.

Never revealed to teachers, *Parrell*, 3669-73; *Biaghams*, 7264-5; *Miller*, 8073-5, 8271; *Storkie*, 11893-7.

Personal salary should be given and part only dependent on, *Woodward*, 5326

Precise conditions for promotion and increment not published to teachers, *Dilworth*, 1292-9

Principal may be damaged by bad assistant, *Dilworth*, 81-3, 143-202, 375-7; *Parrell*, 3676-7; *McNeilly*, 3394-9, 3517-22; *Ward*, 9388-9.

Proposed for adjustment of, and bearing on awards and promotion, question as to meaning of phrase, *O'Connor*, 3258-61

Question as to how stimulus is to be provided without, *Hobson*, 14161-2

should not be Reduced unless after year's warning, *Storkie*, 12464-74

Reduction in practice, and question as to reduction in theory, *Storkie*, 12068-75

Return, 1906-11, submitted, *Dilworth*, 76-81, p. 130, p. 164, I.

Rules for inspectors, *Dilworth*, p. 130, I.

Satisfaction given by system of assessment on whole, and no personal trouble with, *O'Connor*, 2643-9, 3717-23

School buildings and equipment as affecting, question re, *Dilworth*, 56-71, 280-1, 375-413, 507-18, 597-8, 1137-44; *McNeill*, 1340-60, 1356-74, 1383-93, 1465-32, 1552-6, 1773-80, 1785-8, 2000-8; *O'Connor*, 2500-4, 2611-7, 2823-39, 3074-80; *Purser*, 4532-61; *Poser*, 5548-77, 5660, 6717-21, 6829-1, 6825-8; *Grison*, 5481-3, 5938-9; *Benison*, 5995-6009, 6076-90, 6101-16, 6139-43, 6138-7; *Collis*, 6209-20, 6303-5, 6385-7, 6403-10; *Woodward*, 6424; *Hynes*, 6950-60; *Miller*, 8060-61, 8258-67; *McNeilly*, 8353-6; *Ward*, 9383-7; *Storkie*, 11320-3, 11469-63; *Hobson*, 14157-62, 14194-7, 14398-13.

Schools re-inspected on complaints from teachers, and mark may be cancelled and higher one recorded, *Dilworth*, 444-6

## Merit Marks—continued.

Senior inspectors summoned to a conference in 1903 to arrive at an exact understanding of terms, *Dilworth*, 87, p. 131, I.; *McNeill*, 1244 1312; *Wynn*, 2333-42; *Purser*, 3763-5, 3890-15

*Hynes*, 6946.

Severe responsibility on inspectors in third year owing to increments and promotion depending on, *McNeill*, 1336-9, 1444-62, 1500-5, 1512-39; 1622-7, 1727-9, 1969-17, 2043-4.

Special instruction as to the most important factor in determining Inspector's opinion, *Dilworth*, p. 130, I.

Standards required for increment and promotion, *Dilworth*, 149, 203-4, 1183-6, 1197-1200, p. 132, I.; *McNeill*, 1725.

a Stimulus, *O'Connor*, 2961-80

not Subjected to indiscriminate revision at the request of teachers, and procedure adopted, *Storkie*, 11668-9, 11831-52, 12123-9, 12461.

Tone and impressionist system, *Dilworth*, 33-42, 339-47, 459-63, 769-890; *McNeill*, 1332-5, 1375-82, 1408-13, 1591-1779, 1750-9, 1742-6, 1829-41, 2000-13, 2045; *Wynn*, 2163, 2169-76, 2507-13; *O'Connor*, 2666-79, 3210-7, 3293-322; *Purser*, 4246-56; *Downing*, 4845-6, 5488-91; *Poser*, 5329-33, 5630-41; *Grison*, 5914-6, 5940; *Benison*, 5943-50, 6071-3; *Collis*, 6340-3; *Woodward*, 6432-0, p. 478 II.; *Hynes*, 6602-4; *Biaghams*, 7265-90, 7325-49, 7364-73, 7425-32; *Cummins*, 7447-613, 7578-9, 7598-605, 7626-42; *McNeilly*, 8107-11, 8236; *Clarke*, 9251-6; *Ward*, 9303-18; *Trisham*, 10336-8, 10316; *Storkie*, 11255-69, 11978-8, 12077-95, 13816-20, 13842-58.

Too many, and reduction desirable, *Miller*, 8046-9, 8278-8

Treasury knows nothing about, and one of civil results of present Committee is that they will get to know them, *Storkie*, 12469-501

Under to teacher and inspector, *McNeilly*, 8490-9

Uniformity question, *Dilworth*, 82-123, 351-7, 414-9, 529-37, 658-55, 693-9, 752-8, 769-890, 897-910, 1014-3, p. 130-1, I.; *McNeill*, 1238, 1302-3, 1304-10, 1335-4, 1356-65, 1402-4, 1679-90, 1690-2; *Wynn*, 2067-72, 2102-4, 2370, 81, 2531; *O'Connor*, 2635-8, 2650-2, 2700-16, 2866-68, 2013-62, 2981-3001; *Parrell*, 3490-3; *Purser*, 3739-91, 3797-9, 3840-80, 3962-5, 3968-90 4020-39, 4257-65, 4392-609; *Downing*, 4799-807, 4826-8, 4854-62, 5100-9, 5488-91; *Poser*, 5385-8, 5606-10, 5627-35, 5818-9; *Grison*, 5902-13, 5956-9; *Benison*, 6058, 6069; *Collis*, 6238-91; *Woodward*, 6438-75a, 6518-9; *Hynes*, 6582, 6587, 6663-6, 6671, 6567-70, 6585-5, 6780, 6890-5, 7120-4; *Biaghams*, 7240-4, 7260-4, 7408-14; *Cummins*, 7517-25, 7523-5, 7530-3; *McNeilly*, 7818-22; *Miller*, 8063-77, 8208-74, 8280-2, 8313-6; *McNeilly*, 8415-31, 8479-82, 8497-510, 8536, 8470-3, 8540-8, 8564-7, 8608-16, 8635-7; *Clarke*, 9221-40; 9035-41, 9120-8, 9189-94, 9252-62; *Ward*, 9298-302, 9345-8; *Trisham*, 10149-54, 10162-61, 10208-14, 10219, 10319-45; *Dale*, 10442-1, 10473, 10483-4, 10803-15; *Leeson*, 10950-7, 14298-413; *Storkie*, 11489, 11485, 11559-734, 11898-909, 12105, 12767-71; *Hobson*, 14143-51, 14290-4.

MILLER, FRANCIS, Principal Teacher, Tobermora N. School: 8031-8319, App. XXI.

Increments, automatic, advocated, 8077-9

MERIT MARKS:

Abolition of whole system desirable, 8279

Damaging reports on ground of premises being unsatisfactory, 8060-61, 8258-67

Personal, never revealed to teachers, 8072-5, 8271

Too many, and reduction desirable, 8046-9, 8278-8

Variation in standard, 8062-77, 8263-74, 8280-2, 8313-9

Roll, dinner roll, useless, and should not be in operation at all, 8283-336

Salaries, inequitable working of new system and rights of teachers interfered with, and example, 8079-237

Teachers, maternity rule, grievance re, 8206-12

Tobermora National School, extracts from general report, p. 479-80, II.

Model School, Belfast, pupils coming from, to Trade Preparatory School, question as to standard of education, *Forth*, . . . . . 3912-4

# Monitors and Monitresses:

Circular, . . . . . p. 141, I.  
Desire to get into service as teachers through doorway of question, *Hynes*, . . . . . 3623-34  
Examinations of, Preparation of questions, circular, p. 141, I.  
Practical abolition of system deprecated, and question of advantages and disadvantages, *Malaffy*, 3382-5, 3445-55, 3554-5, 3662-9.  
System improved, *Starke*, . . . . . 11423  
Music Organisers, see under Organisers.

# N.

National Education Board, see Board of National Education.  
Nature lessons, see under School Programme.  
Navigation, see under School Programme.  
Needlework, see under School Programme.

# O.

## Observation Book:

Confidential, and Inspector, manager and teacher only have access to, *Dilworth*, 429, 1031-1032  
Difficulty of inspection making full report in question, *Dilworth*, . . . . . 1034-7  
Inspectors should talk matters over with managers rather than make statements in, which is a permanent record, *Woodward*, . . . . . 6514  
Inspectors told to call attention to two or three important points at a time, and not to burden teacher with great number of suggestions all at once, *Dilworth*, . . . . . 1028  
Necessary in order that Inspector on returning may see what points have been neglected, *Dilworth*, . . . . . 1029-30  
Notings by Resident Commissioner conveying disapproval of subordinate's marking, question, *Starke*, . . . . . 13116-37, 13391-7  
Object of, and question whether friction is caused by, *Dilworth*, 357-70; *McNeill*, 1483-91.  
Question as to whether defects only are put in, *Benson*, . . . . . 6135-8  
Suggestion that Inspector might have copy of report he is to send to Board in, question as to advantage, *Starke*, . . . . . 13365-9  
Suggestions in, question as to what happens when they are not followed, *McNeill*, 1672-9  
Teachers would be able to learn nature of report from, *Wyle*, . . . . . 2531-3  
Value of notings to teachers, question, *Purser*, 4054-6

O'CONNOR, T. P., B.A., Chief Inspector:

Appeals, nothing to prevent, . . . . . 3620-3358  
Increments, . . . . . 3021-9

## INCREMENTS:

Annual, favoured, and schemes, but difficulties in way of, 3016-22A, 3030-7, 3337-47  
Necessity for, in interests of teachers, 3004-15

## INSPECTORS:

Chief:  
Duties, . . . . . 2625-9  
in fairly constant communication with senior inspectors, . . . . . 2999-3003  
Power limited to reporting facts, 2630-3  
Conferences:  
Procedure, . . . . . 2969-68, 3243-53  
Regularity, question, . . . . . 2634-9, 2951-8  
of Whole eleven circuits, question, and suggestion, . . . . . 2640-4  
Examination of individual children by, question of, . . . . . 3679-3, 3119-62, 3218-24  
Liberality, in schools, not at all general, 2782-5

## INSPECTION:

Action which would be taken on ascertaining that teacher was providing out of own pocket things which should be provided by, 2826-35  
Contribution towards upkeep of schools, question as to ascertaining amount, . . . . . 2811, 2825

O'CONNOR, T. P., B.A.—continued.

## MERIT MARKS:

Alternative scheme suggested, but comes practically to same thing, 2653-4, 3058-41  
Difference between school and principal teacher, 2910-12, 3054-7  
Factors determining, . . . . . 2640-9  
on inspection alone without asking single question possible, and defensible under certain circumstances, . . . . . 3202-9  
Leniency of inspectors in third year, 2855-9, 3023-5.  
Lowering rather for deterioration in tone than any defect in acquisition of knowledge, 3310-17  
"Making due allowance for adverse circumstances," question, . . . . . 2895-909  
no Personal trouble with system of, 2645-9  
Proposals for readjustment of, and bearing on awards and promotion, question as to meaning of phrase, . . . . . 3256-61  
Satisfaction given by system of assessment on whole, . . . . . 2717-22  
State of school premises as far as teacher is responsible taken into consideration, 2660-4, 3073-50  
Tendency of teachers to study Inspector and supposed idiosyncrasies rather than to develop on own lines, question, . . . . . 2723-7  
Tone, . . . . . 2665-70, 3293-322  
Uniformity, possible to arrive at, by taking sufficient precautions, and fair approximate has been secured, 2635-8, 2650-5, 2700-16, 2846-56, 2913-42, 2981-3003, 3045-54.  
Value, and question as to necessity for, 2953-30  
Primary education, distinct want in system as compared with other countries, but no definite proposals, . . . . . 2803-10  
Pupils, merit certificates given by teacher and senior inspector, . . . . . 3323-6

## READING:

Above, tested by inspectors in all cases, 2777-8  
Books:  
Amount of reading matter required in each class, . . . . . 2765-76, 3053-70  
Cases of children not being supplied with, 3646-8  
Number of, and question as to cost to children, 2840-5, 2862-3  
Supplied by children themselves, 2743-4  
Silent, practice not growing very much, 2779-81  
Results system, and comparison with present system, . . . . . 2665-9, 2674-86, 2849-61, 3061-3, 3169-80, 3225-67

## SCHOOL PROGRAMME:

Freedom of teachers in classification of standards, 2763-62  
Grouping of teaching and has facilitated work of teachers, . . . . . 2737-62, 3071-3  
Instruction of infants weak point in system, but better than under old system, 2818-24, 3165-9  
Lack of initiative on part of teacher in formulating schemes of instruction or in adoption of new methods, . . . . . 2728-36  
Liberty of teachers in dealing with, 2687-94, 2723-7, 3191-201  
New subjects, question of pressing hardly on teachers, . . . . . 2792-803  
Time table, subjects tested by inspectors without interfering with, . . . . . 2785-91

## TEACHERS:

Discontent, question of modification of system to remove, . . . . . 3357-92  
Financial demands, 2811-17, 2825-89, 3074-7  
Greater freedom from anxiety under present system, . . . . . 2680-6  
Study after leaving training colleges as condition of promotion suggested, 3042-7, 3163-5  
Work of, not tested by anyone but Inspector, 3262-8  
Orange Society, rules for guidance of teachers intended to preclude membership of, *Starke*, 11753-4, 12114-5

**Organisers :**

Brought in chiefly since great change of 1900,  
*Dilworth*, .. .. . 21  
**DOMESTIC ECONOMY :**  
 Cookery and laundry amalgamated with needle-  
 work, *Dilworth*, .. .. . 20  
*Duffies, McNeill*, .. .. . 2020-3  
 Number, *Dilworth*, 20, p. 129, l.; *Starke*, 11425;

**DRAWING :**  
*Duffies, McNeill*, .. .. . 2020-3  
 New appointments, *Dilworth*, .. .. . 21  
 Number, *Dilworth*, .. .. . 20, p. 129, l.  
*Duffies, Dilworth*, .. .. . 313-18  
 Former national teachers among, *Dilworth*,  
 .. .. . 21, 314  
 General, number of, *Dilworth*, .. .. . 314, p. 129, l.

**IRISH LANGUAGE :**  
*Duffies, McNeill*, .. .. . 2020-3  
 Number, *Dilworth*, 20, p. 129, l.; *Starke*, 11425.

**KINDERGARTEN :**  
*Duffies, McNeill*, 2020-3, .. .. . 21  
 New appointments, *Dilworth*, .. .. . 21  
 Number, *Dilworth*, 20, p. 129, l.; *Starke*, 11425.  
 Report of Board of National Education made in  
 reference to recommendations of Commission  
 on Manual and Practical Instruction, p. 491-2

**MUSIC :**  
*Duffies, McNeill*, .. .. . 2020-3  
 New appointments, *Dilworth*, .. .. . 21  
 Number, *Dilworth*, .. .. . 20, p. 129, l.

**SCHOOL :**  
 Number, *Dilworth*, .. .. . 20  
 Old appointments, *Dilworth*, .. .. . 21  
 Number, *Dilworth*, .. .. . 20-l, p. 129, l.

**SCIENCE :**  
*Duffies, McNeill*, .. .. . 2020-3  
 New appointments, *Dilworth*, .. .. . 21  
 Number, *Dilworth*, .. .. . 20, p. 129, l.

**P.****Pensions :**

Improved scale, resolutions of Association of  
 Church of Ireland School managers, *McNally*,  
 .. .. . 5842-3  
 Percentage of teachers remaining through all grades  
 up to maximum, question, *Fraser*, 16995-9  
 Question of, urged again and again by Commis-  
 sioners, *Clarke*, .. .. . 9044-6, 9048-9  
 Physical drill, see under School Programme.  
 Physical geography, see under School Programme.

**POOLER, The Venerable Lewis, D.D., Archbishop**  
 of Down, .. .. . 5825-5860  
 Increments, fixed gradual, should be given as in  
 case in any other profession, .. .. . 5860

**INSPECTORS :**

Changes from one district to another too frequent,  
 .. .. . 5825-7  
 should Confine examination to work gone over  
 as indicated in progress book, .. .. . 5701-5  
 Discourtesy to teachers, 5553-62, 5555-9, 5746-7  
 Each man allowed own little fad, no organised  
 system, .. .. . 5817  
 Examinations advocated, but not necessarily in  
 every subject, and not on a fixed date,  
 5642-54, 5784-97, 5823-7, 5849-50, 5734-  
 .. .. . 45  
 Ex-teachers as, great deal to be said for and  
 against, .. .. . 5823-4  
 not One man in fifty fit to inspect infants,  
 .. .. . 5838-41  
 Promotion of child to higher grade should  
 depend on, .. .. . 5884-99  
 Spirit of inspection ought to be changed, and  
 considered most important point in whole  
 thing, .. .. . 5817-24, 5673, 5706-13, 5745-58, 5768-75  
 no Systematic examination of whole class, and  
 examples and specimen questions suggested  
 as means of arriving at uniformity,  
 5543-51, 5611-16, 5633, 5674-99, 5777-84  
 Uniformity, want of, and example, .. .. . 5835-8

**POOLER, The Ven. Lewis, D.D.—continued.****MANAGERS :**

Holding of periodic examinations by, question  
 of, .. .. . 5575-84  
 Matters requiring attention, question as to  
 whether inspectors regularly inform, 5563-7  
 Notice of inspector's visits often received on  
 morning of visit, and opinion that some days'  
 notice should be given, .. .. . 5539-42  
 Part only of report sent to, and should be  
 remedied, .. .. . 5769-76  
 Responsibility for cleaning schools, question,  
 .. .. . 5568-76  
 Spoken word rather than written believed in, in  
 communicating with Board, .. .. . 5829-31

**MERIT MARKS :**

Impressment or tone system partly responsible  
 for want of uniformity, and suggested alterna-  
 tive, .. .. . 5589-93, 5638-41  
 no Knowledge personally of reduction on account  
 of equipment of school, 5669, 5717-21, 5820  
 Lowering, following change of inspection,  
 instances, .. .. . 5627-35  
 Objection to, as a general system not well  
 founded if fair and exhaustive examination  
 were held, .. .. . 5600-5, 5651-72  
 Perfectly useless under present system, 5851-5  
 Uniformity question, .. .. . 5606-10  
 Pupils in higher standards, increase in percentage,  
 question, .. .. . 5850-9  
 Results system, principle disapproved of, but  
 present system also unsatisfactory,  
 .. .. . 5829-38, 5732-3

**SCHOOL CLEANING :**

Payment by teacher out of own pocket, no  
 knowledge of, .. .. . 5821  
 Question as to how far it might be done by  
 children without bringing down on teacher  
 condemnation of parents, .. .. . 5827-8

**SCHOOL PROGRAMME :**

Elementary subjects not as well taught as before  
 1900, but children more intelligent,  
 .. .. . 5594-9, 5802-13, 5761-63  
 Memory cultivation neglected, .. .. . 5844-5  
 Methods should be left to teacher, and inspector  
 should not interfere with, if good work is  
 being done, .. .. . 5714-6  
 New ideas put into children's minds, and want  
 to be clerks and not farmers,  
 .. .. . 5824, 5599, 5722-39, 5754-7, 5804  
 School year, no objection to actual working of  
 uniform, and disadvantage of separate for every  
 school, .. .. . 5709-7

**TEACHERS :**

Grievances against system and not individual  
 inspectors, .. .. . 5814-17, 5809  
 Grievances, question of, and witness not bound  
 to answer for, .. .. . 5793-301

**Powis Commission, Report, 1870 :**

Historical sketch of growth of national education  
 in, *Dilworth*, .. .. . p. 129, l.  
 Results system instituted in consequence of,  
 .. .. . 82  
 Preparation book, no Test of proficiency of school,  
 .. .. . 5690-1

**Primary Education :**

Attitude of teachers and inspectors towards new  
 system, *Dale*, .. .. . 10420-6, 10717-27  
 Benefit of whole community should be aim, and  
 question of, *Purser*, 4315-82, 4442-52, 4545-8;  
*Downing*, 5224-27, 5458-59.  
 Changes introduced in 1900 without consultation  
 with chiefs of inspection, *Purser*, 3791-2, 4288-95.  
 Chief idea of method developed in circular and  
 passages quoted, *Starke*, .. .. . 11433-8, 11642-9  
 Comparison of present system with Results system,  
 .. .. . 52-3, 490, 493-5, 733-44; p. 130, l.;  
*McNeill*, 1493-9, 1942-55, 1967-44; *Wye*,  
 2160-3, 2435-62, 2499-521, 2613-8; *O'Connor*,  
 2665-9, 2674-84, 2949-51, 3081-3, 3169-90,  
 3225-57; *Purser*, 4071, 4075, 4298-306, 4318-82;  
*Downing*, 4731-2, 4734-43, 4985-8, 5039, 5136-

## PRIMARY EDUCATION—continued.

- 44, 8159-62, 8162-237, 5298-11, 5273-309,  
5393-403, 5443-67, 5611-2; *Poser*, 5529-38,  
5594-9, 5732-3, 5751-63, 5803-13, 5842-5,  
*Grierson*, 5889-901, 5940-1; *Beeson*, 6034-42,  
6046, 6184-5; *Collis*, 6344-5; *Hynes*, 6609-22,  
6753-75; *Carver*, 7497-513, 7503-12, 7666  
77, 7891-5, 7609-13, 7617-35, 7628-35; *McKaffy*,  
8331, 8335-7; *Clarke*, 9138-41, 9199-203;  
*Ward*, 9274-82, 9330-613, 9377-79, 9407-14;  
*Frederick*, 10334-5, 10347-9; *Ford*, 10086-90;  
*Starke*, 11310-1, 11391-466, 11425-43, 11459,  
11954-77, 11990-5, 12303-8, 13408-37; *Hobson*,  
14153-74.  
Cost of new scheme, *Dewdney*, 5049-51, 4971  
Criticism of anonymous document sketching pro-  
posed change, suspension of inspector for,  
particulars re, *Dewdney*,  
4927-48, 5336-54, 5404-11, 5492-507  
Desire on part of children to become clerks as  
against mechanical work or farming as outcome  
of, not known of, *Collis*, 6324-33, 4375-9  
Distinct want in system as compared with other  
countries, but no definite proposals, *O'Connor*,  
2903-10  
Grievance against system, and not individual  
inspectors, *Poser*, 5814-117  
Indifference of parents and children, *Starke*, 10018-  
24; *Dale*, 10447-55, 10616-17, 10698-9  
Introduction and growth of system, *Dilworth*,  
p. 129, 1.  
Letter sent to, asking for consideration and report  
of new arrangement, *Levens*, 11175-8, 11182-4  
New ideas put into children's minds, and want to  
be clerks and not farmers, *Dewdney*, 5324;  
*Poser*, 5599, 5723-30, 5764-7, 5804; *MacLough-  
lin*, 7935-8.  
New system replaced Results system in 1900,  
*Dilworth*, 487-91, p. 130, 1.  
No proposals for improvement as affecting funda-  
mental principles, *McNeill*, 1771-2, 1781-4  
Results system, see *that title*.  
Sketch of introduction, to show difficulties, *Starke*,  
11210-309, 13095-17  
Suggestions for more efficient system, *MacLoughlin*,  
7794-806, 7925-915  
Working of system, question re, *Clarke*, 5886-716

## Progress Book:

- Circular, p. 140, 1.  
Inspectors should confine examination to work  
gone over as indicated in, *Poser*, 5701-5  
System followed, *Dilworth*, 1068-74  
No Test of proficiency of school, *Dewdney*, 5090-1

## Promotion:

- Awarding of procedure, *Dilworth*, 146-50, 560, p.  
132, 1; *Wyse*, 2056-79; *Starke*, 11340-53,  
12549-58.  
Awarding, were merit marks abolished, question  
and proposals, *Starke*, 12534-43, 12719-23  
Bearing on, of successful teaching of cookery,  
*Wyse*, 3382-3  
Circumstances under which teachers have not to  
wait another triennial period on failure to obtain,  
*Dilworth*, 428-33, 1201; *Wyse*, 2072-5; *Starke*,  
12461-3.  
Claims dealt with by experienced inspector brought  
into office specially for purpose, *Dilworth*,  
149, 167-8  
Should come to every teacher as matter of course  
with certain provisions, *Ward*, 9320-4, 6647-70  
Conditions as to size of school, and system assumed,  
*Dilworth*, 146, 148, p. 132, 1; *Dewdney*, 4874-84.  
Depending on average attendance and grievance  
of boys under 7 being ineligible, *Wyse*, 2547-64  
Depending on training, scholarship, efficiency and  
service, suggested, *Poser*,  
3911-20, 4106-11, 4115-25, 4166-73, 4453-65,  
4836-44.  
Docket, form for, p. 143, 1.  
Examination for should be restored, *McKaffy*,  
8387, 8624-6, 8624-5, 8642-7  
Grades, see *that title*.  
Inspector's judgment would play larger part in,  
under proposed alternative scheme to merit  
marks, *Frederick*, 10205-14

## PROMOTIONS—continued.

- Merit Marks, see *that title*.  
"Paper," owing to standard numbers in higher  
grades having been reached, *Dilworth*, 161,  
163-78, 467-8, 1158-9, p. 132, 1; *Conners*,  
7336-56, 7643-9; *Clarke*, 9231-3; *Starke*,  
11336-40, 11659-60, 11921-4, 12078, 12549-58;  
*Frimell*, 13062-3; *Hobson*, 14274-7, 14317-26.  
Plan suggested, *Dale*, 10729-33  
Practice in England, *Dale*, 10630-42  
Principal might be damaged by bad assistant,  
*Dilworth*, 61-3, 195-202, 375-7; *Purcell*, 3576-7;  
*McKaffy*, 8394-9, 8517-25; *Ward*, 9288-9.  
Procedure under old system but retention to,  
undesirable, *Dewdney*, 4814-24  
Prospects as compared with old system, question,  
*Levens*, 10945-6, 14370-92  
Provisions for rapid, of specially meritorious  
teachers, *Dilworth*, 191-2  
by Seniority, question, *Ford*, 10205-14, 10277-81  
Severs responsibility on inspectors in third year  
in awarding merit mark, and suggested alterna-  
tive, *McNeill*,  
1335-9, 1444-62, 1506-5, 1512-29, 1622-7,  
1727-9, 1742-5, 1900-17, 2043-4  
Some standard necessary too, even if merit marks  
were abolished, *Starke*, 12070-5  
Special, of assistants, *Dilworth*, 193-5, p. 132, 1.  
Standards of reports required for, *Dilworth*,  
149-58, 1133-6, 1198-1200, p. 132, 1.  
Study after leaving training colleges as condition  
of, suggested, *O'Connor*, 3043-7  
Table, *Dilworth*, 1907-12, p. 164, 1.  
Teachers remain three years at maximum of  
grade before promotion to a higher, *Dilworth*,  
132-5, 140, 147  
Time taken to get from bottom to top of scale,  
*Dilworth*, 656-7; *Biingham*, 7303, 7490-7; *Con-  
ners*, 7430; *McKaffy*, 8383-84; *Clarke*, 9128-32;  
*Dale*, 10644-56; *Starke*, 11469-84.  
Triennial, of efficient principal teachers, circular,  
p. 143-4, 1.  
Undergraded teachers, plea for, *Biingham*, 7303;  
see also *Increment*.

## PURCELL, Walter J., Examiner:

- 3359-3713, App. IV. (part) and VII.  
Appeals, average number, question, 3578-83  
Board of National Education, power of dismissal  
of teacher irrespective of manager, 3591  
Criminal case, 3600-13  
Corporal punishment book, use of, 3693-92

## EXAMINERS:

- Accept inspector's statement as to merit mark,  
except when marked discrepancy seen between  
proficiency table and, 3480-9  
Average number of reports dealt with daily, and  
percentage of adverse reports, 3493-5, 3704  
Circumstances under which reprimand would be  
sent, question, 3613-29  
Complaints against managers come before,  
3428-30  
Date of appointment, 3372, 3614  
Delay in dealing with appeals not due to, 3440-6  
Duties connected with letters re appeals, etc.,  
3399-420, 3527-64  
Duties connected with reports, and regulations  
taken into consideration,  
3374-95, 3454-512, 3529, 3662-73, 3696-711  
No indication as to percentage of change in  
specific case of abrupt raising of standard of  
marks, 3600-13  
Nature of special matters which would be  
submitted to Secretary, 3597-9  
Promotion and increment not dealt with at all,  
3431-6  
Question as to access to Board of teachers being  
limited by appointment of, 3627-56  
Training, question of, 3547-64, 3615-26  
Inspectors, immediately in charge of school directed  
to hold enquiry in cases of complaints against  
teachers, and procedure, 3403-23  
Managers, power of dismissal of teachers, irrespec-  
tive of National Board, 3569-80

## MERIT MARKS:

- of Teacher, not communicated to him, 3569-73  
of Teacher and school separate, but certain  
connection, 3568-8, 3574, 3576-7

## PURCELL, Walter J.—continued.

## REPORTS:

- Average time between receipt of, in office, and sending out to manager, .. 3653-60  
Copies of all not sent to teachers, .. 3674-6  
Time elapsing after inspection before sending in, .. 3677-9

## TEACHERS:

- Complaints against, by managers:  
no Copy furnished to, unless formal enquiry is to be held, .. 3692-6  
Inquiry held into, procedure, .. 3400, 3402-25  
Nature of, .. 3426-7, 3682, 3688-99  
Complaints against, by others than Managers, nature and origin, .. 3437-9  
Financial demands on, and methods of dealing with, by examiners, .. 3677-81

## PURSER, Alfred, Chief Inspector:

- Censure for refusing to carry out orders, circumstances, *Starkie*, .. 13719-31  
Condemned by Teachers' Association, for reflections upon them, *Lemass*, .. 14546-8  
Connection with case of Father Loughrey, *Starkie*, 13689-703; *Lemass*, 14406-82  
Correspondence re dismissal of Mr. Mansfield, p. 489-70, II.  
Disloyal to Board from beginning, and success of new scheme endangered by, *Starkie*, .. 11266-90, 11295-7, 11299, 11853, 12011-35  
Evidence referred to, as being conscious of duties in regard to annual conferences, but use as means of promoting uniformity neglected, *Starkie*, .. 11683  
Letter of instruction to, re new circuits and memorandum thereon .. p. 507-9, II.  
Letter to Secretary re new scheme, involving suspension of, *Lemass*, .. 11061, 11090-103, 11121-7, 14448, p. 489-90, II.  
Little help given to new scheme, *Lemass*, .. 11063-6, 15543-5  
Misconception of duties, *Starkie*, .. 11284-706  
Objection on part of, to work being revised by junior officer, *Lemass*, .. 10938-41  
Proof, in detention of report of Mr. Weply, that he knew state of things in Clonmel district, *Lemass*, .. 14507-65  
Reason for proposing, as secretary, question, *Starkie*, .. 13732-44  
Statement that examiners were chiefs of inspection incorrect, *Lemass*, .. 11192-4  
Statement that he was not consulted about inspection circuits incorrect, *Lemass*, .. 11192-4  
Statement as to relations between secretaries and chief inspectors incorrect, *Lemass*, .. 11196  
Statement that secretaries were always appointed from inspectors incorrect, *Lemass*, .. 11197-8, 14008-13  
Statement that chief inspectors had no official knowledge of conference, repudiated, *Starkie*, .. 12265-81  
Suspension, particulars re, and re previous record, *Starkie*, .. 11266-90, 11299, 13704-18  
Evidence, 3714-4722, Appa. XII-XVIII.  
APPRAISALS:  
Appointment of Committee of Board to deal with, suggested, .. 3636-41  
Rule taking away certain rights, question, .. 4562-3  
Suggestion for dealing with, 4646-57, 4236-40.  
BOARD OF NATIONAL EDUCATION:  
Changes should not be made in code without longer and more careful consideration, .. p. 464, II.  
CHIEF OF INSPECTION:  
Alteration in duties, statement, p. 471, II.  
Consulted on one point only in new programme, .. 4235-6  
Matters referred for advice of, by examiners, question, .. 4550-1  
not Taken into consultation re changes in system, 3791-2, 4286-93, p. 463, II.  
Commissioners, meeting twice fortnightly suggested, .. 4508, p. 464, II.  
Examiners, complained as to no practical knowledge of school matters on part of, .. 4241-5

## PURSER, Alfred—continued.

## Resident Commissioners:

- Personal interference with work of inspection undesirable .. p. 464, II.  
Sole right of deciding what appeals are to go before Board, 4640-7  
Small permanent committee desirable, .. 4503, p. 464, II.  
Circuit case, .. 4576-722, p. 465-9, II.  
Circuit case, .. 3997-4097  
France, system of inspection, &c. p. 472-3, II.  
Increments, subdivisions of merit marks should be abolished, and increments should not be withheld except for unfavourable reports, 3897-910, 4099-105, 4453-05, 4514-30, p. 464, II.

## INSPECTIONS:

## Chief:

- Authority over award of merit mark, and question, .. 4410-6  
Communication with Resident Commissioners, .. 4558-75  
no Official information of trouble which had arisen in Clonmel, .. 4297  
Powers over reports, and duties in office, .. 4209-85  
Reports should be sent in through, 4149-52  
no Responsibility for preparation of "Notes to Teachers" as a whole, and not forced on teachers, .. 4297-13

## Circuits:

- First arrangement as to division of duties and alteration and means taken to secure uniformity, .. 4017-23, p. 463, II.  
Unreasonable man's award militating against just treatment of all schools, .. 3739-91, p. 463, II.  
should Confer with teacher after every inspection or examination, .. 3921-4  
Conferences:  
at Dublin in 1903, only one held, .. 3793-5  
Regularity, question, .. 4029-32  
Distribution of staff under old system and comparison with new, .. 4014-16  
District system, restoration, with 6 or 8 head inspectors advocated, .. 3796, p. 463, II.  
Examinations, no objection seen to teacher taking part in, .. 4120-30  
Head:  
Abolished in 1900 and made senior inspectors and objections to change overruled, .. 4008-13, 4508-10  
Number and duties, .. 3686-7  
Re-examination by, proceedings, 3769-70  
Salaries not affected by Change, only functions, .. 4202-6

## Individual examinations:

- Desirable, and suggested scope, .. 3863-96, 4155-83, p. 464, II.  
Necessary to make system more efficient and more conducive to sound education than at present, .. 4046-5  
Inspection and examination necessary, p. 464, II.  
Judgment of character of schools not possible by mere system of inspection, .. 4009-80, 4153-5  
Junior, training, method before and after Results system, and comparison with present day, .. 3750-65  
Present arrangement would not work for system of individual examination, and suggested change, .. 4041-5  
Protestants and Roman Catholics very nearly equal in numbers, .. 4207-11  
Rude behaviour to teachers, existence admitted, .. 4179-201, 4053-63, 4548-9  
Senior:  
Authority over award of merit mark, and question, .. 4410-6  
Had not in all cases advantages of seniority, and reasons, and question as to power over junior inspectors, 4024-68, 4597-11  
Objection to system because of difficulty of getting number of men to fill position if to be given any real supervising powers of control, .. 3773-88

## PURSER, Alfred—continued.

## INSPECTORS—continued.

Staff in 1871, and supervision exercised by, 3722, 3724, p. 483, II.  
 Work formerly split up better, 4490-8  
 Junior assistant mistresses, abolition of appointment favoured, and reasons, 4512-26

## MERIT MARKS:

Abolition favoured, on grounds of being unworkable, 4096-8, 4184-5  
 Analysis of meaning of terms in report of conference of senior inspectors, 3890-15  
 Different for school and teacher, and question as to effect of proposed alteration in, 4488-87  
 Difficulty reduced by division into favourable and unfavourable, 4382-409  
 Factors determining, 4552-81  
 Tense circular, opinion, 4248-56  
 Uniformity:

Conferences not considered efficient means of securing, 4033-9  
 Difficulty of arriving at, brought out in Mr. Dale's report, and reasons, and alternative suggested, 3849-80  
 Printed guide would not enable inspectors to come to, 4257-65  
 Quite impossible, and reasons, 3797-8, p. 463, II.  
 not Secured under present mode and instance of abrupt lowering in certain district, 3997-4007  
 Steps to secure, as between circuits, 4029-39  
 Steps taken to secure under old system, 3832-5, 3988-96

Observation book, value of notes to teachers, question, 4064-8  
 Papers handed in, 4652A-8  
 Promotion, depending on training, scholarship, efficiency, and service, suggested, 3911-20, 4106-11, 4116-25, 4168-78, 4452-65

## REPORTS:

1871, primary, secondary and incidental, and scope of, 3725-38  
 Method of dealing with, under old system, and difference from new system, 3816-48, 3943-85, 4488-9, 4503-7, p. 483, II.  
 should be sent in through Chief Inspector, 4149-52

## RESULTS SYSTEM:

Sketch, 3746-72, p. 483, II.  
 Stimulating effect at first, but defects manifested as time went on, and question as to value of education, 4318-82  
 Retirement, 4648, 4652-3

## SCHOOL PROGRAMME:

Definite for each school and grading of each school and definite examination on such programme desirable, 3881-96, p. 464, II.  
 Benefit of whole community should be aim, and question of, 4318-82, 4445-52, 4546-8  
 no Progress on whole, may be improvement in one direction but falling-off in others, 4298-306  
 Essentials, and optional subjects to be taken at discretion of manager and teacher favoured, 4181-8  
 Gain by introduction of large number of new subjects, 4145-8  
 Minimum number of necessary subjects, 3894-8

## SCHOOLS:

Babies of three or four years of age not approved of, and play schools suggested, 4218, 4417-41, p. 464, II.  
 Grouping of standards should be left to decision of teacher, 4112-4  
 Very inefficient before introduction of Results system, 4214-17  
 Visits of higher officials, 4081-98

## TEACHERS:

Grievances, 4511-15  
 More trust and confidence should be placed in by Commissioners and officers, p. 484 II.  
 Responsibility for formation of character should not be placed on, 3925-36, 4846

## R.

Reading, see under School Programme.

## Religious Instruction Certificate Book:

Complaints sometimes received about people coming in and giving annoyance, *Dilworth*, 441-2

Visitors of all denominations have full liberty to examine, but not permitted to make extracts, *Dilworth*, 441

## Report Book:

Falsification, in Connell case, and question, *Hynes*, 0722-40, 7073-83, 7179-81  
 Open to inspection of public, *Dilworth*, 440

## Reports:

1871, primary, secondary and incidental, and scope of, *Purser*, 3725-38, p. 463, II.

## ANNUAL:

Circular, p. 141, I.  
 System of grading only thing that really compels, *Dale*, 10678-9

Appeals, see *this title*.

Automatic increments should follow satisfactory, *McNeill*, 1465-60, 1503-4, 1853-7; *Wynn*, 2347-8, 2353-9; *O'Connor*, 3016-22A, 3036-7, 3337-47; *Purser*, 3897-910, 4099-105, 4453-65, 4516-35; *Pasler*, 5880; *Benson*, 6064-70, 6095-100, 6118-28; *Hynes*, 7188-90, 7200-3; *Miller*, 8077-9; *McCarthy*, 8403-7, 8485-8, 8537-02; *Clarke*, 9133-7; *Ward*, 9220-4, 9288-467, 9707-14; *Tristram*, 10149-81, 10204, 10219; *Starkie*, 11357-80, 11803-7, 11908-21, 11925-7, 12048-70; *Robson*, 14206-11, 14253-64.

Average time between receipt of, in office and sending out to manager, *Purser*, 3059-60

Chief heads under which information is to be supplied, regulations re, *Dilworth*, 44-3, p. 129

Comparison of new and old systems of dealing with, and question, *Ward*, 9732-9; *Purser*, 3816-48, 3943-85, 4488-9, 4503-7, p. 483, II.

Control over, by Chief Inspector, *McNeill*, 1579-90; *Hynes*, 8536-40.

Difficulty of making full, in Observation Book, question, *Dilworth*, 1024-7

Examiners of, see under Board of National Education.

Extracts only sent to managers and teachers, and full report desired, *Dilworth*, 238, 348, 1045-61; *Pasler*, 5789-78; *Benson*, 8129-34; *Colles*, 6223-32, 6282-3, 6298-303; *Purser*, 3674-6; *Tristram*, 10322-3; *Starkie*, 11787.

Full formal, on every school every year considered unnecessary, *Starkie*, 13401-7

Formal inspection, Details, question as to, *Dilworth*, 330-3

General, advocated as alternative to merit marks, *Tristram*, 10149-81, 10203-14, 10219

General:

Circular, p. 141, I.  
 Duties of examiners in connection with, and regulations taken into consideration, *Purser*, 3377-98, 3447-8, 3456-512, 3525, 3882-73, 3696-711

Extracts sent to teacher and manager, form of, *Purser*, p. 161, I.

Form for, *Dilworth*, p. 151-3, I.

Importance of, and visit made for purpose of furnishing, *Dilworth*, 32-4

Great deal too much depends on, *Starkie*, 11801

Great importance attached to particular marks given for each subject, *Dilworth*, 351

INCIDENTAL:

Forms for, *Dilworth*, p. 154, I.  
 not Necessary for very short visits, *Starkie*, 18403-7

Relative numbers, question, *Dilworth*, 1066-7

Inspectors subjected to coercion, *Downing*, p. 475, II.  
 Kind of, referred to whole Board before 1900, *Downing*, 4776-82  
 made almost entirely under heads, *Dilworth*, 349  
 Merit Marks, see *this title*.  
 Obsolete, form for, *Purser*, p. 160-I, I.  
 Occasional visits, unless very short, generally entail a short, *Dilworth*, 847

## Reports—continued.

- Office routine with regard to, *Dilworth*, 538-40;  
*Dowling*, 5055-84; *Starkie*, 11583.  
 Referring back to inspector, question, *Dilworth*,  
 423-7  
 Sending back to inspectors for elimination of  
 passages, question, *Dilworth*, . . . 714-6  
 Senior inspector, form of, *Dilworth*, . . . p. 153, 1.  
 should be sent in through Chief Inspector, *Parker*,  
 4149-52  
 Space given to general remarks very small, *Dil-*  
*worth*, . . . 350  
 Suggestion that inspector might write in observa-  
 tion book, question as to advantage, *Starkie*,  
 13365-9  
 Time elapsing after inspection before sending in,  
*Parker*, . . . 3637-9  
 Resident Commissioner, see under Commissioners  
 under Board of National Education.

## Results System :

- Abolished in 1909 and place taken by present  
 system, *Dilworth*, . . . 487-91, p. 130, 1.  
 Abolition, prophecy as to result, *Starkie*, 11808  
 Comparison with present system, *Dilworth*, 32-5, 493-  
 5, 495, 738-44, p. 130, 1.; *McNeill*, 1498-9, 1942-  
 55, 1957-84; *Hynes*, 2166-3, 2435-62, 2499-521,  
 2613-9; *O'Connor*, 2895-9, 2974-80, 2849-61,  
 3081-3, 3168-90, 3225-57; *Parker*, 4071, 4075,  
 4298-306, 4316-82; *Dowling*, 4731-3, 4754-43,  
 4985-3, 5099, 5136-44, 5159-62, 5182-237,  
 5208-11, 5273-360, 5393-463, 5445-67, 5511-2;  
*Parker*, 5529-38, 5594-9, 5752-3, 5751-63, 5802-  
 13, 5845-5; *Griereson*, 5839-901, 5940-1; *Benson*,  
 6034-42, 6046, 6184-5; *Coffin*, 6346-5; *Hynes*,  
 6500-22, 6753-75; *O'Connor*, 7497-513, 7508-  
 12, 7556-77, 7591-6, 7609-13, 7617-25, 7628-  
 30; *McKaffy*, 8331, 8335-7; *Port*, 10086-89;  
*Clark*, 9138-41, 9199-205; *Ward*, 9274-82,  
 9280-818, 9737-8, 9907-14; *Trueman*, 10334-5,  
 10357-9; *Starkie*, 11116-11, 11391-404, 11425-  
 48, 11456, 11954-77, 11980-5, 12203-8, 12840-2,  
 13408-37; *Hobson*, 14153-74.  
 Introduction, history, and effect, *Parker*, 3740-72,  
 p. 463, II.; *Lemass*, 10918-22.

## Roll Book :

- Dinner roll, useless, and should not be in operation  
 at all, *Miller*, . . . 9283-305  
 Falsification in Clonmel case, *Hynes*,  
 6722-49, 7073-83, 7179-81  
 Open to inspection of public, *Dilworth*, . . . 440

## S.

## Salaries :

- Any new scheme must present difficulties and  
 lead to increased expenditure, *Frizzell*, 14048-69  
 Birrell grant, *Dilworth*, 563-6; *Starkie*, 11423.  
 Bonus, or assistants, *Dilworth*, 144, p. 151, 1.  
 Bonus to teachers of large and important schools,  
*Starkie*, . . . 11445

## CAPITATION PAYMENTS :

- Convent schools mainly paid by, altogether,  
*Dilworth*, . . . 562-3  
 Nature of, *Dilworth*, . . . 144, p. 151, 1.  
 Question as to teachers getting living wage,  
*Starkie*, . . . 11373-90  
 Scheme had to be re-cast owing to, *Lemass*,  
 11143  
 Cases of financial hardship not recalled, *Lemass*,  
 14583-6  
 Comparison with England, *Dilworth*, 136-42  
 Considerations which have to be taken into account  
 in fixing, *Dale*, . . . 1707-16, 10643-7  
 no Difference made between large and small schools,  
*Starkie*, . . . 12591-3  
 Difficulty of settling with teachers whose results  
 year did not coincide with 31st March and  
 complaints, *Lemass*, . . . 11141-16  
 Fees for special and extra subjects, *Dilworth*,  
 144, p. 151, 1.

## Salaries—continued.

- Fixed, new system of, *Dilworth*, 123, p. 131, 1.  
 Grades, see that title.  
 Greater security under present system, *Starkie*,  
 11415  
 Higher average, under present system, *Starkie*,  
 11415-8, 11423  
 Higher initial advocated, *McNeill*, 1451-82, 1590-6,  
 1512-20, 1622-7, 1786A-1807, 1831-57, 1908,  
 2024-42; *O'Connor*, 3029-22; *Binham*, 7303,  
 7454; *O'Connor*, 7649-55; *Ward*, 9321-3; *Dale*,  
 10440; *Starkie*, 11371; *Hobson*, 14302-3, 14281-3,  
 Highest, of most in town schools, question, *Starkie*,  
 11465  
 Hopes of saving on new scheme not fulfilled,  
*Starkie*, . . . 13745-59  
 Improvements under new system, *Starkie*, 11415-23  
 Increments, see that title.  
 Inequitable working of new system, and Rights  
 of teachers interfered with, and example, *Miller*,  
 8079-237  
 Local aid, see that title.  
 Made out to teachers, but sent to managers, and  
 question re practice, *Dilworth*,  
 12590-691, p. 129, 1.

## MONTHLY PAYMENT :

- Agitation for, *Dilworth*, 13-14; *McKaffy*, 8543.  
 Difficulties, *Frizzell*, 14079-88; *Starkie*, 11419-  
 23; *Hobson*, 14198-202.  
 Increase in expenditure would not be very  
 serious, *Dilworth*, . . . 1216-7  
 Taking of men from ordinary work would be  
 obviated, *Dilworth*, . . . 1216  
 Payment direct to teacher, and not through  
 manager desirable, *O'Connor*, 7692; *Dale*, 10441;  
*Hobson*, 14198-202.  
 Personal, should be given and part only dependent  
 on results, *Frizzell*, . . . 4526  
 Prophecy as to result of abolition of Results  
 system, *Starkie*, . . . 11893

## QUARTERLY PAYMENT :

- Delay caused by, *Dilworth*, 12, 678, 1214  
 Routine, *Frizzell*, . . . 12948-70  
 Uniformity, original policy, *Starkie*, . . . 11415  
 Re-organisation of system, scheme for, *Lemass*,  
 11029-1, 14424-47, 14563-69  
 Reorganisation of system of payments, memoran-  
 dum . . . p. 497-502, II.  
 Residual grant, *Dilworth*, . . . 123-6  
 Revised scale, criticism, *Frizzell*,  
 12985-14041, 14116-21  
 Rights of teachers secured by new scheme,  
*Lemass*, . . . 11104-7  
 Rule bearing on average attendance sanctioned  
 by Treasury, *Frizzell*, . . . 14068-9  
 Rule as to boys under 7 being ineligible for en-  
 rollment, and grievance of, *McKaffy*, 8489-924  
 Scale proposed, and question, *Starkie*, 13564-73  
 Scale, *Dilworth*, 128-31, 137, p. 131, 1.; *Dowling*,  
 4362.  
 Scheme had to be kept within limits of expenditure,  
*Lemass*, . . . 11074-82  
 Scheme of payments designed *inter alia* to pro-  
 mote advancement of high-class teachers to best  
 schools, *Lemass*, . . . 11074-82  
 Scheme for bonuses to be provided according to  
 size of schools, but failure, *Starkie*, 12693-6  
 Sources, *Dilworth*, . . . 8, p. 128, 1.  
 State grant, see that title.  
 System forced upon Board, *Starkie*, 12590-6  
 Teachers did not suffer any immediate loss by  
 change in 1900, *Dowling*, . . . 6132-5  
 Treasury reserved to itself complete liberty,  
*Lemass*, . . . 11071-2  
 Two-fold, one personal to teacher, and one attached  
 to school, scheme, *McKaffy*,  
 8387-99, 8523-5, 8541, 8567  
 Scholarships, from primary to secondary schools in  
 England, *Dale*, . . . 10783-91

## School accounts :

- no Separate cash book and published accounts for  
 each school, *McNeill*, . . . 1445-9  
 not Simplified by new scheme as claimed, *Dowling*,  
 4072-3

## School attendance :

- Average attendance, *Dilworth*, . . . . . 8  
 Evils of present system of "single school day,"  
*Forth*, . . . . . 10031-41  
 Fallacy with regard to averages, and question,  
*Starkie*, . . . . . 12576-81  
 Increase in percentage since 1900, *Starkie*, 12211-4  
 Low average, and remedy needed, *Forth*, 10012-3  
 Low, and suggestion for improvement, *Dale*,  
 10543-8, 10508-13, 10749-56  
 Number of hours of obligatory attendance, *Downing*,  
 5431-2; *Dale*, 10758-61  
 Regularity of attendance factor in awarding merit  
 mark, and due consideration given to adverse  
 circumstances, *McNeill*, . . . . . 1423-8, 1457-63  
 School Attendance Act, question as to working  
 of, *Makaffy*, . . . . . 8483-4  
 School Attendance Committee of Belfast, report  
 referred to, *Forth*, . . . . . 10012

## School buildings and premises :

- Bipartite and tripartite, describing arrangements  
 made to suit time-table to, *Downing*, 5008-13  
 Central authority has to wait local effort, *Starkie*,  
 11520  
 Class accommodation, allowance made for, in  
 arriving at merit mark, *McNeill*, . . . . . 1423-4  
 Condition, responsibility for, and question as to  
 effect on marking of school, *Dilworth*, 66-71,  
 395-1, 375-413, 507-19, 697-8, 1137-44;  
*McNeill*, 1840-50, 1386-74, 1383-93, 1465-82,  
 1532-6, 1773-80, 1785-8, 2000-8; *O'Connor*,  
 2640-4, 2811-17, 2825-29, 3074-80; *Purser*,  
 3677-81; *Purser*, 4553-61; *Poser*, 5560, 5563-  
 77, 5717-21, 5820-1, 5823-3; *O'Connor*, 5881-3,  
 5938-9; *Benson*, 5993-5006, 8007-9, 6076-90,  
 6101-16, 6139-43, 6186-7; *Coffin*, 6209-20,  
 6303-10, 6385-7, 6406-10; *Woodward*, 6424;  
*Fynes*, 6560-60; *Miller*, 6650-61, 8258-67,  
*Makaffy*, 8352-6; *Ward*, 9383-7; *Starkie*, 11320-  
 3, 11558-63; *Robson*, 14157-62, 14164-7, 14308-  
 13  
 Extravagant structural requirements by Inspectors,  
 question, *Makaffy*, . . . . . 8349-51  
 Floor space, improvement in, *Starkie*, . . . . . 1132  
 Heating and cleaning, grant procured to provide  
 half cost, *Starkie*, . . . . . 11408-14  
 Improvement greatly needed, *Forth*, . . . . . 10025  
 Increase in number urgently needed, *Forth*, 10026-  
 30, 15042-64; *Starkie*, 12227-30  
 Insufficient classrooms, and rule as to exclusion  
 of youngest children if accommodation in-  
 sufficient, *Starkie*, . . . . . 11312-3  
 Improvement in Plans, *Starkie*, 11320, 11406-7  
 Sanitary condition, improvement in during last  
 10 years, *Starkie*, . . . . . 11312-20  
 Wrongly planned, and overcrowding, *Dale*,  
 10618-33, 10614-5

## School equipment:

- Case of teacher being responsible for maps and  
 stationery, *Woodward*, . . . . . 6424-29  
 Desks provided for all children and kindergarten  
 desks obligatory in all schools where infants  
 are enrolled, *Starkie*, . . . . . 11331  
 Inadequate, *Dale*, . . . . . 10534-42  
 Inspectors enjoined to use special consideration  
 in matter of "Merit Mark," *Dilworth*, 286-1, 378  
 Responsibility ultimately falling on teacher as  
 affecting merit mark, question, *McNeill*,  
 1894-1407, 2000-3  
 Slates not used, *Starkie*, . . . . . 11331

## School fees:

- None charged as a rule, *Dilworth*, . . . . . 10  
 Privileges of charging in a few cases, *Dilworth*,  
 10, 596  
 School organizers, see under Organizers.

## School programmes:

- Additional subjects not suitable to schools, and  
 educational status lowered by, *MacLoughlin*,  
 7307-17, 7880-92  
 in Advance of times and motives not understood,  
*Leeson*, . . . . . 11104, 14486,

## School Programme—continued.

## AGRICULTURE :

- Action recommended with view to introducing,  
 p. 495 II.  
 Formerly taught in schools, and what is required  
 could be taught through nature study,  
*Downing*, . . . . . 3555-58

## ARITHMETIC :

- Circular, . . . . . p. 138, I.  
 Comparison of teaching with Results system, *Dilworth*,  
 945-58; *Wye*, 2145-8; *Downing*, 5105-  
 9, 5449-54; *Poser*, 5751-53, 6342-3; *Cannings*,  
 7508-9, 7621, 7625; *Makaffy*, 8366-8; *Ward*,  
 9276-82, 9306-17, 9761-75, 9810-12; *Tristram*,  
 10348; *Starkie*, 11408  
 a Compulsory subject, *Purser*, 3894; *Downing*,  
 4991-4  
 Grouping of classes, question, *O'Connor*,  
 2739-43; *Downing*, 5014-5, 5083, 5383a.  
 Individual examination in, advocated, *Tristram*,  
 10140-3, 10220-1, 10250-61, 10270-6, 10282-  
 307, 10399-401  
 number of schools giving teaching in, under  
 system in force before 1900, *Wye*, . . . . . 2420  
 Plan of judging proficiency, *McNeill*,  
 1690-4, 1698-9  
 Prominence given to, in award of merit mark,  
 and question re information of teachers that  
 special stress should be laid on, *Dilworth*,  
 1055-62  
 should stand out prominently, *Downing*,  
 5076-80, 5369-43a  
 Test by mere inspection not possible, *Makaffy*,  
 3587-8  
 Test recently given instanced, *Dilworth*, 1171-3  
 Time given to, *Fynes*, . . . . . 6700-9  
 Weights and measures tables taught practically  
 by weighing sand, *Dilworth*, . . . . . 707-3  
 Chemistry taught in a few schools under system  
 in force before 1900, *Wye*, . . . . . 2418-9  
 Chief inspectors consulted on one point only,  
*Purser*, . . . . . 4295-6  
 Circulars, . . . . . 144-5, p. 137-141, I.  
 Comparison of liberty granted in England, and  
 question, *Dale*, . . . . . 10618-76

## COOKERY, LAUNDRY-WORK AND DOMESTIC SCIENCE

- Added to curriculum under revised programme,  
*Wye*, 2412; *Purser*, 3585; *Starkie*, 11426  
 Action recommended with view to introducing,  
 p. 495 II.  
 Circular, . . . . . p. 138  
 Essential subject, *Downing*, . . . . . 4991-3  
 Fees for, payable in addition to salaries of  
 teachers, *Dilworth*, . . . . . 144  
 Increase in number of schools taking, and  
 extent, *Starkie*, . . . . . 11426, 11977  
 High opinion of value of teaching, *Wye*, 2350-  
 99; *Brigham*, 7224  
 More discretion should be left to Managers,  
*Woodward*, . . . . . 6620-3  
 Organizers, see under Organizers.  
 Proper subject to be taught under proper con-  
 ditions, *Fynes*, . . . . . 6762  
 Successful teaching, bearing on awards of  
 increment and promotion, *Wye*, . . . . . 2382-8  
 Taught in very small number of schools under  
 system in force before 1900, *Wye*, . . . . . 2416-7  
 Criticism of, and question as to attention paid to,  
*Leeson*, . . . . . 11, 163-73  
 Definite, with certain amount of freedom to  
 teachers and managers to add other subjects  
 suited to locality advocated, *Purser*, 3881-96,  
 4131-4, p. 464; *Downing*, 4989-90, 4993, 5081-2,  
 5418-23  
 Discussed by teachers, question, *Tristram*, 10393-4;  
*Starkie*, 11777-81  
 Domestic economy, see Cookery, Laundry-work  
 and Domestic science, above.

## DRAWING :

- Action recommended with view to introducing  
 p. 494, II.  
 Added to curriculum under revised programme,  
*Wye*, . . . . . 2412  
 Comparison of teaching with Results system,  
*Ward*, . . . . . 9276  
 Change in system, question, *O'Connor*, 3064-61



## School Programme—continued.

## DRAWING—continued.

- Circular, .. .. . p. 138, I.  
 a Compulsory subject, *Purser*, 3894-5; *Downing*, 4991-3.  
 Organisers, see under Organisers.  
 Question of pressing hardly on teachers, *O'Connor*, 2798-800.  
 Rarely taught under Results system, and present extent, *Starke*, 11425.  
 Taught as an optional subject in small number of places under system in force before 1900, *Wyses*, 2413-2414; 2419, 2420.  
 Dressmaking, number of schools giving teaching in, under system in force before 1900, *Wyses*, 2420.  
 Elementary subjects, thorough teaching of, advocated, *Forth*, 10093-5.

## ENGLISH:

- Comparison of teaching with Results system, *Wyses*, 2109-3; *Starke*, 11406, 11425, 11474-6.  
 a Compulsory subject, *Purser*, 3894.  
 Prominence given to, in award of merit mark, and question re information of teachers that special stress should be laid on, *Dilworth*, 1005-52.  
 Extra subjects, estimates, question, *Downing*, 4995-6.  
 Gain by introduction of large number of new subjects, *Purser*, 3894; 4165-8.  
 Gardening, *Starke*, 11435, 11436-9, 11474.

## GEOGRAPHY:

- Circular, .. .. . p. 140, I.  
 a Compulsory subject, *Purser*, 3894.  
 Comparison of teaching with Results system, *Wyses*, 2164; *O'Connor*, 3228-27, 3247; *Downing*, 5290-4; *Ward*, 9275-82; *Tristram*, 10348.  
 Grouping of classes, question, *O'Connor*, 2744-50.  
 Geometry, number of schools giving teaching in, under system in force before 1900, *Wyses*, 2420.  
 Grading schools, memorandum, p. 521-2, II.

## GRAMMAR:

- Circular, .. .. . p. 140, I.  
 Comparison of teaching with Results system, *O'Connor*, 3225-7; *Downing*, 5178-82, 5455-7; *Ward*, 9292-605.  
 Greater freedom of teacher in selecting text-books and arranging subjects, and question, *O'Connor*, 2487-94, 2723-7.

## HAND-AND-EYE TRAINING:

- Action recommended with view to introducing, p. 494, II.  
 Circular, .. .. . p. 138, I.  
 Principle favoured, *Downing*, 5217-22.  
 History of preparation, *Lemas*, 11135-65.

## HISTORY:

- Added to curriculum under revised programme, *Wyses*, 2412.  
 Comparison of teaching with Results system, *Downing*, 5289; *Ward*, 9276.  
 Practically unknown under Results system, but now distinct subject, *Starke*, 11425.  
 Plan of judging proficiency, *McNeill*, 1828-9.  
 no Restriction on teaching of, *McNeill*, 1820-4.

## HOME LESSONS:

- Circular, .. .. . p. 140, I.  
 Value of, and importance attached to, *Downing*, 5091-4; *Dale*, 16617.

## HYBRIDITIES:

- Taught in 14 schools under system in force before 1900, *Wyses*, 2418-9.  
 Improvements suggested, .. .. . p. 496 II.  
 Individual question, *Tristram*, 10359.

## IRISH LANGUAGE:

- Extent of teaching, *Starke*, 11440-3.  
 Fee for, payable in addition to salaries of teachers, *Dilworth*, 144.  
 Organiser, see under Organisers.  
 Statement that under one circular inspector who did not like teaching of, could put down school as bad, unjustified, *McNeill*, 1739-9, 1742-5, 2045.  
 Unfairness of extra fees being given for, and not for any other language, *Hobbes*, 14314-7.

## School Programme—continued.

## KINDERGARTEN:

- Action recommended with view to introducing, p. 494, II.  
 an Essential subject, *Downing*, 4991-3.  
 Introduction into curriculum, question, *Dilworth*, 704-11, 803-15.  
 Lack of initiative on part of teacher in formulating schemes of instruction or in adoption of new methods, *O'Connor*, 2723-26.  
 Laundry-work, see *Cookery*, *Laundry-work* and *Domestic Science*, above.  
 Liberty of teachers, and interference of inspectors, question, *McNeill*, 1493-7; *O'Connor*, 3101-201; *Downing*, 5063-8, 5384-92, 5470-7; *Paster*, 5714-4; *Mohaffy*, 5617; *Forth*, 10057-68; *Tristram*, 10182-92; *Starke*, 13777-86; *Hobbes*, 14265.  
 Light and Heat, taught in a few schools under system in force before 1900, *Wyses*, 2418-9.

## MANUAL AND PRACTICAL INSTRUCTION:

- Action recommended with view to introducing, p. 493-4, II.  
 Change in system, question, *O'Connor*, 3092-103.  
 Changes in methods of examination and inspection as result of report, p. 492-3, II.  
 Essential subject, *Downing*, 4991-3.  
 Relative value, question, *O'Connor*, 3246-7.  
 Universal in lower classes, but not taught in higher classes, *Starke*, 11426-33; *Purser*, 3895.

## MATHEMATICS:

- Practically disappeared from programme, *Downing*, 5008-10.  
 Statistics of teaching in schools, *O'Connor*, 3254-8.  
 Memorandum submitted to Chief Inspector, and observations thereon, *Lemas*, 11083-127, 11601, 11100, 14449; p. 439-90, II.  
 Mental arithmetic, comparison of teaching with Results system, *Downing*, 5170-4; *Ward*, 9276.  
 Minimum number of necessary subjects, *Purser*, 3894-6; *Downing*, 4991-4.  
 Modified, invited to be submitted by managers, and case of Father Laughrey, *Starke*, 13989-703; *Lemas*, 14469-82.

## NATURE LESSONS:

- Almost universal and valuable in rural districts, *Starke*, 11433.  
 Botany taught under, *Downing*, 5357-64, 5367-8.  
 not Taught in same school as elementary science, *Downing*, 3392-7.  
 Navigation taught in very small number of schools under system in force before 1900, *Wyses*, 2418-9.

## NEEDLEWORK:

- Action recommended with view to introducing, p. 495, II.  
 Collective teaching, *Starke*, 11425.  
 a Compulsory subject, *Purser*, 3893; *Downing*, 4991-3.  
 Increase of 600 in schools teaching, *Starke*, 11425.  
 New subjects, question of pressing hardly on teachers, *O'Connor*, 2792-803.  
 Organisers, see that title.  
 Overloaded, and modified programme not proposed to extent they might be, *Hynes*, 6081-98, 6756-48, 6847-55, 6889-906, 7097-119.

- Overloaded, and question as to desirability of making certain subjects compulsory and leaving others to discretion of managers and teachers, *Brecon*, 6022-42, 6144-54.

## PHYSICAL EDUCATION:

- Action recommended with view to introducing, p. 495 II.  
 Circular, .. .. . p. 138-9, I.  
 Comparison of teaching with Results system, *Ward*, 9276.  
 Effect of not teaching on grading of school, question, *Dilworth*, 144.  
 Essential subject, *Downing*, 4991-3.  
 Introduced in 1900 and now almost universal, *Starke*, 11425.  
 Important in up-bringing of children, *Hynes*, 6018-9, 6741.

## School Programme—continued.

## PHYSICAL DRILL—continued.

- Question as to relative value, *O'Connor*, 3241-6.  
 should be taught in all schools, *Purser*, 3895  
 necessity for Teaching, under new curriculum  
 troublesome probably to some of older teachers,  
*O'Connor*, 2793, 2801  
 Time given to *Hyne*, 6716-12  
 Physical geography, number of schools giving  
 teaching in, under system in force before 1900,  
*Wye*, 2420  
 Present, unsuitable to National Schools, and  
 detrimental to interests of both pupils and  
 teachers, *Purser*, p. 474, II

## READING.

- Aloud, tested by inspectors in all cases, *O'Connor*,  
 2777-8  
 Amount read in course of year, *O'Connor*,  
 2768-78, 3638-79; *Downing*, 3373-8.

## Books:

- Cases of children not being supplied with,  
*O'Connor*, 2848-8  
 Dropping of text-book on Agriculture a loss  
 to the country, *Hyne*, 6852-5  
 Free books, suggested provision, but never  
 acted upon, *Leamas*, 14549-53  
 Supplied by children themselves, *O'Connor*,  
 2763-4, 2849-5, 2863-5; *Dale*, 10330-42;  
*Circular*, p. 139, I.  
 Comparison of teaching with Results system,  
*O'Connor*, 3247-37; *Downing*, 5183-390, 5204-  
 17, 5443-8; *Poser*, 5751-63, 5842-3; *Gum-  
 mina*, 7508, 7587, 7586-90, 7617-19, 7622;  
*McKaffy*, 8363-5, 8434-40, 8537-40, 8590-7;  
*Ward*, 9276, 9388-91, 9807 9813-14; *Starkie*,  
 11462-8, 11425, 13675-81.

- Essential subject, *Downing*, 4991, 4993-4  
 Grasping impossible, *Downing*, 5014-5, 5083  
 Individual examination in, advocated, *Tristram*,  
 10140-3, 10220-1, 10250-61, 10270-6, 10292-307  
 Plan of judging proficiency, *McNeill*,  
 1896-8, 1898-8, 1826.

- Silent, practice not growing very much, *O'Connor*,  
 2779-81.  
 Smaller amount gone into more thoroughly  
 would be more beneficial and comparison  
 with German system, *Purser*, 4139-44  
 should stand out prominently, *Downing*,  
 3078-80, 3369-83a.

- Received by teachers with acclamation, and  
 question as to evidence for statement, *Leamas*,  
 14533-6.  
 Represents a maximum attainable only in favour-  
 ably situated schools, and most rural schools  
 take up little beyond "the 3 R's," *Starkie*, 11400.

- Result of enlargement depriving teaching of  
 concentration on more essential subjects, question  
*Binham*, 7291-302, 7338-83.

- Revision, memorandum, p. 502-5, II  
 Scheme of revision, *Leamas*, 11021-2

## SCIENCE AND OBJECT LESSONS:

- Action recommended with view to introducing,  
 p. 494-5, II.  
 Change in system, question, *O'Connor*, 3104-18  
*Circular*, p. 138.  
 Comparison of teaching with Results system,  
*Ward* 9276, 9807-9.  
 Course unsuitable, *Dale*, 10839, 10843  
 Essential subject, *Purser*, 3895-6; *Downing*,  
 4991-3.  
 Hardship entailed on teachers having failed to  
 send in modified programme, *Hyne*, 6993-8  
 Interesting subject and helps to break monotony,  
*MacLoughlin*, 7815  
 More discretion should be left to Manager,  
*Woodward*, 6320-3  
 Nature study not taught in same school as,  
*Downing*, 5362-7  
 Necessity for teaching, under new curriculum  
 troublesome probably to some of older teachers,  
*O'Connor*, 2793, 2801

- Organisers, see under Organisers.  
 Proper subject to be taught under proper con-  
 ditions, *Hyne*, 6762

- Taught in number of schools, and successes,  
*Starkie*, 11433

- Sent to chief and senior inspectors, and some of  
 the district in rough state for criticism,  
*Leamas*, 11166

## School Programme—continued.

## Schemes:

- Action recommended with view to introducing,  
 p. 496, II.  
 Added to curriculum under revised programme,  
*Wye*, 2412  
 A compulsory subject, *Purser*, 3894-5; *Downing*,  
 4991-3; *Hyne*, 6620-1, 6761.  
 Difficult to get teachers, *MacLoughlin*, 7816  
 Effect of not teaching on grading of school,  
 question, *Dilworth*, 818-20.  
 Increase in number of schools taking, *Starkie*,  
 11425-6

- Question of pressing hardly on teachers, *O'Connor*,  
 2795-7

- Relative value, Question, *O'Connor*, 3238-40  
 Taught at optional subject in certain number of  
 schools under system in force before 1900,  
*Wye*, 2418, 2420, 2421-2, 2425

- Special subjects, more discretion should be left to  
 Manager, *Woodward*, 6320-3

## SPELLING:

- Circular*, p. 139, I.  
 Comparison with Results system, *Ward*, 9276-82,  
 Subjects which should be emphasised, *Downing*,  
 5076-80, 5369-83a.

- Submission to inspectors before being issued for  
 criticism, question, *Ward*, 9531-8

- Submitted to whole Board, *Clarke*, 9149-59  
 Submitted to teachers, *Leamas*, 14474-7

- Suitability of, question, *Dale*, 10838-43  
 Temperance lessons introduced, *Starkie*, 11426

- Tendency of teachers to study Inspector and  
 supposed idiosyncrasies rather than to develop  
 on own lines, question, *O'Connor*, 2723-7

- Widened, and question re *Wye*, 2410-28  
 Woodwork, action recommended with view to  
 introducing, p. 494, II.

## WRITING AND COMPOSITION:

- Circular*, p. 139, I.  
 Comparison with Results system, *Poser*, 5751-63,  
 5842-3; *McKaffy*, 8373-7, 8441-7; *Ward*, 9276.  
 Essential subject, *Downing*, 4991-3  
 Experiment in, *Downing*, 5284-7  
 Individual examination in, advocated, *Tristram*,  
 10140-3, 10220-1, 10250-61, 10270-6, 10282-  
 307.

- Plan of judging proficiency, *McNeill*, 1599,  
 1827.

- should stand out prominently, *Downing*, 5076-80,  
 5369-83a.

- Writing on abstract themes unsuitable, *Dilworth*,  
 1148-60

## School year:

- Promotion of children should not be restricted to  
 beginning of, *Dale*, 10553-61

- Time of proposed examination, question, *Hyne*,  
 14229-30, 14245-7

- Uniform, as at present, i. proposed separate for  
 each school, question, *Wye*, 2524; *Poser*,  
 5700-7; *O'Brien*, 5978-80; *Woodward*, 6180-1,  
 p. 478, II.; *Hyne*, 6974-84; *Binham*, 7364-  
 77; *McKaffy*, 8357-10, 8638-41; *Ward*, 9749-  
 53; *Tristram*, 10163-6, 10215-8, 10262-7, 10366-  
 5, 10368-73; *Dale*, 10851-7; *Starkie*, 13574-400.

## Schools:

- Convent, mainly paid by capitation payments,  
*Dilworth*, 562-3

- Higher grade: Scheme proposed, but nothing  
 done, *Starkie*, 11423-3

- Intermediate, question of age children leave  
 primary schools, *Gummina*, 7636-41

## NATIONAL:

- Age of admission of babies, question, *Dale*,  
 10549-54, 10514-5, 10618-21; *Starkie*, 12315-  
 23.

- All books specially produced for, sent round for  
 examination of each member of a committee,  
 and then submitted to committee for sanction,  
*Starkie*, 11631

- Appearance of classrooms improved by *Starkie*,  
*Starkie*, 11331

- Apprentice classes of Technical Institute, Belfast,  
 product of, and standard of education low,  
*Forth*, 9904-10

## Schools—continued.

- Babies of three or four years of age not approved of, and play-schools suggested, *Purser*, 4218, 4417-41
- with bilingual programme in operation, circular, p. 148, I.
- Bilingualism instituted in 200 schools, *Starkie*, 11443
- Boys coming from, found very insufficiently prepared to take advantage of technical schools and institutes, *Forth*, 9824-32
- Boys eligible for Trades Preparatory schools, and having exhausted programme of, kept marking time in, suggested remedy, *Forth*, 9894-7, 9900-4
- Bulk of applicants for Day Trades Preparatory School from, *Forth*, 9887-8
- Change from school to school used by parents to get rid of attendance officer, and question, *Tristram*, 10218, 10248-9
- Children employed to large extent out of school hours in work which militates against proper pursuit of daily studies, *Forth*, 9908-7
- Children enrolled in, discouraged from attending evening classes at Belfast Technical Institute, *Forth*, 98339-44
- Children insufficiently educated for vacancies notified to Juvenile Advisory Committee, *Forth*, 10003-8
- Children leaving, to go to Intermediate schools, question, *Cummins*, 7036-41
- Closing of unnecessary, procedures, *Starkie*, 11827-30
- Condition caused by lack of local interest in, no longer true to same extent as 10 years ago, *Starkie*, 11324-31
- No Co-ordination between, and efficiency will not be secured without close connection between schools in same area, *Forth*, 10016-8
- Draft system formerly in vogue in single teacher schools, *Starkie*, 11396-402
- Employment of children having left Work of Juvenile Advisory Committee of Labour Exchange, *Forth*, 9992-10011
- English systems unsuitable for, *Tristram*, 10143, 10366-7
- Ex-pupils attending Preparatory Section of Evening Division of Belfast Technical Institute, low standard of education, *Forth*, 9903, 9904-89
- Freedom of teachers in classification of standards, *O'Connor*, 2753-02
- Future of pupils question, *MacLoughlin*, 7935-8; *McKaffy*, 8309-12, 8048-52
- Government, *Delworth*, p. 129, I.
- Grading, memorandums, p. 521-2, II.
- Great improvement in condition compared with ten years ago, *Starkie*, 13289-301
- Great majority of children do not get beyond fourth standard, *Starkie*, 12209-11
- Grouping of standards, question, *Wynn*, 2460-9; *O'Connor*, 2747-62, 3071-3; *Purser*, 4112-4; *Downing*, 4891-6, 5014-20, 5083-4, 5383-3A.

## HALF-TIME SYSTEM:

- Number of days spent in school, *Callis*, 8330-1
- Tendency to lower standard of education, *Forth*, 9898-10002
- Higher classes, statistics of pupils, question, *Delworth*, 849-50, *Pooler*, 5355-9
- Improvement in neatness and refinement, and in discipline of children and manners, *Starkie*, 11974, 13289-301
- Inspectors, see that title.
- Instruction of infants unsuitable, and ineffective, and question, *O'Connor*, 2818-24, 3185-9; *Starkie*, 11372
- Interval between boys leaving, and joining Trade Preparatory School, *Forth*, 10003-101
- Kindergarten methods universal in instruction of infants, *Starkie*, 11391-11459
- Literature, question of, *O'Connor*, 2782-5; *Starkie*, 11331-2, 12231-3
- Managers, see that title.
- Merit certificate given to pupils by teacher and senior inspector, *Wynn*, 2248-91A; *O'Connor*, 3323-6
- Merit Marks, see that title.
- Number of pupils on rolls, *Delworth*, 8, p. 129, I.

## Schools—continued.

- One-teacher, most difficult to teach, but debarred from promotion above third grade, *Downing*, p. 478, II.
- Organisation, Circular, p. 130, I.
- Out of date and inadequate organisation, question, *Starkie*, 13782-5
- Promotion of pupils, question, *Pooler*, 5156-8, 5684-50; *Downing*, 5434-42; *Woodward*, p. 478, II.; *Cummins*, 7614-6; *Dale*, 10055-61
- no Provision for mentally defective and unhealthy children, and scheme advocated, *Forth*, 10090-2
- Raising of leaving age advocated, *Forth*, 10012; *Dale*, 10057
- Return of, visited by Mr. Welpy during first year in charge of Glenmalur circuits, p. 520, II.
- Satisfactory, should be left in hands of teachers, and closely examined by inspectors once in three years, *Starkie*, 11355-6
- Scholarships to secondary schools, Scheme, *Starkie*, 11497-9
- Small efficiency, question and tendency of inspectors to close down, *McKaffy*, 8057-61, 8474-8, 8526-31, 8577-85; *Tristram*, 10326-33, 10393-8, 10401-8; *Starkie*, 11449; *Dale*, 10090-403; *Starkie*, 11373-90
- Smallness of number of pupils passing to secondary schools, and provision of scholarships advocated, *Forth*, 9874-82, 10018
- Standard I. criteria re ages of pupils, p. 139, I.
- Swimming baths, provision in connection with larger schools, question as to source of money, *Downing*, 5021-2
- Teachers, see that title.
- Two new standards to take up intermediate courses introduced, *Starkie*, 11443-5
- "Tone" circular, *Delworth*, 30-42, 339-47, 409-86, 789-806; *McNeill*, 1353-5, 1375-82, 1408-13, 1691-1770, 1730-9, 1742-6, 1926-47, 2008-10, 2045; *Wynn*, 2160, 2161-76, 2507-13; *O'Connor*, 2803-79, 3210-7, 3293-322; *Purser*, 4246-56; *Downing*, 4845-8, 5483-91; *Pooler*, 5589-93, 6636-41; *Glassen*, 8014-8, 8090; *Reeson*, 6043-50, 6071-5; *Callis*, 6340-3; *Woodward*, 6483-9; *Hynes*, 6802-4; *Reynolds*, 7285-50, 7335-40, 7364-77, 7425-32; *Cummins*, 7497-512, 7578-9, 7598-602, 7626-33; *McKaffy*, 8407-14, 8538
- Clarke*, 9251-6; *Hart*, 9363-18; *Tristram*, 10336-8, 10348; *Starkie*, 11355-69, 11978-9, 12077-93, 13816-20, 13842-83
- Understanding not complained of, *McKaffy*, 8279-81
- Very inefficient before introduction of Results system, *Purser*, 4314-17
- Visits of Resident Commissioner, *Delworth*, 119-20, 652, p. 131, I.; *McNeill*, 1366-68, 1608-2; *Purser*, 4081-95; *Hynes*, 6805-11; *Wood*, 9819-22, 9434-503; *Dale*, 10484-96, 10605-8, 10822A-8; *Starkie*, 11486-3, 12080, 12139-5, 13129-30, 13145-73
- NON-NATIONAL:
- Number of, and of pupils attending, *Delworth*, 4-5, 298
- Term, meaning of, *Delworth*, 294
- Secondary, smallness of number of national schoolboys passing to, and provision of scholarships advocated, *Forth*, 9874-82, 10018
- Primary intermediate, Board pressing Treasury for grants, *Downing*, p. 478, II.
- Science, see under School Programme.
- Science Organisers, see under Organisers.
- Scottish, public elementary schools, system of examination and inspection, p. 492-3, II.
- Singing, see under School Programme.
- Spelling, see under School Programme.

STARKIE, W. J. M., M.A., LITT.D., LL.D., Resident Commissioner of National Education, 11290-11915, App. XXXIII.

Correspondence re Chemical of Mr. Mansfield, *Purser*, p. 469-70, II.

## APPEALS:

- Delay through delay in getting minute, 18352
- Means of access to Board, question whether there are due facilities, 12384-89, 12412-22, 12454-60
- Method of dealing with, not in any essential respect different before 1930, 11826-57

STARKIE, W. J. M., M.A., LL.D., LL.D.—*con.*APPEALS—*continued.*

- Number, 1906-1912, .. 12461  
 Procedure, .. 11585-609, 12036-42 12438-47  
 Belfast case, .. 11530-2, 11708-24, 12784-8, 13120-62,  
 13300-74, 13613-53, 13824-41

## BOARD OF NATIONAL EDUCATION:

- Action taken by, question as to what is to be  
 understood by "Board," .. 11498-508  
 Administration, system of, 11596-609, 11627-31  
 Annual reports, Government refuse to publish,  
 12581

## Chief of Inspection:

- Appeal against change of name and consequent  
 suspension of Messrs. Downing and Pinner,  
 particulars *re* and *re* previous record, .. 11556-96  
 no immediate supervision exercised over  
 inspectors, .. 11233  
 Powers at present performed by whole Board,  
 12425-4  
 Routine work done by clerks and *no* visits  
 paid to schools, .. 11215, 11224-33

## Circulars:

- Chief idea of method of inspection developed in,  
 and passages quoted, .. 11631-8, 11642-9  
 Being codified and printed in form of book, and  
 no objection to communication to teachers, .. 12739-44  
 Directions not always carried out, .. 11639-41  
 Issued without reference to Commissioners, .. 12772-3  
 Leaving impression on inspectors' minds that  
 bribes were taken by managers for appoint-  
 ments to schools, .. 13282-8, 13519-21

## Commissioners:

- Charge of knowing nothing or next to nothing  
 of what is going on in office, .. 13202-81  
 Check inspection cannot be held except by  
 order of, .. 13037-41  
 Powers, .. 12913-18

## Resident:

- Accusation of giving secret instructions to  
 inspectors repudiated, 11727, 13599-70  
 Administrative person, .. 11584-659, 11627-30, 11631-3, 12904-26,  
 12934-65, 12968-91, 13094-15, 13025-31,  
 13796-18

- Appeals go direct to, and have to be counter-  
 signed by them before being sent to  
 Chief Inspector, .. 12036-42, 12461  
 Chief Inspectors subordinate to, and not to  
 secretaries, .. 11261-4, 12597-808  
 and *Cloenduff* case, 11480, 11486-97, 11569-  
 30, 11532-43, 11707, 11731-4, 12999-104,  
 12281-328, 13134-48, 13479-512, 13531-  
 90, 13508-41, 13509-15, 13589-99  
 and *Cloenduff* case, 11803-32, 11842-52,  
 11852-4, 12043-51, 13032

- Deputations from Teachers' Organisation  
 ceased and particulars, .. 11610  
 Hampered in carrying out policy by in-  
 competence or disloyalty of four or five  
 higher officials, .. 11260-90  
 Inefficiency allowed to go on because of  
 danger of being compelled to resign,  
 and question, .. 13219-31  
 Nothing whatever to say to introduction  
 of new system except to prelude over  
 administrative machinery, .. 12867-76

- Notings in Observation Book conveying  
 disapproval of subordinates' marking,  
 question, .. 13116-37, 13591-7,  
 Primary functions, question, .. 12802-4  
 Reprimands not brought before, as a rule,  
 12423, 12453

- Sketch of introduction of new system to  
 show difficulties in way of, .. 11200-300, 12016-17

- Speech outlining new proposals, favourable  
 reception, .. 11291-2

- Speeches suppressed by Government, .. 12581-5

- Visits to Schools, and question, .. 11480-5, 12060, 12130-5, 13145-78  
 no more Votes as far as voting is concerned  
 in promotion of inspectors, than any  
 other member of Board, .. 12832-8

STARKIE, W. J. M., M.A., LL.D., LL.D.—*con.*BOARD OF NATIONAL EDUCATION—*continued.*Commissioners—*continued.*

- Resignation, particulars, .. 11252, 11298-9, 12332-61  
 Right to discuss matters with officials, question,  
 12966-89, 12992-13003, 13016-32A, 13086-92  
 Sending of appeals to individuals, question,  
 12774-83  
 Conferences held with teachers on proposed  
 modifications in system of education, 12610  
 Deputations representative of teachers, 12610

## EXAMINERS:

- Arrangement to call attention of higher  
 authorities to any great variation in  
 standard suggested, .. 11486-8  
 Duties of chiefs of inspection divided  
 between new chief inspectors and,  
 11260-1, 11585  
 Procedure *re* reports, .. 11507  
 Reprimands, responsibility rests with secre-  
 taries, .. 12425-30, 12859-71  
 Routine work admirably carried out,  
 11264-8

- Formal resolutions of Teachers' Associations  
 printed in agenda and laid before, at regular  
 intervals, .. 11610

- Fundamental rules not to be changed without  
 consent of Lord Lieutenant, and question,  
 12405-11

- History of, and of committees as affecting  
 possibility of committees in future, 12328-63

- Improvements introduced or attempted to be  
 introduced since 1900 summarised, 11406-79

- Information as to striking reduction in value of  
 merit marks, question, .. 12472-87

- Means of access to, .. 11610-2

- Office Committee; history and functions,  
 11581, 11639-2

- Powers in matters of finance, question, 11558

- Proposal to sever connection between office and  
 inspection staff, .. 11231-64, 12751-5

- Publication of new rules, question of giving  
 notice of, .. 11811-20, 12500-73, 12588-605

- Relations with teachers, .. 11770-96

- Responsibility for certain documents, question,  
 12877-98, 13745

## Secretary:

- Dispute with Chief Inspector about a  
 modified programme, and as a result  
 Board decided that two offices were quite  
 independent, .. 13689-793

- Duties, .. 11583

- Objections to exclusion of inspectors from  
 post of, .. 12753-4

- Responsible for conveyance of reprimands,  
 11501-7

- Restored to original position, and have now  
 actual authority over chief inspectors,  
 12751-3

- Routine work in office admirably carried  
 out, .. 11264-6

- Success of new scheme endangered by high  
 officials, 11266-90, 11295-7, 11299, 12519-31

- Unpopularity and continual attacks on, question  
 as to explanation, .. 11902-12010, 12016-22

- Cloenduff* case, .. 11485-97, 11569-30, 11532-45, 11707,  
 11731-4, 12096-104, 12291-328, 13138-80,  
 13456-78, 13479-512, 13523-30, 13531-40,  
 13609-41, 13609-15, 13638, 13688-90

- Cloenduff* case, .. 11809-32, 11843-52, 11882-8, 12043-51, 13032-  
 120

- Corporal punishment book, regulation and question,  
 12900-8

- Development grant, diverted from proper purposes,  
 1224-6

- Education, state of, .. 11310-11

## Grants:

- First:  
 Block in promotion owing to standard number,  
 11335-40, 11456-60, 11921-4, 12549-36

- Standard numbers fixed after consultation with  
 Treasury and refused to make any alteration,  
 11338-40

- Standard numbers of women will be filled  
 before end of next year .. 12532-5

- Second, standard numbers not nearly reached,  
 12559

STARKIE, W. J. M., M.A., LL.B., LL.D.—con.

## INSTRUCTORS :

## Annual :

should be awarded in every case where report was satisfactory .. 11805-7, 12965-79

would cost more, but advocated, .. 11803, 11908-21, 11925-7

Originally proposed but scheme set aside, .. 11803, 12052-6, 12589

Automatic, subject to condition of receiving no unsatisfactory report advocated, .. 11354, 11357-60

80 per cent. of teachers could get, and question, .. 12513-18, 12586-8

Scheme, .. 12676-790, 12796-7

Suggestion that effect of refusal of, should not extend beyond year in which it is refused, and question, .. 12791-15

System bad, .. 11901

System elaborated by Board, .. 12400-4

Teachers having joined since 1896 at a low initial salary have stronger claim to, than other teachers, .. 12716-8

Triennial scheme had from point of view of teacher and of inspector .. 12057-64

Inspection System, comparison with Results system favourable, .. 11954-77, 12203-8

## INSPECTORS :

## Appointments :

Interviewed by committee of whole Board who make nomination to Board, .. 11831

by limited competition suggested, but objected to, .. 12744-7

on Merit and better men .. 13797

Present system works very well, and method, .. 12746-50

Promote of recruitment largely from ranks of national teachers, and question, .. 13766-78

Attitude .. 11965-62, 12157-87

Best men lost owing to poorness of initial salary, .. 13797-309

## Chief :

Actual authority, question of, .. 12136-53, 12165-6

Additional, proposed and position to be occupied by, .. 12806-8

have ample means of knowing variation in standard, .. 11488-90

Disloyal to Board from beginning, and success of new scheme endangered by, .. 11266-90, 11296-7, 11299

Duties of, .. 11833-707

Duties of chiefs of inspection divided with, .. 11260-1

Most highly paid officials, with intention of breaking ambition, to be appointed secretaries, .. 11294

One-fifth of schools taken in each year, and question as to sufficiency to know district, .. 12154-62

Competency question, .. 12811-25

## Conferences :

Dublin, 1904, report .. p. 531-10

Duty of chief inspectors to preside at, and official notice sent to .. 12245-51

Uniform standard specially considered at, and agreement arrived at regarding value to be allotted to different merit marks, .. 11857-68

## Divisional :

Advocated .. 12183-6

Asked for simply because of cheapness and position proposed to be occupied, .. 12695, 12759-69

Effect of time of school year, .. 13383-406

Examination not disapproved of as a corrective to impressionist system if it did not affect teaching, .. 11355-6, 11379, 11963-73, 11978-9, 12188-90

## Head :

Absorbed in senior inspectors with higher salaries, .. 11257-60

Appeal against change of name and consequent suspension of Messrs. Downing and Purser, particulars re and re previous record, .. 11286-90

Duties, &c., .. 11213-43, 11247-57

Impressionist and test system, question of, .. 12977-95

STARKIE, W. J. M., M.A., LL.B., LL.D.—con.

## INSTRUCTORS.—continued.

Inspection and investigation question re difference .. 13010-6

Knowledge of Irish a condition for every alternative appointment, .. 11443

Number, .. 12806

Practical teaching experience, question, .. 11452-9

Practice of, with reference to examination and inspection as distinct from examination, and question whether uniformity could not be obtained .. 12791-6

Precluded from expressing opinions directly adverse to policy of Board, .. 12843-52

## Promotion :

Because of being hard markers, reply to charge, .. 12925-31

Method, .. 12832-3

Provisional, appointment proposed but not carried out, .. 11606-9

Redistribution into 22 circuits and system, .. 11630-7

Relations with teachers, question of, and would be greatly improved if responsibility for increment were removed from, .. 12832-48

Results of new organisation in main satisfactory, but dissatisfaction and incompetence of some of heads of staff, and instances .. 11396-90

Senior, differences of opinion with district inspector referred to Chief Inspector, .. 12896-10

Standard element .. 11485

not Subjected to indiscriminate revision at mere request of teachers and procedure adopted, .. 11968, 11969, 12451, 11831-52, 12123-9

Tone and attitude towards teachers, .. 11905-62, 12167-87

Training, examination in method required to be passed at end of 6 months, .. 11609-73

Transfers frequent, but policy is to keep them in districts as long as possible, .. 12099-31

Undersystem question .. 11650-34, 11244-9

Via, notice of :

to Managers, shortness of, .. 11940-2, 12197-203

to Teachers, objection to, .. 11960-2, 12649-75, 13904-9

Junior Assistant Mistresses, no improvement made in education equal to that of, .. 11391-5, 11430

## MANAGERS :

Circular issued to inspectors leaving impression that bribes were being taken by, for appointments to school, .. 12828-8

Dismissal of Teachers :

Action now taken by Board, .. 11787-99

Appeal to Board as to desirability of removing teacher, question, .. 11791-6

Dismissals, grounds for, .. 11944-63

Letters from, procedure, .. 11585

New, rule that order in which secretaries stand is to remain unaltered, .. 11802

Rule enabling furnishing of confidential reports on school abolished, .. 11892

## MERIT MARKS :

Abolition advocated, and schemes for awarding increments and promotion, .. 12502-48, 12718-28, 12786-97

Absence of specific and clear reference to, in rules, .. 13392-38

Circumstances under which teachers have not to wait three more years to obtain increment promotion, .. 12451-3

Condition of school buildings ought to be in teacher's favour and not against him, .. 11659-63

Difficulty in grading schools mainly responsible for present agitation, .. 12114-22

Everything in power of Board done to lessen friction, .. 11354

Form a ready means by which Board can distribute awards of increments and promotions, and if abolished would be necessary for Board to assess Inspector's reports under some such similar heads, .. 11546-8

Importance of not altering, without grave reason, stress laid on, and steps taken when lowered, .. 11689-92, 11883

no Inspector below rank of senior Inspector allowed to alter, without conference with the latter, .. 11863, 12438-91, 12992

STARKIE, W. J. M., M.A., Litt.D., LL.D.—*con.*

## MISCELLANEOUS—continued

- Lead down as a principle that it is not to be altered, and objections, 13781-96, 13801-8  
Lowering, instances showing violation of spirit of circular in tone, and question, 13816-20  
Personal mark of teacher, question re, 11887-92, 11895  
Personal, teachers not made aware of, and reason, 11893-7  
Reduction, question of, 12968-75, 12964-74  
Spirit of 1911 circular not sufficiently obeyed, and misinterpreted by people in whose interest it was drawn up, 11355-69  
Treasury knows nothing about, and one of evil results of present committee is that they will get to know them, 12463-601  
Uniformity question, 11480, 11485, 11650-734, 11858-900, 11901-7, 12105, 12767-71  
Observation book, suggestion that Inspector might leave copy of report he is to send to Board in, question as to advantage, 13335-9

## PRIMARY EDUCATION :

- Loss in, from abolition of stimulus of examination under Results system, question, 13468-37  
Sketch of introduction, to show difficulties, 11210-369, 12014-17  
PROMOTION :  
Block in, owing to standard numbers in higher grade having been reached in case of men, 11981-4  
Method, 11340-53, 12649-58  
"Paper," Treasury responsible for, 12076  
Some Standard necessary for, even if merit marks were abolished, 12070-5  
Time taken to get from bottom to top, 11450-61

## REPORTS :

- Full formal, on every school every year considered unnecessary, 13401-7  
Great deal too much depends on, 11901  
Incidental, not necessary for very short visits, 13405-7  
Procedure, 11385  
Results system, abolition, prophecy as to result, 11808

## SALARIES :

- Bonuses  
Scheme for, to be provided according to size of schools, but failure, 12693-5  
to Teachers of large and important schools, 11465  
no difference made between large and small schools, 12501-8  
Highest, of men in town schools, question, 11465  
Initial, far too small in case of large schools, 11371  
New scheme :  
Hopes of saving not fulfilled, 13745-59  
Improvements under, 11415-23  
Scale proposed, and question, 11654-73  
System forced upon Board, 12590-6

## SCHOOL ATTENDANCE :

- Fallacy with regard to averages, and question, 12576-81  
Increase in percentage since 1900, 12211-4

## SCHOOLS, BUILDINGS AND PREMISES :

- Central authority has to wait local effort, 11320  
Deficiency of accommodation :  
in Belfast, question re, 12227-30  
Rule as to exclusion of youngest children in case of, 11312-3  
Floor space, improvement in, 11320  
Plaza, improvements, 11320  
Sanitary condition, improvement during last 10 years, 11313-20

## SCHOOL EQUIPMENT :

- Desks provided for all children, and Kindergarten desks obligatory in all schools where infants are enrolled, 11331  
Slates not used, 11331

STARKIE, W. J. M., M.A., Litt.D., LL.D.—*con.*

## SCHOOL PROGRAMME :

- Improvement under present system, 11425-43, 11450  
Intelligence increased but accuracy lessened, question, 11890-5  
Freedom of teachers in organisation, question as to modification by inspectors, 13777-80  
Modified, invited to be submitted by managers, and case of Father Longbrey, 13689-703  
Reading, extracts showing increase in intelligence owing to fact that examination in subject matter was made compulsory, and question, 13678-81  
Represents a maximum, attainable only in favourably situated schools take up little beyond "the 3 Rs," 11466  
School Year, uniform & separate, for each school, question of, 13374-400

## SCHOOLS :

- Age of admission of babies, question, 12215-23  
Appearance of schoolrooms improved by flowers, 11331  
Cleaning, grant from Treasury inadequate, but no case of teacher paying for, come across, 11320-3  
Condition caused by lack of local interest in, no longer here to same extent as 10 years ago, 11324-31, 11974, 13289-394  
Draft system formerly in vogue in single teacher schools, 11395-402  
Efficiency question, 11391-406  
Higher grade, scheme proposed but nothing done, 11423-5  
Large majority of children do not get beyond fourth standard, 12209-11  
Libraries :  
Considerable increase in, 12231-5  
Not sufficiently common, 11331-2  
Multiplication of, and question, 11372-90  
Out of date and inadequate organisation, question, 13793-5  
Satisfactory, should be left in hands of teachers, and closely examined by inspectors once in three years, 11355-6  
Small and unnecessary reduction in number, 11469  
Two new standards to take up intermediate courses introduced, 11443-5  
Visits of Resident Commissioner :  
Inspectors accompanying, question, 13149-76  
Particulars, 11430-5  
State Aid, misunderstanding of wording "surrendered to the Treasury," and question, 11838-81

## TEACHERS :

- Appointments : circular issued to inspectors leaving impression that babies were being accepted by managers, 13283-3, 13512-21  
Appointment as county, urban or district councillors allowed when co-opted, 11798-802  
Assistants, rule that order in which they stand is to remain unaltered when a new manager comes in, 11802  
Attendance at political meetings, question, 11771-6, 11708  
Character query abolished, 11802  
Civil rights, 11782-4, 12109-15  
Complaint against Managers :  
of Dismissal, action now taken by Board, 11787-90  
Privilege granted of making, direct to Board, 11787  
Dismissals :  
Appeals to Board from managers, question, 11791-6  
Increase in percentage since 1902, but nothing proved as to absolute increase, 11785, 13199-220  
For inefficiency, official procedure, and percentage, 11790-9, 11787  
Every effort made to continue teacher ineligible for pension, until pensionable age, 11735  
Every teacher furnished with grounds of dissatisfaction of Board and allowed to present statement in own defence, 11735, 11787

STARKIE, W. J. M. M.A., Litt.D., LL.D.—*con.*TEACHERS—*continued.*Discipline—*continued.*

- by Managers, no information, .. 11742-4  
 None, on account of inability to adapt themselves to new conditions, .. 11735  
 None on single bad report not on report of inspector below rank of senior or chief inspector, 11745-8, 12236-34, 11735  
 not Part of policy that all teachers below "good" are to be dismissed or eliminated, 11682-9  
 Policy to get rid of men when young and without loss by refusing them recognition as principal teachers unless they qualify for diplomas within five years of completing training, .. 11745-60  
 Rare, except for immorality, .. 11760  
 Thorough inspection of school as a whole and examination of all children necessary, 12235-64  
 of Two kinds, .. 11736-41  
 Warning before severe punitive action is taken so as to have ample opportunities of remedying defects, .. 11735  
 Extracts from reports sent direct to, for information and guidance, .. 11787  
 Proliferation and inefficiency :  
   Action taken by chief of inspection in case of indefensibility lax, .. 11735  
   Penalties for, .. 11581-4  
   Question as to inducement, 11956-9, 12167-87  
 Furnished with statement of changes of irregularities or inefficiency, and allowed to submit reply or explanation direct to Board, .. 11787  
 Further report of inspector after appeal from, not sent to, .. 12438-87  
 Good teachers secured for country schools and some of best schools in out-of-the-way parts, 11371  
 Higher certificates awarded to, who successfully pass examinations in subjects of professional or general character, .. 11448  
 Insecurity of tenure, .. 11923-33  
 Liberty of, question as to undue restrictions, 12793-801  
 Male assistants, training required, 11332-5, 11428  
 having been Monitors preferred, .. 11449-51  
 New managers must enter into agreement with each member of existing staff and cannot dispense with services of any, except under terms of agreement, .. 11797-8, 11770  
 Maternity rule, question as to whether it would stand in law, .. 12927-33  
 Penalties and fines, code, .. 11985-90  
 not Permitted to carry on trades or to be engaged in any trade or occupation or to be members of any association tending to impair their usefulness as teachers, .. 11782-6  
 Preparation for work, question as to use of regulation as engine of oppression, .. 12878-88  
 Principals, training required, 11332-5, 11448  
 Programme question, discussion of, 11777-81  
 Promise of recruitment of inspectors largely from ranks of, and question, .. 12766-76  
 Relations with inspectors, question of, and would be greatly improved if responsibility for increment were removed from inspectors, 12632-48  
 Reprimands :  
   Confidential, and no effect on reputation, 12430-9, 12821-3  
   Letters sent out by secretaries, 11591-7  
   Procedures, .. 12426-53, 12859-71  
   Rules for guidance and relaxation of, 11770-1  
   Submission of inspectors' further report to, in appeal cases, question, .. 11585-607  
   System of marking an outrage on, .. 11335  
   Third year's course of training for, who propose to attend lectures in University Colleges, and higher certificate awarded to, .. 11448  
   Training Colleges, provision, .. 11474-8  
   Women, training will be required as soon as colleges can supply enough trained teachers to fill vacancies, .. 11332, 11474

## State grant :

- Local aid a condition for securing, *Dilworth*, 8, 9, 304-11, 302-5  
 Practically whole of salaries of National School Teachers paid from, *Dilworth*, .. 8  
 Surplus of balances, question, *Dilworth*, 178-90, 280-74 ; *Cummins*, 7525-56 ; *Clarke*, 8770-3, 8838 ; *Starkie*, 11858-81 ; *Price*, 12932-57, 14128-8, 14642-64, 14070-8 ; *Hobson*, 14268-73.  
 Total amount, 1911, *Dilworth*, .. 11 p. 129, 1.  
 Syllabus book, no test of proficiency of school, *Dawson*, .. 3090-1

## T.

## Teachers :

- Abuse of system, and question, *Tristram*, 10190, 10222-32, 10359-64  
 Appeals, see that title.  
 Appointment as county, urban or district councillors allowed when co-opted, *Dilworth*, 223-4, 224-5, p. 123, 1 ; *Starkie*, 11798-802.  
 APPOINTMENTS :  
   Circular issued to inspectors leaving impression that bribes were being accepted by managers, *Starkie*, .. 12282-8, 12512-24  
   Having been monitors preferred, *Starkie*, 11449-51  
   Placed in third or lowest grade, *Dilworth*, 122 of Unsuitable educational capacity, *Dale*, 10626  
 ASSISTANT :  
   Appointed on or after 1st April, 1900, ineligible for promotion beyond third grade unless in exceptional circumstances, and by special order of Commissioners, *Dilworth*, .. 123  
   Average required fee, reduced, *Starkie*, .. 11423  
   Male, training required, *Starkie*, 11312-5, 11448  
   Rule that order in which they stand is to remain unaltered when a new manager comes in, *Starkie*, .. 11892  
   So-called principle of the "swing" introduced, *Starkie*, .. 11423  
   Total number, *Dilworth*, .. 162-3  
   Principals have nothing to do with appointment of, except by advising manager, *Dilworth*, 197-240  
 Attendance at political meetings, question, *Dilworth*, 925-33, p. 123, 1 ; *Starkie*, 11771-4, 11798

## CANDIDATES FOR TRAINING COLLEGES :

- Better and larger supply would be obtained were initial salary raised, *MacNeill*, 1786A-1807, 2024-42  
 Death in supply of, *Hynes*, .. 6837-88  
 Migration of, question, *Dilworth*, .. 136-7  
 Supply fluctuating, *Dilworth*, .. 745-7  
 Censure by examiners in case of negligence in performance of duties final, *Parcell*, 3281-7  
 Character query omitted, *Dilworth*, p. 123, 1 ; *Starkie*, .. 11892  
 Circular to, .. 134-7, 1.  
 Civil rights, *Blapham*, 7329-2, 7383-4, 7443-9 ; *Cummins*, 7481-3, 7527-23 ; *Tristram*, 10355-8 ; *Starkie*, 11782-6, 12169-15, 12798-801.  
 Classes for singing, *Starkie*, .. 11425  
 Combined in just as loud terms of *Rowell* system as they are now complaining of present system, *Wise*, .. 2463-85

## COMPLAINTS AGAINST, BY MANAGERS :

- no Copy furnished to, unless formal enquiry is to be held, *Parcell*, .. 2592-5  
 Inquiry held into by manager, procedure, *Parcell*, .. 3400, 3402-25  
 Nature of, *Parcell*, 3426-7, 3082, 3089-90

## COMPLAINTS AGAINST, BY PERSONS OTHER THAN MANAGERS :

- Duties of examiners connected with letters, *Parcell*, .. 3408-20  
 Nature and origin, *Parcell*, .. 3437-9

## Teachers—continued.

## COMPLAINTS AGAINST MANAGERS:

- of Dismissal, action now taken by Board,  
*Starkie*, . . . . . 11787-90  
 Privilege granted of making, direct to Board,  
*Starkie*, . . . . . 11787  
 Correspondence not carried on with by Board,  
 and exception to rule, *Dilworth*, 205, p. 133-4, 1.  
 Course of study for students after leaving training  
 colleges important, *McNeill*, 1530-44, 1620-1  
 Criticism of programme to outside public, question,  
*Dilworth*, 225-8, 230-2, 933-44; *Frischman*, 10392-4;  
*Starkie*, 11771-81.  
 Depositions, see under Board of National Education.  
 Difficulty of doing work, *Faria*, . . . . 10067-68

## DIPLOMA:

- Award of, process followed, and statistics, *Wynn*,  
 2049-50, 2262-2266  
 Form for, *Wynn*, . . . . . p. 162, 1.  
 Granting of, question as to conditions, *Dilworth*,  
 335-91  
 Table, *Wynn*, . . . . . p. 165, 1.

## DISMISSALS:

- Appeals to Board from managers, question,  
*Starkie*, . . . . . 11791-4  
 Board cannot renege teachers, but may either  
 remove manager or not allow manager to  
 appoint successor, *Dilworth*, . . . . . 240  
 Every effort made to continue teacher ineligible  
 for pension until pensionable age, *Starkie*,  
 . . . . . 11735  
 Formal statement of grounds furnished to  
 teacher, and allowed to present statement in  
 own defence, *Dilworth*, 239, *Starkie*, 11783,  
 11787.  
 Increase in percentage since 1902, but nothing  
 proved as to absolute increase, *Starkie*,  
 . . . . . 11735, 13194-220  
 In inefficiency, official procedure, and per-  
 centage, *Starkie*, . . . . . 11740-9, 11787  
 Last resource, *Dilworth*, . . . . . 1161-70  
 by Managers, no information, *Starkie*, 11742-4  
 None, on account of inability to adapt them,  
 advice to new conditions, *Starkie*, . . . . 11735  
 None dismissed on single bad report, nor on  
 report of inspector below rank of senior or  
 chief inspector, *Starkie*, . . . . . 11735, 11745-8, 12235-54  
 of Old teachers on ground of inefficiency,  
 question, *Clarke*, . . . . . 9047-73  
 not Part of policy that all teachers below "good"  
 are to be dismissed or eliminated, *Starkie*,  
 . . . . . 13652-9  
 Policy to get rid of men when young and without  
 ties by refusing them recognition as principal  
 teachers unless they qualify for diploma  
 within five years of completing training,  
*Starkie*, . . . . . 11740-60  
 Power of managers, irrespective of National  
 Board, *Purcell*, . . . . . 3682-80.  
 Power of National Board irrespective of  
 managers, *Purcell*, . . . . . 3588  
 Procedure, *Dilworth*, . . . . . 648  
 Rare, except for immorality, *Starkie*, . . 11740  
 on Report of single inspector in no case, and  
 instance and question, *Lennox*, 14508-32  
 Right of appeal direct to Board, *Dilworth*, 240  
 Thorough inspection of school as a whole, and  
 examination of all children necessary, *Starkie*,  
 . . . . . 12365-64  
 of Two kinds, *Starkie*, . . . . . 11735-41  
 Warning before severe punitive action is taken  
 so as to have ample opportunities of remedying  
 defects, *Starkie*, . . . . . 11735  
 Demanding idea of restrictions, *Dilworth*, p. 133, 1.  
 Due facilities for appeal to Board not allowed,  
*Downing*, . . . . . p. 477, 11.  
 Examination after having left Training College,  
 question as to desirability, *Downing*,  
 . . . . . 5023-5, 5153-5  
 Examinations of, preparation of questions, circular,  
 . . . . . p. 141, 1.  
 Examinations held by, not as adequate test of  
 work done by, *Wynn*, . . . . . 2181  
 Exception taken to not being at liberty to promote  
 pupils, except at beginning of school year,  
*Downing*, . . . . . 5156-6

## Teachers—continued.

Extracts only, of reports sent to, and full desired,  
*Dilworth*, 236, 348, 1045-61; *Posler*, 5769-70;  
*Lennox*, 6129-34; *Clarke*, 6223-32, 6262-3, 6298-  
 303; *Purcell*, 3674-6; *Frischman*, 10308-31;  
*Starkie*, 11787.

## FALSIFICATION OF ACCOUNTS:

- Action taken by chiefs of inspection in case of  
 and inefficiency indefensibly lax, *Starkie*, 11735  
 Fines and severe punishment for, under Results  
 system, *Lennox*, . . . . . 10964-7  
 Inducement, question as to, *Starkie*,  
 . . . . . 11956-9, 12167-87  
 Opportunity given of forwarding statement in  
 defence, *Purcell*, . . . . . 3390-6, 3529-36  
 Financial demands made upon, for equipment  
 and cleaning of schools, and effect on marking,  
 question, *Dilworth*, 280-1, 378-413, 507-10,  
 597-8; *McNeill*, 1540-60, 1556-74, 1583-93,  
 1465-82, 1552-6, 1773-80, 1785-8, 2000-8;  
*O'Connor*, 2811-17, 2690-4, 2825-39, 3074-80;  
*Purcell*, 3677-81; *Parker*, 4552-61; *Posler*,  
 5598-77, 5608, 5717-21, 5829-1, 5825-8, *Grier*,  
 5881-3, 5928-9; *Lennox*, 6066-6308, 6095-9,  
 6076-80, 6191-10, 6139-43, 6186-7; *Clarke*,  
 6209-20, 6203-10, 6385-7, 6408-10; *Ward*,  
 6424; *Hynes*, 6959-60; *Miller*, 5050-61, 6258-67;  
*McCarthy*, 8352-8, 8413-14; *Ward*, 9383-7; *Dale*,  
 10536-7; *Starkie*, 11320-3, 11659-63; *Hobson*,  
 14187-82, 14194-7, 14408-12.  
 Forbidden to keep public-house, or to be the  
 husband or wife of a person keeping a public-  
 house, *Dilworth*, . . . . . 222, 282, p. 133, 1.  
 Good teachers secured for country schools, and some  
 of best schools in on-the-way parts, *Starkie*,  
 . . . . . 11371

Grades, see that title.

- Grants from Board for cultivation of Irish studies  
 among, *Starkie*, . . . . . 11443  
 Greater freedom from anxiety under present  
 system, *O'Connor*, . . . . . 2690-8  
 Greater freedom in selecting text-books and  
 arranging subjects, and question, *O'Connor*,  
 . . . . . 2687-84, 2723-7.  
 Grievances and discontent, and question of,  
*Dilworth*, 498-501, 665, 1019-20; *O'Connor*,  
 3267-92; *Parker*, 4511-15; *Posler*, 5798-801,  
 5814-7, 5860; *Clarke*, 8718-20, 9214-23; *Ward*,  
 9293-8, 9345-53, 9664-7.

## HIGHER CERTIFICATES:

- Awarded to, who successfully pass examination in  
 subjects of professional or general character,  
*Starkie*, . . . . . 11463  
 Notice to Managers and Teachers, . . p. 516, 11.  
 Increased facilities under new scheme for encourag-  
 ing earnest teachers and controlling negligent  
 teachers, *Downing*, . . . . . 4978  
 Increments, see that title.

## INEFFICIENCY:

- Furnished with statement of charges of irregu-  
 larities or inefficiency, and allowed to submit  
 reply or explanation direct to Board, *Starkie*,  
 . . . . . 11787  
 Number of cases, question, *Wynn*, . . . . 2084-7  
 Process followed, *Wynn*, . . . . . 2080-3  
 should be informed of inspector's statements in  
 appeal cases, *Hynes*, 6955-90, 7093-6; *Starkie*,  
 11585-607, 12438-57; *Hobson*, 14189-93, 14248-  
 52.  
 should be informed of object of check inspection,  
*Ward*, . . . . . 9351-2  
 Insecure tenure under Results system, question,  
*Lennox*, . . . . . 10960-3  
 Insecurity of tenure, *Starkie*, . . . . . 11828-53  
 Lack of initiative in formulating schemes of  
 instruction or in adoption of new methods,  
*O'Connor*, . . . . . 2726-36, 3083-118  
 Liberty in dealing with school programme and  
 interference of inspectors, question, *McNeill*,  
 1493-7; *O'Connor*, 3191-201; *Downing*, 4974-7,  
 4997-5000, 5085-8, 6384-83, 5470-7; *Posler*,  
 5714-5; *McCarthy*, 8617; *Faria*, 10067-68;  
*Frischman*, 10182-92; *Starkie*, 13777-80; *Hobson*,  
 14395.  
 Managers required to enter into formal agreements  
 with, *Starkie*, . . . . . 11770  
 Minimum rule, *Downing*, p. 477, 11; *Wynn*, 2555-  
 68; *Bingham*, 4347-40, *Miller*, 5350-12; *Starkie*,  
 12564-76, 12927-33.



## Teachers—continued.

- Matter of greater importance to, to have just and uniform system of inspection than in England, *Dale*, 10709-804
- Merit Marks, see *that title*
- More trust and confidence should be placed in, by Commissioners and their officers, *Purser*, p. 404, 11
- Necessity of written preparation for lessons, question, *Downing*, 5092-4
- New managers must enter into agreement with each member of existing staff, and cannot dispense with services of any, except under terms of agreement, *Starkie*, 11797-8
- New subjects in curriculum, question of pressing hardly on, *McNeill*, 2792-803
- Notes to Teachers:
- Nature of, and question as to use of, *Wye*, 2427-34
  - no Responsibility on chief inspectors for preparation of, as a whole, and not forced on teachers, *Purser*, 4307-13
  - Submitted to whole Board, *Clarke*, 9149-59
- Notice of Inspectors' visits, question, *Ward*, 9356-60, 9743-50, *Wyses*, 6891-7007, *Tristram*, 10377-81; *Dale*, 10571-5, 10648-51, 10658-61, 10829-31; *Starkie*, 11960-2, 12649-75, 13904-9; *Tolson*, 14183-5, 14238-47
- Number, 1903-12, p. 517, 11
- no Objection to communication of certified circulars to, *Starkie*, 12739-44
- Observation book open to, *Dilworth*, 1632
- Penalties and fines, code and procedure, *Purser*, 3397-8, 3421-5; *Starkie*, 11881-4, 11896-90; *Prinzel*, 14110-8, 14121-4
- not Permitted to carry on trades, or to be engaged in any trade or occupation, or to be members of any association tending to impair their usefulness as teachers, *Dilworth*, 821-3, 282-93, 219-35, p. 133, 1; *Starkie*, 11788-9
- Practical rules for guidance of, *Dilworth*, p. 133, 1
- Preparation for work, circular to Inspectors, and question, p. 147-8, 1; *Starkie*, 13878-84

## PRINCIPALS:

- Nothing to do with appointment of assistants, except by advising manager, *Dilworth*, 197-500
- Total number, *Dilworth*, 162
- Refused recognition as, unless they qualify for diploma within five years of completing training, *Starkie*, 11749-60
- Training required, *Starkie*, 11353-5, 11468
- Prizes for successful teaching of Irish, *Starkie*, 11443
- not Prohibited from farming, *Dilworth*, 221
- Promotion, see *that title*
- Provision for watching work of students from training colleges for first five years, *McNeill*, 1549-51
- Prop'd Teachers' class instituted, *Starkie*, 11423, 11446-8
- Recruitment of inspectors from ranks of, question, *Dilworth*, 18-19; *McNeill*, 1066-71; *Downing*, 1066-70; *Peeler*, 5823-4; *Wingham*, 7267-74; *Cambridge*, 7514-6; *Leaves*, 11054-5; *Tristram*, 10135-6; *Dale*, 10742-3; *Starkie*, 12748, 13766-76
- Relations with Board, *Dilworth*, 306-12, p. 132-3, 1; *Starkie*, 11770-96
- Relaxation of rules, *Dilworth*, p. 133, 1; *Starkie*, 11770-1

## REMARKS:

- not Brought before Resident Commissioner as a rule, *Starkie*, 12423
- Confidential, and no effect on reputation, *Starkie*, 12430-3
- no Importance attributed to, *Starkie*, 13821-3
- Issuing by examiners inadvisable, *Dale*, 10606-12, 10622-5, 10819-22
- Letters sent out by secretaries, *Starkie*, 11301-7
- Only go on letters signed by secretary, *Leaves*, 14363-6, 14620-3
- Procedure, *Starkie*, 12423-53, 13859-71
- Sent out by examiners without reference to any higher authority, and question, *Purser*, 3513-38; *Ward*, 9435-48, 9822, 9740-1
- Required to examine pupils every year and question as to desirability of inspector testing them in same subjects, *Wye*, 2436-98
- Returns of, forms for, *Dilworth*, 157-9

## Teachers—continued.

- Return of number compulsorily retired before attaining age for retirement on full pension, p. 518, 11
- Responsibility for formation of character should not be placed on, *Purser*, 3923-37, 4545
- Restrictive rules, *Dilworth*, p. 133, 1
- Revised programme submitted by, *Leaves*, 14454-7
- Rules and regulations with regard to conduct, *Downing*, p. 477, 11
- Salaries, see *that title*
- Saturday conferences, *Starkie*, 11425
- Staff regulated by average attendance, and taken into consideration in arriving at merit mark, *McNeill*, 1438-40
- Start on careers better equipped than formerly, *Downing*, 4821-5
- no Stampage on letters sent to Inspectors, *Wingham*, 14277-80
- Statements of whole careers prepared and sent to manager and directed to, with request to furnish explanation or observation in cases of inefficiency in school work, *Wye*, 2584
- not Students out of school hours, *McNeill*, 8389
- Study after leaving Training College as condition of promotion, suggested, *O'Connor*, 2042-3, 3013-3
- System of marking on entrance on, *Starkie*, 11295
- Tendency to study inspectors and supposed idiosyncrasies rather than to develop on own lines, question, *O'Connor*, 2733-7
- Third years' course of training for, who propose to attend lectures in University Colleges, and higher certificate awarded to, *Starkie*, 11408
- Tone and manner adopted towards, by inspectors, *Dilworth*, 306-12, 306-18, p. 132, 1; *Purser*, 4028-63, 4179-201, 4548-9; *Peeler*, 5552-62, 5657-24, 5635-6, 5673, 5708-12, 5748-50, 5768-75; *Wingham*, 3849-5, 5877-8, 5917-37, 5912-35, 5973-5, 5981-5; *Leaves*, 6914-23, 6160-7; *Coffin*, 6231-43, 6250-50, 6289-7, 6311-15; *Wingham*, 7236-9, 7248-9; *Wingham*, 7487-8, 7494, 7603-3; *McNeill*, 8338, 8342; *Clarke*, 8717, 8248, 9233-3; *Ward*, 9291-4; *Peeler*, 10047-86; *Starkie*, 11855-62, 12167-87, 12632-48; *Wingham*, 14175-82, 14218, 14296-309, 14314-3
- Trained in Model Schools in new subjects, *Leaves*, 11158
- TRAINING COLLEGES:
- Complaint that questions at July examinations were too severe, investigation by Board, and particulars, *Leaves*, 10920-11
  - Criticism of programme asked year after year, *Leaves*, 11162-72
  - Provision, *Starkie*, 11474-9
- Women, training will be required as soon as colleges can supply enough trained teachers to fill vacancies, *Starkie*, 1332, 11474
- Work of, not tested by anyone but Inspector, *O'Connor*, 3202-6
- Work mistress, number, *Dilworth*, 163
- TEACHERS' ASSOCIATIONS:
- Formal resolutions printed on agenda and laid before Board at regular intervals, *Starkie*, 11610
- TEACHERS' ORGANISATION:
- Criticism of action of inspectors thought to be doing harm to education of district, question, *Dilworth*, 917-8
  - Deputations received by successive Resident Commissioners, *Dilworth*, 911-16
- Technical Institutes:
- Belfast, see *that title*
  - Boys coming from national schools found very inefficiently prepared to take advantage of, *Peeler*, 9824-32
  - Tobermore National School, extracts from general reports, *Wye*, p. 479-80, 11
- TIME TABLE:
- Bipartite and tripartite describing arrangements made to suit, to construction of school, *Downing*, 5608-13
  - Circular, p. 129, 1
  - Examples, p. 913, 11
  - Hours allotted to reading, writing and arithmetic, question, *Wyses*, 6700-12

## Time Table—continued.

|   |         |
|---|---------|
| Memorandum re revision .. ..  | p. 503  |
| Subjects tested by inspectors without interfering with, <i>O'Connor</i> , .. .. | 3786-81 |

## Tipperary Teachers' Association:

|  |              |
|--|--------------|
| Memorial from, and 14 specific complaints, and Mr. Walsby's reply to complaints so made, .. .. | p. 300-16 I. |
|--|--------------|

see also Clonmel case.

## Trade Preparatory Schools:

|   |                     |
|---|---------------------|
| Boys eligible for, and having exhausted programme of elementary schools, kept marking time suggested remedy, <i>Forth</i> , .. .. | 9386-7, 9390-4      |
| Funds, source, <i>Forth</i> , .. ..   | 9386-91             |
| Grade of education which should be provided by National Board, <i>Forth</i> , 9370, 9382-3, 9392-9                                |                     |
| Increased number desirable, <i>Forth</i> , .. ..  | 9382, 9384-5, 10018 |

## TRISTRAM, REVEREND J. W., D.D., Canon of St. Patrick's Cathedral: .. 10102-10408

|  |                   |
|--|-------------------|
| Appeals, teachers have not right to, in fullest sense of word, .. .. | 10308-21, 10362-4 |
|--|-------------------|

## BOARD OF NATIONAL EDUCATION:

|   |                              |
|---|------------------------------|
| Principle of appointment of officials most undesirable, .. ..   | 10304-5                      |
| Rules should be tentatively published, .. ..                    | 10193-202, 10233-47, 10390-2 |
| Increments, automatic, on satisfactory report, advocated, .. .. | 10149-61, 10294, 10219       |

## INSTRUCTORS:

|  |  |
|--|--|
| Conferences, desirable, .. ..  | 10176-81                               |
| Districts changed too frequently, .. ..  | 10167-73                               |
| Experience gained by teachers in primary schools not sufficient to qualify for office of, .. ..  | 10133-5                                |
| Individual examination in certain subjects desirable, .. ..  | 10250-76, 10128-43, 10220-1, 10282-307 |
| Recognised methods of teachers should not be interfered with by, but too great tendency on part of teachers to destroy individuality, objected to, .. .. | 10182-63                               |
| Training in practical teaching in primary schools advocated, .. ..   | 10113-37                               |

## Visits:

|   |         |
|---|---------|
| Change from results system has not much increased number, .. .. | 10385-8 |
| Notice of, shortness of, and disadvantages, .. ..               | 10110-7 |

## MERRY MARKS:

|  |  |
|--|--|
| Impossibility of summing up in single word character of school, or to attain uniformity, and alternative proposed, .. .. | 10149-54                                     |
| Plan for securing uniformity of standard, .. ..  | 10162-81                                     |
| Tone, system, .. ..  | 10335-8, 10346                               |
| Promotion, by seniority, question, .. ..   | 10205-14, 10377-81                           |
| School programme, individual, question, .. ..  | 10589  |
| School year, uniform, opposed, and year for each school beginning with visit of inspector, desirable, .. ..              | 10145-6, 10215-8, 10262-7, 10320-3, 10368-73 |

## SCHOOLS:

|  |                |
|--|----------------|
| Change from school to school used by parents to get rid of attendance officer, and question, .. .. | 10218, 10248-9 |
| English systems unsuitable for, 10143, 10368-7   |                |
| no improvement in efficiency since 1900, .. ..   | 10347-9        |
| Small, efficiency question, and tendency of inspectors to close down, 10226-33, 10363-4            |                |
| .. ..  | 10401-8        |

## TEACHERS:

|   |                           |
|---|---------------------------|
| Abuse of system, and question, .. ..  | 10195, 10223-32, 10359-64 |
| Civil rights and question, .. ..  | 10385-8                   |
| Complaint that they never see reports, 10308-21   |                           |
| Criticism of programme to outside public, question, .. ..                               | 10393-4                   |
| should get notice of inspector's visits as well as Manager, .. ..                       | 10377-81                  |
| <i>Vernay</i> , M., Inspector des Ecoles, extracts of letters from, <i>Purser</i> .. .. | p. 472, II.               |

## W.

*Walsh*, Dr., Archbishop of Dublin, resignation from Board of National Education, question, *Stokes*, 13244-51

*WAED*, PHILIP, Commissioner of National Education: .. 9263-9222  
Correspondence re dismissal of Mr. Mansfield, *Purser*, 469-70, II.

## APPEALS:

|  |                  |
|--|------------------|
| Fines and dismissals come before Board 9327-8  |                  |
| Senior or chief inspector should inform teacher of object of visit of check inspection, 9351-3 |                  |
| Standing committee for dealing with, desirable, .. ..  | 9329-34          |
| Teachers should have right to re-inspection on, and divisional inspectors proposed, .. ..      | 9694-701, 9742-3 |
| Belfast case, 9305-18, 9408-34, 9494-503, 9518-30, 9557-65, 9729-31, 9786-92.                  |                  |

## BOARD OF NATIONAL EDUCATION:

|   |         |
|---|---------|
| no Alteration of rules without majority of Commissioners being present, question, 9403-6  |         |
| Circulars: .. ..  |         |
| should be inserted in Appendix to Report, .. ..   | 9469-2  |
| Issued in June, 1911, and August, 1912, intended to remedy system, .. ..  | 9303-13 |
| Commissioners: .. ..  |         |
| no Definite rules as to practice of office laid before, .. ..   | 9328-72 |
| Imbued with one idea and actuated by one motive, to administer in most efficient manner system of primary education, .. ..                                      | 9285    |
| Number of letters received from teachers, 9293-6, 9548-54, 9603-4, 9703-5, 9815-8   |         |
| Powers and duties, but in practice power largely directed of, and passed on to Resident Commissioner, 9325-6, 9337-8, 9361-7, 9378-82, 9622-23, 9663-74, 9682-9 |         |

## Residents:

|  |                           |
|--|---------------------------|
| Position .. ..   | 9512-17                   |
| Strained relations with elder officials, question, .. ..   | 9492-3                    |
| Suspension of Chief Inspectors, and question as to powers .. ..  | 9508-11                   |
| Visits to schools: .. ..   |                           |
| Destructibility of, question, .. ..  | 9618-22                   |
| Tendency to lessen confidence of inspectors and public, in Board, question 9494-503  |                           |
| Examiners, reprimands sent out by, without reference to any higher authority, and question, .. ..                                | 9435-45, 9622, 9740-1     |
| in Looking for best educational results not desire or intention of, that any injustice should be inflicted on any teacher, .. .. | 9285                      |
| Marks necessary to get increment and promotion should appear in published rules of, 9378-79                                      |                           |
| Notice should be given before proposed rules become rule in practice, .. ..  | 9467-70                   |
| Office work, question as to employment of ex-inspectors, .. ..   | 9471-5                    |
| Routine business, suggestion for conducting, .. ..   | 9424-9                    |
| Clonmel case, 9303-18, 9665-6, 9717-26, 9729-30, 9774-85, 9787-92.   |                           |
| Cloacal case, .. ..  | 9416-32, 9793-306         |
| Increments, should be annual, and come to every teacher as matter of course, with certain provisions, .. ..                      | 9320-4, 9389-407, 9707-14 |

## INSPECTORS:

|   |                  |
|---|------------------|
| Distribution of districts and circuits and general work, question, .. ..  | 9476-88          |
| Element of examination should enter into inspection, and suggestions, 9294, 9333-36, 9339-44, 9570-9, 9618-21, 9679-81, 9754-73 |                  |
| Dictatorial tone, .. ..   | 9290-1           |
| Divisional, scheme, .. ..   | 9694-701, 9715-6 |
| Formal visits, notice to teacher as well as to manager, question re, .. ..  | 9365-60, 9743-59 |
| Junior, sufficiency of initial salary to secure as good men as desired, question, .. ..   | 9459-91          |

## WARD, PHILIP—continued.

## MERIT MARKS:

- Check inspection, Inspector should not be over critical or censorious, 9334  
 Head teacher penalised by H.M. assistant, 9388-9  
 Junior Inspector should have power to raise, but not to lower, 9290  
 Levering in third year, and effect on increments, 9286-8, 9290-2  
 Standard value impossible, and abolition advocated, 9288-302, 9245-8  
 too much Responsibility put on Inspector, 9298  
 Weeding in rules is school building and equipment as affecting, question, 9383-7  
 Primary education, education given of more practical character and in certain subjects children are really better educated, 9274-82, 9280-618, 9257-70  
 Promotion, should come to every teacher as matter of course with certain provisions, 9320-4 9267-70  
 Reports, comparison of new and old systems of dealing with, and question, 9732-9  
 School programme, submission to Inspectors before being issued for criticism, question, 9531-3  
 School year, individual for school would give more satisfaction to teachers, 9749-52  
 Teachers, discontent, and question as to being confined to certain areas, 9293-6, 9549-56, 9604-7

## Weely, Mr.:

- Accompanying Resident Commissioner on visits to schools, question, Storke, 13149-76  
 Appointment as chief inspector, question as to claim, Storke, 13673-4, 13177-98  
 and Chancel case, Dulceith, 963-71, 1502-8, p. 290-16, 1, 1, Monro, 1628-54, 1808-10; Wyse, 2267-87, 2302-27, 2678-80; Parrell, 3600-13; Parer, 3997-4007; Hynde, 4713-52, 4817-28, 6006-48, 6070, 7008-30, 7084, 7082-7, 7073-83, 7161-87, 7191-4; Clarke, 8967-81, 8995-31, 9175-8; Ward, 9303-13, 9568-6, 9717-26, 9729-30, 9774-85, 9787-92; Storke, 11480, 11485-97, 11609-30, 11632-45, 11707, 11731-4, 12046-164, 12281-328, 13138-56, 13479-512, 13531-90, 13609-41, 13680-18, 13828, 13889-93, 13958-78, 13922-30; Lemons, 14398, 14406-8, 14483-93, 14567-96.

Return of schools inspected by, in first year in Chancel circuit with merit marks, p. 525, II.

- Wicklow Teachers, dissatisfaction among, with respect to passing teachers out of service, and question, Dulceith, 1161-70  
 Wilkinson, Sir Hiram, appendix handed in, p. 485-6 II.

## WOODWARD, REV. ALFRED S., M.A.:

6411-4526, App. XX.

## INSPECTORS:

- no Charge against as inspectors, 6449-501  
 Methods do not conduce to sound education, p. 478, II.  
 Practically no tests at all and modified system of examination favoured, 6592-12  
 Spirit of inspection should be changed, 6513  
 P. 478, II.  
 no Uniform system, and steps should be taken to secure, p. 478, II.

## MANAGERS:

- Full reports and not merely extracts should be sent, p. 478, II.  
 Inspectors should talk matters over with, rather than make statements in Observation Book, which are a permanent record, 6514  
 Short notice of Inspectors' visits, and should be remedied, 6514

## MERIT MARK:

- not Condemned if inspection were a reality, 6187-9, p. 478, II.  
 Full reports without attempting to sum up in one word desirable, 6490-8  
 Impressionist and tone system objected to 6433-9  
 p. 458, II.

## WOODWARD, REV. ALFRED S., M.A.—continued.

## MERIT MARK—continued.

- Personal salary should be given and part only dependent on, 6526  
 Serious complaints as to want of uniform standard known of, and particulars case instanced and facts, 6438-792.

## SCHOOLS:

- Cleaning, responsibility question, 6424  
 Promotion of children should depend to some extent on inspection, p. 478, II.  
 School equipment, case of teacher being responsible for maps and stationery, 6424-30  
 School programme, special subjects more discretion should be left to manager, 6520-3  
 School year:  
 Individual, for each school proposed, 6480-1  
 Time of, should be taken into account in inspections, p. 478, II.

Writing, see Writing and Composition under School Programme.

## WYSE, A. N. BONAPARTE, M.A., Private Secretary to the Resident Commissioner:

2040-2618, App. IV. (parts IV. &amp; VI.)

- Appeals, procedure, 2193-243, 2380-0, 2530-46  
 Board of National Education, Resident Commissioner and private secretary, visits paid to schools, 2102-4  
 Chancel case, 2267-87, 2302-27, 2578-80

## INCREMENTS:

- Absolute necessity, in interests of teachers of system of, and administration with all fairness that can be reasonably expected possible, 2106-48, 2243-51, 2323-301, 2568-72

## Annual:

- Effect on efficiency of schools would not be as good as triennial, 2348  
 would have to be very trifling sum, 2347  
 Automatic, teachers not in favour of, 2363-9  
 Depending on average attendance, and grievance of day's under seven being ineligible, 2567-84  
 Process, 3056-79  
 Schemes proposed not considered an improvement of, 2106-48, 2243-51.

## Inspection system:

- Sufficient test of schools and proficiency of pupils, and question re, 2292-301, 2342-9, 2420-62, 2450-2621.

## INSPECTORS:

- Criticism of policy of Board, not allowed, in Blue Book to be presented to Parliament, but at liberty to approach Board with any suggestions, 2179-80  
 Divisional, appointment suggested, and suggested duties, 2582-619  
 Formal examination by, not considered good for education in primary schools and question as to change in views, 2182-3, 2573-7  
 Junior, training, present method satisfactory on whole, but might be more thorough, 2523-5  
 Suggested redistribution, 2595-619

## MERIT MARKS:

- Abrupt raising of standard in Tipperary, question as to reconciliation with statement that uniformity has been attained and not being noted or checked in office, 2267-87, 2301-27  
 Balancing of, question re difficulty, 2067-72  
 Considered satisfactory way of classifying schools, and reasons, 3328-32  
 Full allowance made by inspectors for fact of school only having been couple of months at work, 2523-9  
 Lowered by new Inspector, procedure, 2072-5  
 Lowering without any examination quite legitimate and right in certain cases, 2185-92  
 Opinion as to superiority of system, and question re, 2149-29  
 Tendency of inspectors to raise, in third year and also for teacher to work harder, 2109-17  
 Tone, 2160, 2169-76, 2507-13

## WYSE, A. N. BONAPARTE—continued.

## MISCELLANEOUS—continued.

Uniformity, steps taken to secure, and more  
could be done, .. .. 2370-81, 2381.

## PROMOTIONS:

Depending on average attendance and grievance  
of boys under seven being ineligible, 2547-54.

Process, .. .. 2605-79

School programme, widened, and question re.  
2410-26

## SCHOOLS:

Grouping of standards in small schools, and  
opinion, .. .. 2409-9

Improvement in every respect under new  
system, 2160-3 2435-55, 2496-507, 2613-9.

Pupils, merit certificate given by teacher and  
senior inspector, .. .. 2288-91A.

School year, uniform as at present desirable, 2524

## WYSE, A. N. BONAPARTE—continued.

## TEACHERS:

Complained in just as loud terms of Bonaparte  
system as they are now complaining of  
present system, .. .. 2463-85

Examinations by, not an adequate test of work  
done by teacher .. .. 2181

## Inefficiency:

Number of cases, question, .. 2084-7

Process followed, .. .. 2080-5

Maturity rule, and grievance of .. 2655-65

Notes to Teachers issued by Board, nature of,  
and question as to use of, .. 2427-34

Required to examine pupils every year and  
question as to desirability of inspector testing  
them in same subjects .. .. 2446-98